

EPIPHANY STUDIES

IN THE

SCRIPTURES

**"The Path of the Just is as the Shining Light,
That Shineth More and More
Unto the Perfect Day."**

SERIES XIII

SAMUELS — KINGS CHRONICLES

(With An Appendix)

7,000 Edition

"Which of The Prophets have not your Fathers Persecuted?" (Acts 7:52).

PAUL S. L. JOHNSON
As Executive Trustee of The Laymen's Home Missionary Movement
PHILADELPHIA, PA., U. S. A.
1949

To the King of Kings and Lord of Lords

IN THE INTEREST OF

HIS CONSECRATED SAINTS,

WAITING FOR THE ADOPTION,

— AND OF —

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

"THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH,"

— AND OF —

THE GROANING CREATION, TRAVAILING AND WAITING FOR

THE MANIFESTATION OF THE SONS OF GOD,

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED.

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

COPYRIGHT 1949

BY PAUL S. L. JOHNSON

As Executive Trustee of The Laymen's Home Missionary Movement

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

IT IS the design of this volume of the Epiphany Studies in the Scriptures to set forth the antitypes of the books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles, with the exception of those parts of them that treat of David and Solomon. Those parts of these books that treat of David are given, as to their small antitype, in the two volumes of this work entitled "The Parousia Messenger." Those parts of these books that treat of Solomon will, as to their small antitype, be discussed, *D. v.*, in a chapter that is to be added to another volume of this work. The present volume treats first, of antitypical Samuel in two chapters; then of antitypical Samuel and Saul in one chapter. Thereafter it gives the antitypes of the kings of Israel and Judah insofar as they concern their large parallels. We say large parallels, in which the years in the lives of these are paralleled by the years of certain Gospel-Age movements just 2520 years later, because there is a small parallel in which the years of these kings are paralleled by days in the Epiphany. This small parallel has been explained in *EJ*, chapter 6. It might be added that there is a third set of antitypes of the kings of Judah and Israel, that is, certain specialized antitypes, for example, Elijah as the type of the Church as God's reformer-mouthpiece to the world from Jordan to its final deliverance, Elisha as the type of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, first, as the servants of the Church until it lost mouthpieceship to the world, and thereafter, as God's mouthpiece to the world, particularly as Societyites. There are numerous other specialized antitypes in these books. In the appendix we treat briefly of the specialized antitype of Athaliah and Joash and their acts. The first part of the appendix treats of the Gospel-Age antitypes of Lamentations set forth in *Lam.* 1-5.

From the above it can be readily inferred how rich in typical teachings the six books treated of in this volume are. That the two books of Samuel and the two books of Kings are typical, and that typically prophetic, is evident from the fact that, in the Hebrew Old Testament, they belong to its second division, which is in Hebrew called *The Prophets*. This division has two parts, the first, the

books from Joshua to 2 Kings inclusive, being by God called The Earlier Prophets, and the second, consisting of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the twelve minor prophets, is there called The Later Prophets. From what Peter said (Acts 3:24) we infer that Samuel, the first of the line of prophets, wrote Joshua, Judges and Ruth, and from 1 Chro. 29:29, we infer that he wrote the bulk of 1 Sam. The questions arise, Why does God call the former set of books "Earlier Prophets" since they are historical in character, and how could the inspired Peter refer to these four books, as well as to the rest of these historical books, as Prophets? The reply to these questions is that they are prophetic. They are histories that give prophetic types, that is, types that foretell future persons, events and things. From this fact we infer that 1 and 2 Chro., treating of the same general events, are also typically prophetic. It is these facts that have moved the author to study these books as types of future things in the unfolding plan of God, and to set forth his Divinely illuminated findings thereon in this volume. That upon its ministry God may richly bestow His blessing is the prayer of its author.

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

Philadelphia, Penna.,
July 7, 1945.

CONTENTS.

PART I. ISRAEL'S FIRST PROPHET AND KING.

CHAPTER I. SAMUEL.

1 Sam. 1-4.

PRENATAL EXPERIENCES. BIRTH AND BOYHOOD. EVIL PRIESTS. EARLY
ACTIVITIES AS PROPHET. THE FIRST BATTLE. THE SECOND BATTLE. . 7

CHAPTER II. SAMUEL (Continued).

1 Sam. 5-8.

THE ARK AT ASHDOD; AT GATH; AT EKRON. WORK OF THE PHILISTINE
LORDS. BETH-SHEMITES. KIRJATH-JEARIMITES. WAR WITH THE
PHILISTINES. DESIRING A KING. 83

CHAPTER III. SAMUEL AND SAUL.

1 Sam. 9-15.

SAUL MADE KING. HIS VICTORY OVER NAHASH. SAMUEL'S
VINDICATION AND EXHORTATIONS. SAUL'S FIRST WAR WITH THE
PHILISTINES. HIS DISOBEDIENCE. 181

PART II. LARGE PARALLELS OF JUDAH'S AND ISRAEL'S KINGS.

CHAPTER IV.
EARLIER PARALLELS.

1 Kings 12:1–2 Kings 8:29; 2 Chron. 13:1–22:5.

CHRONOLOGICAL HARMONIES. EARLIER PARALLEL PROTESTANT
MOVEMENTS. THEIR MANY CONTROVERSIES. ANTITYPICAL ELIJAH
AND ELISHA. 273

CHAPTER V.
SOME MIDDLE PARALLELS.

2 Kings 9-11:21; 13:1-25; 14:15, 16; 23-29; 15:8-12;
2 Chron. 22:10-23:21.

JEHU. JEHOAHAZ. JEHOASH. JEROBOAM II. ZACHARIAH. ATHALIAH.
JOASH. 383

CHAPTER VI.
OTHER MIDDLE PARALLELS.

2 Kings 11:21-12:21; 14:1-14, 17-20; 2 Chron. 24:1-25:28.

JOASH (OF JUDAH). AMAZIAH. WAR BETWEEN AMAZIAH AND JOASH (OF
ISRAEL). 471

CHAPTER VII.
LATER PARALLELS.

2 Kings 14:21–17:41; 18:9-12; 2 Chron. 26:1–28:27.

UZZIAH. JOTHAM. AHAZ. SHALLUM. MENAHEM. PEKAHIAH. PEKAH.
AHAZ. HOSHEA. 527

CHAPTER VIII.
LAST PARALLELS.

HEZEKIAH. MANASSEH. AMON. JOSIAH. JEHOAHAZ. JEHOIAKIM.
JEHOIACHIN. ZEDEKIAH. 619

CHAPTER I

SAMUEL.

1 Sam. 1–4.

PRENATAL EXPERIENCES. BIRTH AND BOYHOOD. EVIL PRIESTS. EARLY
ACTIVITIES AS PROPHET. THE FIRST BATTLE. THE SECOND BATTLE.

WE WILL, as the first part of this book, study the first 15 chapters of 1 Sam., and that under the following two titles: (1) Samuel—Type and Antitype (1 Sam. 1—8), and (2) Samuel and Saul—Type and Antitype (1 Sam. 9—15). Accordingly, in this and the following chapter we will study the first subject, and, after finishing it, we will study the second subject in the third chapter, God willing and prospering our study. As elsewhere indicated, our typical expositions will be made terser than those usually hitherto given. Otherwise we will be unable to accomplish the Lord's will for the Epiphany messenger, that he explain everything in the Bible not explained by the Parousia messenger. We will not find the Samuel antitype to follow throughout a progressive, chronological sequence of events. Rather, the first 15 chapters of the book give us, especially in its first eight chapters, a series of Gospel-Age pictures of certain events more or less disconnected chronologically from one another, though more or less connected in general lines of thought. Thus the events of 1 Sam. 1 and 2 give us a chronological picture of certain related events, more or less separate and distinct from those that follow. As we go on we will point out in each case the changes from one to the other set of pictures. The general setting of 1 Sam. 1 and 2 will first be given. It treats of the elect classes, especially of the Little Flock, in the end of the Age. The antitype in general outlines is like that of Jacob, his wives and his children, with certain differences to bring out thoughts not found in the Jacob

picture. In this story, generally speaking, Elkanah corresponds to Jacob, Peninnah to Leah, Zilpah and Bilhah, and Hannah to Rachel, with certain elaborations not found in the Rachel picture. We have seen that in his family matters Jacob types the Gospel-Age star-members and their special helpers; Leah, Zilpah and Bilhah certain truths and the servants who applied them to the members of the ten denominational groups of Christendom; Rachel the elective truths and the servants who applied them to the Little Flock and the Great Company in the end of the Age—the Parousia and the Epiphany; Joseph the Little Flock in the Parousia movement and Benjamin the Great Company in the Epiphany movement. In the Hannah picture Samuel is made to correspond with Joseph in the Rachel picture, Hannah's other three sons (1 Sam. 2:21) to the Great Company in its three divisions and Hannah's two daughters to the Youthful Worthies in their two groups, those in the Epiphany movement, who will, if faithful, be the Millennial Shimite Gershonites, and those among the Levite Truth movements, who will, if they cleanse themselves and then prove faithful, be the Millennial Libnite Gershonites. Thus we see that while Rachel types the spiritual elective truths and the servants that apply them to the two spiritual elect classes in the end of the Age, Hannah additionally types the earthly elective truths and the servants that apply them to the earthly elect class, the Youthful Worthies developed in the end of the Age, *i.e.*, from 1881 onward. The Jacob, *etc.*, and the Elkanah, *etc.*, types are a splendid example of how God gives His truths, here a little and there a little, thus making various Scriptures, while giving certain lines of Truth in common, supplement one another by giving varying details, which, of course, are not contradictions. So far an outline of the antitypes of 1 Sam. 1 and 2. Now to general, not particular details.

(2) The star-members and their special assistants (Elkanah, *God-acquired*, 1) throughout the Gospel

Age from early in the Smyrna period (70-313 A.D.) onward, have been prominent in both the real and the nominal church (Ramathaim, *two, heights*) as watchmen (Zophim, *watchers*) in both Zions (mount Ephraim, *doubly fruitful*), in the interest of God's real and nominal people. They had the qualities (son ... son ... son ... son) of being shown love, *i.e.*, experienced God's love in providence, redemption, instruction, justification, sanctification and deliverance (Jeroham, *he is loved*), of being strong in grace, knowledge and service (Elihu, *he is strong, or he is a god*), of being humble (Tohu, *lowly*), of being the bearer of good tidings (Zuph, *honeycomb*) and of especial efficiency (Ephrathite, *one doubly fruitful*). They were made the steward of two sets of truths and of the servants who applied them to their respective subjects (he had two wives, 2). The character and nature (name) of the first of these sets of truths and its appliers were grace (Hannah, *grace, favor*). The character and nature (name) of the second of these sets of truths and its appliers were strength and brilliance (Peninnah, *coral, pearl*). The second set of truths and its appliers had produced and developed from the Smyrna period unto the end of the Philadelphia period the ten, or twelve, denominational groups (had children) of Christendom: the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Calvinistic, the Baptist, the Unitario-Universalist, the Episcopal, the Methodist, the Christian (Campbellite) and the Adventist Church. It will be noted that under the Jacob picture the Congregational Church is included in the Calvinistic Church, while the Fanatical Sects are regarded not as sects, but as individuals fanatically disposed in all of the ten denominational groups of Christendom, though in the tabernacle's camp picture these two as denominational groups are set forth as the antitypes of the Manasseh and Benjamin tribes respectively. While thus antitypical Peninnah had as children the ten, or twelve, denominational groups (it will be noted that

their number is not indicated, except suggestively or indirectly in 2, 4, 8, hence they may be viewed from either of the above viewpoints), antitypical Hannah had produced and developed neither a denomination nor a permanent movement (had no children).

(3) The star-members, as God's special servants, started, and they and their special assistants developed (this man went up, 3) all twelve movements, that were later perverted into sects, by their services (worship) and sacrifices (sacrifice) among God's nominal people (Shiloh, *quiet*, not active or zealous). Their services and sacrifices were in connection with the ten (or twelve) stewardship doctrines, by which they started and developed the ten (or twelve) movements that were later by the crown-lost leaders perverted into the above-mentioned ten (or twelve) denominational groups. These they did not start or originate in certain equal, regular, periods of time, as the facts prove, but from time to time at irregular intervals (yearly, year by year, 3, 7). And to do these things they had to leave the movement or denomination in which they previously were (out of his city). Their services and sacrifices were not in the interests of sectarianism, as were those of the crown-lost princes, but unto the Lord directly (unto the Lord). The period covered by such services and sacrifices was that in which the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches in their clergy (Hophni, *fighter*, in allusion to the contentiousness of the Greek and Roman clergy) and the Protestant Churches in their clergy (Phinehas, *brazen mouth*, in allusion to their strong teachings) functioned as the subordinates of the crown-lost princes (Eli, *high*, in allusion to the exalted position of the crown-lost princes in each of the denominations). Hence this period of service and sacrifice started in the Smyrna period, during which the Greek Catholic Church started and began its further development, and extends up to the present. The sacrifices and services that developed the Parousia Little Flock movement

and the Epiphany Great Company and Youthful Worthy movements take place toward the end of the functioning of the Catholic and Protestant clergy, as will be brought out later. These clergy classes are called priests of the Lord (priests of the Lord), more particularly as referring to their services as the denominational mouthpieces of the nominal church, *as God's mouthpiece*, before 1878, when with the nominal church they ceased being such.

(4) At each of these periods of service and sacrifice (when the time was that Elkanah offered, 4), *i.e.*, at the time after the starting and developing of the ten (or twelve) Little Flock movements set in, as each was perverted into a denomination the star-members and their special assistants gave to the truths and to the servants that applied these to the pertinent sectarians (Peninnah) the doctrine (portions) that became the stewardship doctrine of the pertinent denominational group, and thus in all gave such to all the ten (or twelve) denominational groups, both to the greater and stronger (sons) and to the lesser and weaker (daughters). But to the truths that developed the ten (or twelve) Little Flock movements of the Gospel Age and the servants who applied and apply these to the participants in these movements (antitypical Hannah), the star-members and their special assistants gave at each time of such services and sacrifices more than to antitypical Peninnah (a worthy portion, 5; literally, one of two faces, favors, *i.e.*, while more or less perversions set in the stewardship doctrine, as each denomination received and used its own, the Little Flock movements' developing truths and their servants got not only what the denomination received, but more—all ten [or twelve] truths free from the denominational perversions, and such additional truths as were confined to the ten [or twelve] Little Flock movements). But throughout the Age, until the Parousia, antitypical Hannah was not given by God the power to produce a *permanent* Little Flock movement

(Jehovah had shut up her womb). Antitypical Peninnah (her adversary), by her persecutions of every Little Flock movement which preceded its perversion into a denomination, by her scorning the day of little things, characteristic of every Little Flock movement, by her mocking the Little Flock brethren associated with the Little Flock movements and by her perverting such movements into sectarian systems, sorely distressed antitypical Hannah (provoked her sore, 6), and thus accomplished her design to make antitypical Hannah fret (fret; literally, *tremble*), which certainly occurred (Is. 54:11, 15-17), because the Lord did not in the interim between the Harvests prosper antitypical Hannah's movements with permanence (because the Lord had shut up her womb).

(5) As the star-members, their special helpers co-operating, served and sacrificed among the nominal people of God (he did so, 7), in one Little Flock movement after another (year by year) the Little Flock servants other than the 70 [35 star-members and 35 special helpers] co-operated with the latter in such movements (she went up to the house of the Lord). But in each of such movements antitypical Peninnah exercised her opposition to antitypical Hannah (provoked her). This oppositional course caused antitypical Hannah much grief (therefore she wept); and she did not appropriate the blessings that her privileges in those Little Flock movements offered her (did not eat). The star-members and their special helpers (Elkanah, 8), noting this grief and abstinence from appropriating such blessings on antitypical Hannah's part, inquired the reason. This occurred as troubles involved each of the ten (or twelve) Little Flock movements; for the star-members and their special helpers saw their faithful co-operators' grief, disappointment and failure to count their blessings (why ... why ... why). Then they suggested a blessing (am not I better to thee) that was by antitypical Hannah overlooked and that was more valuable than the

possession of all ten denominational groups combined (ten sons), possessed by antitypical Peninnah. After the last truth, the one on Chronology given in the Miller movement, had in its easier and harder parts been appropriated (eaten ... and ... drunk, 9) by the tenth (or twelfth) denomination (in Shiloh), the Adventists, antitypical Hannah arose from the dust of Babylon (Is. 52:2), and as a cleansed sanctuary class stood apart from Babylon, yet mingled more or less among the nominal people of God (in Shiloh). Her more or less severed stand was during the exercise of the rule (seat; literally, *throne*) of the crown-lost princes (Eli, *high*), who as the crown-lost leaders of the various denominations were in prominence as such at the entrance (post; literally, *door post*) of the nominal church (temple of the Lord; the temple proper was not built until about 145 years later, in the times of Solomon; and the temple here referred to was a structure that had been erected in such a way as completely to enclose and cover the tabernacle and hide its exterior from view, even as the true Church was within, and its normal visible parts were hidden from view through its being within, the nominal church up until the Parousia).

(6) The Little Flock's Truth servants, apart from its then star-member (Bro. Miller) and his special helper (Bro. Wolf of England, or Bro. Himes of America, we are not sure which), in the cleansed sanctuary suffered much distress because their efforts seemed fruitless (she was in bitterness of soul, 10). And what else should they have done than to have repaired to the Throne of Grace (prayed unto the Lord), and poured out in tears and sighs their plaint to the Father of all mercies (wept sore). These in their prayers gave God a solemn promise (vowed a vow, 11), in most intense, most humble and repeated pleadings for pitying consideration (if Thou wilt indeed look on the affliction of Thine handmaid, and remember me, and not forget Thine handmaid), asking to

be favored with bringing into being a permanent Little Flock movement (wilt give Thine handmaid a man child), and promising to devote it perpetually to the Lord (I will give him unto the Lord all the days of his life) and to regard and treat it as an antitypical Nazarite (there shall no razor come upon his head), in allusion to the fact that the movement would be like an antitypical Nazarite, in that in no way would it through unfaithfulness deprive itself or permit itself to be deprived of its special powers as the mouthpiece of the Lord. This prayer was one of act, as well as desire and words, these faithful ones ardently working (which is a prayer of act, as distinct from one of words) to arouse such a movement. This made them also set forth the character that they thought such a movement should have. These ardent prayers, yearnings and teachings (continued praying; literally, *multiplied praying*, 12) occasioned the crown-lost leaders to direct special attention to their teachings (Eli marked her mouth). Their speech was most hearty (Hannah, she spake in her heart, 13); and they uttered only doctrines (only her lips moved), but their pertinent doctrines were not understood by the crown-lost princes (voice was not heard); and as a result the latter thought the former were drunken with error (Eli thought she had been drunken). The crown-lost leaders denounced them as errorists (Eli said ... How long wilt thou be drunken? 14), and exhorted them to give up their errors (put away thy wine from thee). They alluded to their being long drunken, because these yearning souls were recognized by the crown-lost leaders as having been in the Miller movement, which then, between 1846 and 1874, was universally considered by the nominal church as an erroneous movement of fools and fanatics.

(7) These faithful souls very respectfully denied the charge of being long in error, or of being in error at all (Hannah answered ... No, my lord, 15). Then they opened their hearts to the crown-lost leaders,

as hearts sharply pained by sorrow (I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit). Again, they denied that they were cherishing any error (I have drunk neither), small (wine) or great (strong drink). They said that their heart's desires and works were poured out as a prayer before the Lord (but I have poured out my soul before the Lord). They did not desire the crown-lost princes to regard them as evil or worthless, and therefore asked that they do not so regard them (count not thine handmaid for a daughter of Belial [*wickedness, or worthlessness*], 16), and therefore gave a picture of the real condition of their full hearts and words (out of the abundance of my complaint and grief [*literally, provocation*] have I spoken), as one in deep need of the Lord's favor and help. We are not to forget that the crown-lost leaders, despite the fact of their loss of their crowns, were earnest, zealous and kindly-disposed consecrated men of God, as this is pictured forth in the reply of Eli, their type (said, Go in peace: and the God of Israel grant thee thy petition, 17). Indeed, it was quite creditable of their piety and tolerance that they could wish the sorely distressed faithful ones their petition, whose exact nature was unknown to them. They would not perhaps have been so kindly disposed in the matter, had they understood the nature of the prayer; for its answer implied something against them, as recognized leaders of God's people. Their kindly-disposed exhortation (Go in peace) and their good wish (the God of Israel grant thee thy petition) heartened the Little Flock servants (Let thine handmaid find grace in thy sight, 18) since the latter highly respected the former, and thus desired their favor; for it is most natural to desire the favor of great ones whom one respects. After these assurances these longing ones (Ps. 107:5, 9) felt more of resignation, comfort, assurance and peace (went her way, 18). They appropriated to themselves the promises that at that time the Lord was opening up to His Faithful, as they were nearing 1874 (See Antitypical

David's First Appearance, EI, 507-540), and became full of expectant joy (did eat, and her countenance was no more sad). Hope makes the heart joyous.

(8) The star-member (Bro. Russell) and his special helpers (the five pilgrims who successively became his special helpers: Bros. Barbour and Paton, Sr. Russell, Bro. McPhail and J.) and the rest of the Little Flock servants entered into the Harvest activity early in the Harvest day (they rose up in the morning early, and worshiped before the Lord, 19). Then they began to give their attention to the Little Flock especially (came to their house to Ramah [*height*; not here Ramathaim, *double height*, because the antitypes had by now left Babylon, the second of the two heights]). So occupied, Bro. Russell and the five in their succession, on the one hand, and the rest of the Little Flock, on the other hand, became of one heart and mind in the work of producing the Parousia Little Flock movement (Elkanah knew Hannah, his wife), and God remembered their heart's longing prayer, work and vow and granted it in preparing the way for such a movement (the Lord remembered her). In due time, through God's interposition, this movement was brought into being (wherefore ... she bare a son, 20) and developed into the greatest and only permanent Little Flock movement of the Age. No wonder that antitypical Hannah regarded it as standing for the character and honor of God (called his name Samuel, *name of God*, not as many mistakenly render it, *heard of God*). It could be so regarded, because it came into being in answer to a prayer that it might exemplify the character of God, and reflect honor upon him (because I have asked him of the Lord). During the Parousia Bro. Russell and the five above-mentioned pilgrims successively (Elkanah, 21) and the rest of God's people in the Truth (and all his house) appeared before the real and nominal people to carry out their consecration and their sacrifice unto the Lord in the Harvest work (went up to offer unto the Lord ... sacrifice and his vow) in a

more or less public manner, *i.e.*, engaged in work toward the public. But some of the Little Flock devoted their attention to the care of the new ones coming into the Truth for their development unto fitness for the public work (Hannah went not up ... said ... not go up, until the child be weaned, 22). After these would develop such unto fitness for public work, they would with such partake in that form of service (I will bring him ... before the Lord, and there abide for ever, continually). Thus the two sides of the Harvest work are brought to our attention: (1) that toward the public; and (2) that toward the brethren. Bro. Russell and the five above-mentioned pilgrims successively were agreed to this course on antitypical Hannah's part (Elkanah ... said ... Do what seemeth thee good ... the Lord establish His word, 23).

(9) Thus the Little Flock servants in their capacity of ministering to the babes nourished these with the sincere milk of the Word, that they might grow thereby unto fitness of entering the sphere of work toward the public as a part of the Parousia Little Flock movement (gave her son suck), and continued to prepare them for such work until they were fit for it (until she weaned him, which in Oriental countries does not occur with a first-born until the child is five years old). After such servants of the Truth had well prepared the Little Flock members for the public Harvest work (had weaned him, 24), they brought those whom they had prepared for such a service (took him up with her ... unto the house of the Lord in Shiloh) before the public, for these to engage in that service. They brought them in faith in the merit of Christ as sufficient to satisfy God's justice (one of the bullocks), as that which manifested God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice on behalf of the Church (the second bullock) and as that which makes the Church's sacrifice and vows acceptable to God (the third bullock). They appeared, preaching the harder things of the Truth (one ephah of flour) and the simpler things

of the Truth (bottle of wine) to the public. They did it while their protégés were more or less immature, being desirous of arousing their zeal for service as early as possible (the child was young). They offered the sacrifice of faith in the merit of Christ as sufficient for the three things typed by the three bullocks (slew a bullock, 25). And by their advancing their protégés into public service, some as pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims, sometimes aptly referred to as "pilgrim-ettes," some as colporteurs and sharpshooters, some as volunteers, some as newspaper workers, some as Bible House workers, some as extension workers, some as Photo-Drama workers, they brought these to the attention of the crown-lost leaders by leading them into the public work (brought the child to Eli, 25).

(10) In the stress of opposition, which, however, is not here indicated, but of which the Harvest history is full, and which came to the Little Flock as servants of the Truth, it became necessary that they should own antitypical Samuel as their protégés, as they brought them forward to the service. The same class, though not necessarily the same individuals, that prayed for antitypical Samuel presented them before the Lord and acknowledged them as their protégés before the crown-lost princes. This acknowledgment was very politely and very emphatically made (Oh my lord, as thy soul liveth, my lord, 26). Then they identified themselves as of the same class as from 1846 to 1874 ardently pleaded with God (praying unto the Lord) for the production and development of a permanent Little Flock Movement, and as having done so while in more or less fellowship with the crown-lost princes (I am the woman that stood by thee). They openly acknowledged that they had prayed for the Samuel movement, which was now an accomplished fact (For this child I prayed, 27). In the presence of the fact that the Samuel movement was in existence and active, they could confidently affirm that the Lord had graciously granted the petition (the Lord hath given me my petition).

This they told as a testimony to the fact that God grants the prayers of His faithful people (which I asked of Him). They then stated the fact of the vow which they had made in connection with the said petition, and the fact that they were now fulfilling that vow (I have lent him to the Lord, 28—a wrong translation; Dr. Young renders it better: Also I have caused him to be asked for Jehovah [’s use] *i.e.*, my heart impelled me to pray for him, not in my own interests, but in those of the Lord). They likewise stated that the vow was not one binding him to the Lord for a little while, but perpetually (as long as he liveth he shall be lent to the Lord; literally, all the days that he shall be he was prayed for in the Lord’s interests). V. 28 shows that the Samuel class heartily joined in co-operation to realize antitypical Hannah’s intentions when she made the vow; for he entered into the service of the Lord before the nominal people of God, *i.e.*, served in the work toward the public, as that part of the harvest history abundantly proves (And he [Samuel, not Eli, is the one here spoken of] worshiped the Lord there).

(11) It would be in place in discussing 1 Sam. 1 and 2 to set forth a comparison and a contrast between antitypical Sarah, Rachel and Hannah: As to the truths of which they are the expression, antitypical Sarah refers to those only that develop The Christ; antitypical Rachel, those that develop the Christ and the Great Company; and antitypical Hannah, those that develop the Christ, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, as we will prove of her when explaining 1 Sam. 2:21. As to the personal parts of these three antitypes, the appliers of these truths, antitypical Sarah includes the Ancient Worthies from Abraham to John the Baptist (yea, we may from an anticipatorial standpoint begin them with Abel) and the Christ class in their capacities of developing the Christ class; antitypical Rachel, the Ancient Worthies, the Christ class in its capacity of developing the Christ, and the

Ancient Worthies, the Christ class and the Great Company in their capacity of developing the Great Company; and antitypical Hannah, the Ancient Worthies, the Christ in their capacity of developing the Christ, the Ancient Worthies, the Christ and the Great Company in their capacities of developing the Great Company, and the Ancient Worthies, the Christ, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies in their capacities of developing the Youthful Worthies. In point of time of operation, antitypical Sarah is active from Abel on until the Little Flock leaves the world; antitypical Rachel from Abel's time until the Great Company leaves the world; and antitypical Hannah, from Abel's time until the Youthful Worthies leave the world. In time of producing their children, antitypical Sarah was active from Jordan until the Church leaves the world; antitypical Rachel, the same period for The Christ, and for the Great Company as individuals, from shortly after Pentecost onward, and as a class from Nov. 25, 1916—Jan. 14, 1917, onward until the Great Company leaves the world; antitypical Hannah, the same periods for The Christ and the Great Company respectively and for the Youthful Worthies as individuals, from Oct., 1881, onward to Sept. 16, 1914, and as a class from Sept. 16, 1914, onward until they leave the world finally. In point of ceasing to operate, antitypical Sarah operates until the last member of The Christ leaves the world; antitypical Rachel, the same plus until the last Great Company member leaves the world; and antitypical Hannah, the same plus until the last of the Youthful Worthies leaves the world. Antitypical Sarah is the least inclusive, antitypical Rachel is more so, and antitypical Hannah is the most so of these three. What great truths are here seen!

(12) Having finished the discussion of 1 Sam. 1, we will proceed to study 1 Sam. 2. It continues the viewpoint set forth in Chapter I. Let us remember that Hannah as the mother of Samuel types the Christ features of the Oath-bound Covenant in its personal

parts, *i.e.*, the Little Flock brethren in ministering the Oath-bound promises in the development of their less mature Little Flock brethren into the Harvest Movement. Their success in such work and its accompanying and resulting privileges made them declare, with ardent yearnings (prayed, and said, 1), the antitype of vs. 1-10, which, analysis will show, features salient parts of the Harvest message from the standpoint of antitypical Hannah's relations to them. With this thought in mind, we will now study the antitypes of vs. 1-10, which are very helpfully rendered by Rotherham, whom, with a few exceptions, we will quote for this section. Certainly these Little Flock developers of their less mature brethren unto participation in the Harvest work were by their success therein brought to the very heights of joy at the privilege that they had in their consecrated course (My heart hath leaped for joy in Yahveh, 1); because to arouse such a (permanent) movement had been the desire of such from early in the Smyrna period, at whose start the Little Flock movement of the Jewish Harvest ceased. They exulted in the fact that the Truth and its arrangements as the power (horn) of God's people, restored during the Harvest, had been set on high by God (is exalted by Yahveh) before the nations, through their being rescued from their creedal corruptions and set forth with unanswerable power, transparent clearness and glorious victory over error. This was so because the utterances (mouth) of such servants of the Oath-bound Covenant were so greatly enlarged (is opened wide), since their minds comprehended the heights and depths, the lengths and breadths of the Divine Plan of the Ages, and this enabled them to overthrow in argument all of their adversaries (Is. 54:17; Luke 21:15; over my foes), who, though many, wise, mighty and noble (1 Cor. 1:26-28), were unable to meet the Truth servants' attacks on their errors and their defenses of the Truth. Truly, the joy of the Lord proved to be their strength (Neh. 8:10); for the Truth, which

sets forth the plan of salvation (in Thy salvation) from various standpoints: the high calling, restitution, future probation, the first and second hells, the ransom, God's perfect character, *etc.*, gave these such joy as strengthened them in their fight for the Truth and against the error. No wonder that they were so joyful!

(13) As the most important feature of the Harvest message, they set forth the perfection of God's Person, Character, Word and Works, as being superior to the corresponding things in all others (There is none holy like Yahveh, 2). They stressed the sole Deity of the Father against the doctrine of the trinity (Nay, there is none except Thee!). And in so doing they stressed His superiority in these four, as well as in all other good respects, even over those of His Only Begotten, let alone over those of all who are that Son's inferiors (nor is there a rock like our God). Then turning to antitypical Peninnah and her children (the nominal-church leaders and denominations), these Truth servants, as the mother of the Little Flock Parousia movement, reminding them of their many and proud teachings, exhorted against their continuance therein (Do not multiply words, so loftily, loftily, 3), as they had done in their past teaching and persecuting course. Moreover, they rebuked their Parousia boasting and arrogance (Rev. 3:17), and exhorted them to desist therefrom, especially in their mouthpieces (nor let arrogance proceed from your mouth). The reasons for such exhortations are plain—God alone is the God of true knowledge (for a God of knowledge is Yahveh) and is powerfully accomplishing His plans and purposes for His own glory alone, and certainly not for that of the arrogant and haughty antitypical Peninnah and her children (and for Himself are great doings made firm). Another feature of the Harvest message did the developers of the Little Flock into the Harvest Movement proclaim: the breaking up of the creeds (bows ... are broken, 4) as the means whereby the great theologians (mighty) of the nominal church shot

forth their sharp sayings and teachings, as figurative arrows, at their enemies. It was the Truth, as a mighty sword (Eph. 6:17), that broke up these bows of the mighty, and it did this after the Harvest warriors girded it on, and used it as their weapon of offense, though before so doing they were, and were regarded as the stumbling and fainting ones (while the fainting ones are girded with strength). Yea, the Harvest Truth was their strong, sharp and powerful sword (Heb. 4:12), whereby they utterly overthrew the creeds.

(14) Another part of the Harvest message proclaimed by the developers of the Little Flock into the Parousia Movement was this: Members of the nominal church who had boasted that they were rich and increased in goods and had need of nothing (Rev. 3:17; thus were "the sated" full, 5) had to hire themselves out to the Truth people to obtain the Truth as the life-sustaining bread (have for bread taken hire), while the Little Flock, which before the Harvest had been hungry for the Truth and fainted at its lack (Ps. 107:5), were during the Harvest made to cease from their hunger and faintness (but the famished have left off [their hunger and weakness]), and become satisfied with the goodness of the Truth (Ps. 107:9). As a result antitypical Hannah became the mother of the *perfect* (seven) Parousia Movement (the barren hath borne seven). On the contrary, antitypical Peninnah, the nominal-church developers, who produced the ten [or twelve] denominations (many sons) of Christendom, waxed fainter and fainter during the Parousia (languisheth). Additional parts of antitypical Hannah's Parousia message were the curse, the death state and the resurrection (Yahveh killeth, exacts the death penalty, as the curse, through the dying process), but in the Millennial morning will bring back the dead, some to the life resurrection, others to the judgment resurrection (Yahveh doth kill and make alive; causeth to go down to sheol [the death state] and bringeth up,

6). Still another part of the Harvest message did antitypical Hannah proclaim, according to v. 7: Yahveh certainly made the nominal people of God poor during the Parousia (Yahveh maketh poor, 7); for He divested them of mouthpieceship for Him to the world, divested them more and more of the little Truth and Truth arrangements that they had had, took away the tentative robe of righteousness that they had had, bereaved them of the little peace, joy and other graces that they had had, stripped them of their various prerogatives that they once had as His nominal people, thus leaving them wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked (Rev. 3:17). On the other hand, antitypical Hannah proclaimed that the Little Flock was enriched (and enricheth) by God through His giving it the Divine Truth as figurative silver and gold, the graces as precious stones, the white raiment of Christ's righteousness as her glorious dress and the qualities of humility, meekness, Truth-hunger, honesty and holiness as an eye-salve for anointing her eyes (Rev. 3:18). Yea, theirs were the true riches!

(15) Moreover, antitypical Hannah then proclaimed the fact that Yahveh abased the proud and exalted the humble (1 Pet. 5:5, 6; Jas. 4:6; layeth low, yea, exalteth). How manifest this is in the abasement of the great in the nominal church during the Parousia, and will be yet more so in the Epiphany, especially in Armageddon, and mostly so in the Kingdom; and in the exaltations of the Little Flock in the Parousia, which will yet be more manifest in the Epiphany, and mostly so in the Basileia, the Kingdom. The exposition of both clauses of v. 7 shows this of both classes in the Parousia and the Epiphany. Yea, hath not God raised up the poor, the humble, from the dust of error (Is. 52:2), (raiseth from the dust) in which beside Babylon's rivers they sat down and wept when they remembered Zion (Ps. 137:1), to become enriched Little Flock members (8)? Yea, hath not God uplifted the needy, from the dunghill of sin, to become Little Flock

members? And by so doing, hath He not give them a dwelling with nobles, among God's real people? And did He not do this to prepare them to be seated with our Lord upon His Millennial throne (Rev. 3:21), as saith v. 8, as joint-heirs of His (Rom. 8:17; 2 Tim. 2:12)? These will be made God's pillars of the new earth (to Yahveh belong the pillars of the earth), and as such they will be the foundations of the world to come, made such by God Himself (He setteth thereon the world—symbolic heavens and earth). V. 8 beautifully prophesies in typical form the Parousia preaching of antitypical Hannah with respect to the thought that the gracious Father condescends to uplift the poor and needy Little Flock to the highest spiritual privileges during their stay in the flesh, and thus prepares them to become His Kingdom, whereby He will establish among the children of men a new earth in which will dwell righteousness (2 Pet. 3:13) unsullied by evil.

(16) V. 9 contains another part of the Parousia message of antitypical Hannah, and that in three parts: (1) that she would proclaim God's watchcare over the feet-member saints, which word is in the A. V. used to translate a word that means *loving ones*—most exact description of saints, whose highest quality, like God's highest quality, is disinterested love. Ps. 91 most beautifully describes this quality as theirs and God's provisions for their watchcare during the Parousia and Epiphany (the feet of His loving ones He doth guard); (2) that she would proclaim God's judgment on the wicked, the Second Deathers, as one that remands them in this life into outer darkness and after this life into the perpetual darkness of Gehenna (Jude 13; but the wicked in darkness shall be silent); and (3) that she would proclaim the Truth that not by human but by Divine strength will one prove to be an overcomer (Zech. 4:6; for by strength shall no man prevail). Finally, as indicated in v. 10, antitypical Hannah proclaimed five other parts in God's great

Parousia works: (1) that God would defeat and shatter in utmost confusion those who oppose Him, who are Satan and his legions of fallen angels, the kings and judges of the earth in church, state, aristocracy and labor and their supporters and the sifters and siftlings (as for Yahveh, they shall be shattered who contend with Him); (2) that through the arising New Heavens (the Christ during the Parousia beyond the veil, taking their great power and reigning) against those who contend with Him will He stir up controversies that will end disastrously for such opposers (against them by the heavens will He thunder); (3) that He through the great tribulation will sorely stripe the human family, which must undergo this striping to prepare them to receive meekly the Kingdom of God, which they had refused to receive meekly at the ministry of moral suasion (Yahveh will judge the ends of the earth); (4) that God would give The Christ all power and authority as His Vicegerental King to reign Millennially over mankind and the earth (and giveth strength to His King); and (5) that God would exalt the power of His Christ by giving Him the highest success and honor through His reign as King and ministry as Priest (and exalt the horn of His Anointed One). If now in the light of the foregoing interpretation we review vs. 1-10, we will all easily recognize that Hannah's prayer and speech types, as we said at the outstart of the exposition of this section, the proclamations, with ardent yearnings, made by the Little Flock developers of antitypical Samuel during the Parousia. Praised be the Lord!

(17) After introducing the Little Flock brethren as the Parousia Movement in its various members into the public service (1:26-28) Bro. Russell and the said five pilgrims successively gave their attention to the higher features of the Truth service in helping the brethren, as well as themselves, to attain higher character development (Elkanah went to Ramah to his house, 11). And the Little Flock Movement, the

Parousia Movement, attended to the public service of the Truth in pilgrim, colporteur, volunteer, *etc.*, work, in such a manner as was in the presence of, and as brought them to the attention of, the crown-lost leaders (and the child [better here, the youth] did minister unto the Lord before Eli, the priest). The Catholic and the Protestant denominations in their clergy (sons of Eli, 12), as classes, with individual exceptions, were to the Lord during the Parousia unprofitable, worthless and wicked (sons of Belial, *worthlessness, wickedness, unprofitableness*). They did not appreciate (know) the Lord in His person, character, word and works. Instead of seeking to serve the Lord wholeheartedly, they used their positions for their personal advantages, for the following was their manner of procedure (the priests' [not priest's] custom with the people was that, *etc.*, 13): They by their agents (the priest's servant) used the teachings as to doctrine, organization and practice (fleshhook of three teeth) as a means of their work (hand) to draw out of the true priesthood's doctrinal (pan), refutative (kettle), correctional (caldron) and ethical (pot) teachings many and large parts of the consecrators' privileges as sacrificers connected with these four forms of teachings for their own personal, selfish aggrandizement, *i.e.*, the very benefits that the consecrators should have drawn out of their services to themselves the clergy appropriated to themselves exclusively. This they did, *e.g.*, by exclusively appropriating to themselves the office of being priests, which all the consecrators were, and all the priestly privileges, which all the consecrators should have had; for they claimed them as their own exclusively. In the Catholic churches this "custom" of exacting the "benefit of the clergy" has been reduced to a business of vast classifications, every department drawing to the clergy from the consecrators what is the latter's. Thus the Catholic and Protestant denominations in their clergy have robbed God's people, whom "the

clergy" have been pleased to call "the laity," of their sacrificial privileges and have enriched themselves thereby, as to prerogatives belonging to the true priesthood (1 Pet. 2:5, 9). This was the universal custom throughout Catholicism and in most of Protestantism (So they did in Shiloh unto all Israelites that came thither). This is a sad state of things.

(18) But the Catholic and Protestant clergy's "custom" contained in it something worse than robbing God's priesthood of their privileges connected with their sacrifices: They have robbed God of His part of the sacrifice. The choice part of a real sacrifice is the love (fat, 15) that should prompt and accompany the sacrifice. This is the particular thing offered as a sweet savor to God in the services of an antitypical sacrifice (burnt; literally, make perfume with). This precedes the privileges (sodden flesh) that the sacrificers receive as consecrators, even as in the type the fat was burned before the flesh was sodden. But through their agencies (priest's servant) the Catholic and Protestant denominations in their clergy demanded what they considered their part in the sacrifice before (raw flesh; not sodden flesh) the sacrificer as such would get his privileges, and also before God would get the portions of the sacrifices belonging to Him. That is, these clerics took to themselves, for themselves, honors, riches, powers, influence, *etc.*, that the sacrificers should bring to God. Hence they have become money-lovers, popularity-lovers, honor-lovers, influence-lovers, *etc.*, using the opportunities of their offices for self-aggrandizement instead of to the glory of God. To them their office is a business, out of which every earthly advantage that they can get they seek to draw to themselves. Thus instead of God's getting the benefits of the consecrators' sacrifices the denominations in their clergy have drawn these to themselves. This has made them lovers of ease, luxury, fame, *etc.* The prophets severely denounce them for this course (Mal. 1:6—2:10; Is. 56:10-12). And

when the consecrators would desire and work otherwise (If any man said ... Let them not fail to burn the fat presently [now], 16) they were persecuted by the clergy, who used force to exact for their own personal gain what through the sacrifices of God's people should have gone to the advancement of God's cause (If not, I will take it by force). Thus they forced the faithful to give up the Divinely profitable parts of their sacrifices, by imprisonment, restraint, slander, riots, arrests, boycottings, *etc.* Yea, earlier than the Parousia they used all sorts of means of torture and death in what actually was taking away from God the fruits of the sacrifices of God's people. And the Parousia clergy, acting out the same principles, though in more attenuated forms, are partakers of their earlier living persecuting brethren's sins. By these courses they greatly sinned against the real priesthood and against God in matters pertaining to God (Wherefore the sin of the young men [Hophni and Phinehas] was very great before the Lord, 17). For their pertinent evils, exposed to the public, turned many into atheists, agnostics, heathen, infidels, worldlings, *etc.*, all of whom despised the religious life, deeming it hypocrisy; especially did they do this with the more prominent of the people (therefore men [literally, *the men*,—the prominent ones] abhorred the offering of the Lord). Thus it is true that Churchianity and the clergy have become a stench in the nostrils of ever-increasing multitudes, especially of the more prominent people throughout Christendom.

(19) The translation *child* (Samuel ... a child, 18) is unhappy. The Hebrew word *naar*, here translated *child*, is used to designate males of almost any age from childhood to full manhood, *e.g.*, Hophni and Phinehas (17), their servant (13, 15), Gehazi and the Shunammite's servant (2 Kings 5:14, 20; 8:4) are all called by the word *naar*, here translated *child*. It had better here be rendered *young man*. The Little Flock as the Parousia Movement, *i.e.*, the

Little Flock (Samuel) engaged in the special Parousia work, was very actively engaged (ministered) in the Parousia work of the Lord (before the Lord). They stood girded with the Truth, centered in the Abrahamic and New Covenants, *i.e.*, they had the Truth and were devoted to its service (Eph. 6:14; girded with a linen ephod). The ephod was worn only by priests (18, 28) or by those who had a priestly character, like David (2 Sam. 6:14), typing a priest. Samuel was not of the priestly family, but belonged to the tribe of Ephraim (1:1). But being a Nazarite, and devoted for his whole life to God's service (1:11), he had a priestly character, typing the Little Flock, at times as a whole, and at times in its special leaders. The Little Flock Truth servants (his mother, 19), in their capacity of developing their Little Flock brethren, gave the latter (him) official powers (little coat), by giving them added truths and the ability and opportunities to serve them, especially amid the various Parousia call and sifting periods (brought it to him from year to year), at which times such Truth servants specially served in connection with Bro. Russell and the pertinent one of the said five pilgrims (when she came up with her husband to offer the yearly sacrifice). As all these servants of the Truth were thus ministering in such Parousia call and sifting periods, the crown-lost leaders did them much good (Eli blessed Elkanah and his wife, 20), not by word but by deed, and that as a return for their devotion in giving antitypical Samuel to the Lord; for these ministered to antitypical Elkanah and Hannah (the Lord give thee seed of this woman) in that they brought people to consecration, some of whom became new creatures, others of whom became Youthful Worthies; and of the former the bulk apparently became crown-losers. We say this because the said seed given Elkanah by Hannah types the Great Company in its three main divisions and the Youthful Worthies in their two main divisions (21). This blessing was partly by antitypical

Eli brought into being as symbolic begettals, in part during the Parousia, but the births take place during the Epiphany, not during the Parousia, so far as these two as classes are concerned, though there were individual crown-losers and Youthful Worthies during the Parousia. After each call and sifting period of service, Bro. Russell, the pertinent one of the said five pilgrims and the rest of the Truth servants betook themselves to the special high calling matters (they went to their own home).

(20) After the Little Flock Movement—the Parousia Movement—was completed, in 1914, the Lord blessed in the Epiphany antitypical Elkanah (who was first, for 2-¹/₁₂ years, the Parousia messenger and the last of the five said pilgrims, thereafter the Epiphany messenger) and antitypical Hannah (now the Parousia and Epiphany Truth and the other servants of the Parousia and Epiphany Truth) with fruitfulness (the Lord visited Hannah, so that she conceived, 21). By the time this fruitfulness will become the antitype of the finished picture there will be born three clean general Great Company and two clean general Youthful Worthy groups (and bare three sons and two daughters). Thus here we learn that Hannah in the widest sense of the type of the Gospel-Age elects' mother pictures forth all of the Gospel-Age applications of the Oath-bound Covenant (Gen. 22:16-18), with their implied truths and arrangements, and the servants who have applied them to the development of the three general classes of the Gospel-Age elect. It will be noted that, as the mother of the Christ class, antitypical Hannah is the same as antitypical Sarah and Rachel as mother of antitypical Joseph, that as the mother of the Great Company she is the same as antitypical Rachel as mother of antitypical Benjamin, the cleansed Great Company as a whole, while Hannah's three sons in contrast with Samuel represent the cleansed Great Company in its three main groups, corresponding to the Gershonite, Merarite and Kohathite

Levites. Hannah alone of these three mothers types the mother of the Youthful Worthies, and that in their two divisions, (two daughters) corresponding to the Libnite and Shimite Gershonites. As yet we do not know it; but there may be a mother of four sons used in the Bible to type the Oath-bound Covenant as the mother of the four special elect-classes—the Ancient Worthies, the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. If so, in due time the Lord will reveal this to us. And since in a certain sense (Rom. 11:29) Fleshly Israel is an elect people of God and is a part of the seed in the Oath-bound Covenant, as also are the persevering of the tentatively justified, there may be a mother of five or six used in the Bible to picture these together with the four special elect classes, as the five or six class-children of the Oath-bound Covenant. If there, the Lord will reveal it to us.

(21) The time of the first Samuel antitypes (the Parousia) was late in the long ministry of the crown-lost leaders (Now Eli was very old, 22). These during the Parousia mainly and partly in the Epiphany have learned of the great wickedness of the Catholic and Protestant churches in their clergy (and heard all that his sons did unto all Israel) in the two forms of robbing God's consecrators of their privileges as such, and God of the benefits of the sacrifices of His people. Another evil they also learned of these clerics: that they were living in unclean, defiling relations with the twelve large denominations and with their almost innumerable sects (lay with the women that assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation). These unclean and defiling relations on the clergy's part consisted of the false doctrines, organizations, ethics, discipline and other arrangements that they foisted upon these denominations and sects, as well as the sifting errors and arrangements of the Parousia and Epiphany, with which these defiled such denominations and sects. It was primarily from the Parousia and Epiphany Truth servants' exposures

that antitypical Eli first learned of them; then from their observations and the complaints of denominational and sectarian members who also protested against these symbolic fornications and adulteries. These crown-lost leaders protested to the clergy against such evils, as can be seen in the protests against such evils made by evangelists, like Moody, Small, Jones, Booth, Sunday, Gipsy Smith, Biederwolf, Gaebelin, Torrey, Grey, *etc.*, and pastors, like Pearson, Gregory, Meyer, Gordon, Spurgeon, Parker, Farrar, Morgan, *etc., etc.* (He said unto them, Why do you such things? for I hear of your evil dealings by all this people, 23); but the remonstrance was feeble.

(22) Those of our readers who attended, *e.g.*, the meetings of Billy Sunday, will recall how to their faces he excoriated for their evils the ministers who were seated on the platform from which he was speaking! This is an illustration of the antitype of vs. 23-25. Certainly the pertinent reports against the clergy were no good thing (It is no good report that I hear, 24). Certainly the clergy by these deeds caused the Lord's people to transgress (ye make the Lord's people to transgress). They showed these recalcitrant clerics that for humans' sin against fellow humans, they might be entreated for (not *judged*, as the A. V. gives it) by the judge; but if one sin deliberately against the Lord, none could entreat successfully for him (if one man sin ...; but if a man sin against the Lord, who shall entreat for him? 25). So far as the rebukes that these crown-lost leaders administered to the wicked clergy are concerned, this must be said: They were neither vigorous enough (my sons, 24) nor were they accompanied with as strenuous methods at suppression as the evils deserved, even as Eli in the type was neither severe enough in his rebukes nor strenuous enough in his measures to suppress the evils and evil-doers in their evils. Both in type and antitype the matter was allowed to go on with nothing more than feeble remonstrances. And, of course, these

hardened sinners, not subjected to the suppressive measures for which their misconduct called, but let go with too tender rebukes, which their hardened consciences quietly shed, as a duck would shed water from its back, went on in their evil ways, in both the type and the antitype. Too much leniency with evildoers in one in an executive position encourages them in their wrong ways. But in both the type and the antitype their impenitence was arousing the Lord to execute retribution upon them—a cutting off of life in the type, and in the antitype a cutting off from their office and of life, combined with the destruction of Catholicism and Protestantism as institutions in Armageddon (therefore [not *because*] the Lord would slay them). In contrast with the course of the Catholic and Protestant clergy, antitypical Samuel progressed and developed very well (And the youth [not *child*] grew on,—literally, went and became large, *i.e.*, grew to full stature) and was recognized as good, both by the Lord and by men (Luke 2:52; and was in favor [literally, was good] both with the Lord and also with men, 26). We saw this fulfilled.

(23) Bros. Storrs, Stetson and Russell and the said five pilgrims in their succession (there came a man of God unto Eli, 27) appeared before these crown-lost leaders with a message denouncing the clergy for the above-mentioned wickedness, and the crown-lost leaders for tolerating them, and forecasting condign punishment, as those who heard these and read their writings know that they frequently spoke and wrote in this vein. They came as a messenger of God, *i.e.*, with Bible passages as giving them the contents of their rebukes, *etc.* (Thus saith the Lord). They raised the question in the crown-lost leaders' minds by their pertinent speeches and writings: Did God reveal Himself to the Jewish Harvest Christians as to members of Christ's house while they were involved in Satan's empire in its Roman-empire phase (Did I plainly appear unto the house of thy father when they were in

Egypt in Pharaoh's house)? The answer, of course, is, Yes; for God did then manifest Himself to His Jewish Harvest priests as these were made underpriests in the Christ priesthood. Then these brothers' speeches and writings raised another question in the minds of the crown-lost leaders: Did God choose Jesus Christ (choose him, typical Aaron, 28) from among all God's people (out of all the tribes of Israel) to be the Church's High Priest (to be My priest), to bring the antitypical Bullock and Goat as the true sin-offerings (to offer upon Mine altar), to yield the odor of a sweet smell in the graces of the Spirit (to burn incense), to administer the Truth, especially on the two great covenants, as God's Representative (to wear an ephod)? Again the answer is, Yes. Then, through their speeches and writings, they raised a third question in the minds of the crown-lost leaders: Did God arrange for the Gospel-Age priesthood as the house of Christ to get a sufficiency for their earthly needs from certain features of the sacrifices of the consecrators (Did I give unto the house of thy father [Aaron] all the offerings made by fire of the children of Israel)? Again the answer is, Yes; for the Lord ordained that they that preach the Gospel should also live by the Gospel (1 Cor. 9:14). Thus without their robbing the consecrated of their privileges and God of His parts in the sacrifice and thus His honor, the "clergy" were sufficiently provided for as to their earthly needs; and therefore there was no call for them to do the evils above-mentioned. Therefore, through Bros. Storrs', Stetson's and Russell's and the five others' speeches and writings God demanded of the Catholic and Protestant denominations in their clergy why they opposed the plain intent of the sin-offerings (kick ye at My sacrifice, 29) and the preachings (offering; literally, meat offering), that God had charged in His Temple (which I have commanded in My habitation), by their perversions, misuses, errors, attacks on the Truth and self-aggrandizements (make

yourselves fat), in putting their interests above those of the consecrators and of God (with the chiefest of all the offerings [meat offerings] of Israel My people). Not only did God through these brothers make this demand; but He also blamed the crown-lost leaders for tolerating the situation, which was an actual honoring of denominations in their clergy above God (and honorest thy sons above Me).

(24) Having through these brothers' speeches and writings pointed out the sins of the clergy and the wrong of the easy-going attitude of the crown-lost leaders toward these sins and sinners, God by the same agents and means proceeds to announce from the quoted Scripture passages (Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, 30) the retribution that is to come upon all the guilty. The first of these pieces of retribution was the revocation of a promise long kept (forever, age-lasting), despite the wrongs done by the beneficiaries of the promise: the office of being the leaders of God's people would not be continued with the clergy and the crown-lost leaders (Be it far from Me). This was announced by the above-mentioned brothers, in telling how antitypical Saul would be rejected as leader of God's people, and by Bro. Russell and the said five pilgrims in their succession, announcing that Babylon was cast off from mouthpieceship in 1878. The second piece of retribution would be that the clergy and the crown-lost leaders who failed to honor God would fall into disrepute. This has been increasingly going into fulfilment, and will finally eventuate in their becoming a stench in everybody's nostrils (they that despise Me shall be lightly esteemed). On the other hand, God has been honoring His Parousia and Epiphany priesthood, because they have honored Him (them that honor Me I will honor). The third piece of retribution would be that the strength (arm, 31) of the crown-lost leaders and that of Christ's nominal church and its clergy (the arm of thy father's house) would be taken away.

This was fulfilled when God forsook antitypical Saul (crown-lost princes) and cast off Babylon and her clergy (will cut off). The fourth piece of retribution would be that the clergy would soon be cut off in the great tribulation, especially in its Armageddon feature (there shall not be an old man in thine house). The fifth piece of retribution would be that the crown-lost leaders would see an enemy, Bro. Russell as their successor, antitypical of David, whom Saul counted an enemy, as Saul's successor (thou shalt see an enemy in My habitation, 32), enjoying the Truth and its Spirit as the real wealth of God's people (in all the wealth which God shall give Israel). This would spell the speedy overthrow of the clergy (there shall not be an old man in thine house forever, for long). The sixth piece of retribution would be that those who would remain in the true priesthood would depart (man of thine whom I shall not cut off from Mine altar, 33) from among the clergy; and this would be by their coming into, and ministering with the Parousia Truth; they would by their refutation of the errors of the crown-lost leaders and the unfaithful clergy gradually blind the insight of the crown-lost leaders to what Truth they had (to consume thine eyes), and would by turning away ever-increasing numbers from the crown-lost leaders and the unfaithful clergy greatly grieve them (to grieve thine heart). This is also given as a sign of the near approach of the overthrow of the crown-lost leaders and the unfaithful clergy (and all the increase ... shall die in the flower of their age).

(25) Then the Lord through the above-mentioned brothers pointed out a sign to the crown-lost leaders: that as classes the Catholic and Protestant denominations in their clergy would die as mouthpieces of the Lord, which was from 1878 onward (Is. 65:11-15; Jer. 25:36-38); and as individuals the unfaithful clergy would all be slain (Is. 65:12; Jer. 25:34, 35), especially during Armageddon (this ... sign unto thee ... thy two sons ... in one day ... die, 34).
To the

crown-losers this would be a sign in two senses, corresponding to the two senses in which the sentence would fulfill: (1) The clergy going into increasing error and making increasing attacks on various phases of Bible Truth from 1878 onward would be giving evidence to the crown-lost leaders that they were cut off from all mouthpieceship for the Lord. This is a secondary application of the passage. (2) As the primary application of the passage, the clergy would be literally slain in their non-Spirit-begotten members, their Spirit-begotten members being counted either among the crown-lost leaders, whose cleansed members will later be slain, or the hierarchy and uncleansed clerics who will be slain and be Second Deaths. But all of these new creatures who will survive as such until Armageddon will live long enough to see at least the bulk of the rest of the clergy slain in Armageddon, as Eli in the type lived to learn of the death of Hophni and Phinehas (4:12-18). Then God proceeded to tell, through the above-mentioned brothers, that He would in Bro. Russell establish a wise and faithful stewardly priest (Matt. 24:45-47; Luke 12:42-44; Num. 25:10-13; I will raise Me up a faithful priest, 35), who would fulfill all the Lord's good pleasure in the exercise of his stewardly priestly office (that shall do according to that which is in Mine heart and mind). To that faithful and wise servant God would build up a faithful priesthood—the Parousia priesthood—as the household over which he would be placed as their leader under Christ in the Parousia priestly work (Num. 25:13; and I will build him a sure [faithful] house). He as that servant would be faithful as Jesus' special eye, hand and mouth unto the end of his ministry (and he shall walk before Mine Anointed [Jesus] forever, [unto a completion]). And, finally, God affirmed that every true priest (every one that is left in thine house, 36) of those under the charge of the crown-lost leaders, leaving the nominal church, and coming into the Truth, would humbly (come and crouch to him)

apply to that wise and faithful servant (1) for each piece of Truth (a piece of silver) and food for heart and mind (a morsel of bread), and (2) for opportunities and positions of service (Put me, I pray thee, into one of the priests' offices), that they might appropriate the privileges of these to their sustenance (that I may eat a piece of bread). This ends the forecasts of the Lord through the above-mentioned brothers; and we are witnesses of the fulfillments of most of them, whose fulfillments are a proof to us that the rest will fulfill in due time, which our God guarantees.

(26) Our study of Samuel, type and antitype, now brings us to 1 Sam. 3 and 4. It will be recalled that we remarked in the opening part of our previous study that the antitypes of 1 Sam. 1—8 do not follow one another in chronological succession, as the development of one subject. While there was such a chronological sequence in 1 Sam. 1 and 2, our study of these two chapters brought us to a full conclusion of the line of thought in the antitype of those two chapters. Our study of 1 Sam. 3 and 4 will take up a somewhat different phase of the activities of the Little Flock in relation to certain events forecast in 1 Sam. 2:27-36; for in 1 Sam. 3 and 4 Samuel does not represent the Little Flock Parousia movement, but the Little Flock itself in part as in Babylon from after 1846 until after 1897, and then as the Little Flock in the rest of the Parousia and in part of the Epiphany in the Truth movement as such. Thus the viewpoint as to antitypical Samuel, though somewhat related to, is somewhat different in 1 Sam. 3 and 4 from that of him as presented in 1 Sam. 1 and 2. As we study the Samuel picture further, we will find still other viewpoints of antitypical Samuel presented to us; for in most of the later pictures of him we will find him typing Little Flock leaders mainly, as we have already seen this in our study of 1 Sam. 16, as he there acts in connection with antitypical David's first appearance.

We make these remarks the better to enable our dear readers to see clearness in our study.

(27) The opening statement of 1 Sam. 3 proves that the class and time of the antitype of v. 1 could not be the Truth section of the Little Flock in the Parousia and the Epiphany, because to it during the Parousia and the Epiphany the Word of the Lord was not rare, scarce (precious, 1); for never, not even in the Jewish Harvest, was the Truth (the Word of the Lord) more abundant to the Little Flock than during the Gospel Harvest. Nor can we say that among those of the brethren who were in the part of the cleansed Sanctuary separate from Babylon the Truth was rare or scarce, though, of course, it was not so abundant with the Little Flock in the Truth as during the Parousia and Epiphany. The language of v. 1 rather seems to fit the Little Flock's condition in its members who remained in Babylon during the time between 1846 and 1897; for during that time very little Truth came to that part of the Little Flock. The condition of the Little Flock during that time could properly be described as one in which it served (ministered unto, 1) the Lord before Eli, and that before the Truth (lamp of God, 3) went out in the temple (the nominal church), where from 1878 onward it began gradually to go out finally. Samuel's lying down in the temple to sleep is in harmony with this thought; for not only the foolish, but also the wise virgins fell asleep between 1846 and 1877 (Matt. 25:5); and, as the following episode shows, the part of the Little Flock that remained in Babylon until 1896, typed here, as we understand it, by Samuel, continued to sleep onward from 1846 to 1897. Some of the Little Flock slept even until 1914. Not only the above lines of Truth show that Samuel in 1 Sam. 3:1-3 represents the Little Flock in Babylon from 1846 to 1878, but thoughts that later parts of the chapter bring out will be found in harmony with this thought. Hence the above-given considerations enable us to see the time

setting of vs. 1-3, and also prove that the viewpoint of the Samuel antitype now under study differs somewhat from that given in 1 Sam. 1 and 2.

(28) In v. 1 the word, *naar*, should not be given as *child*, rather as *youth*. Certainly, this class did serve the Lord in conversionist work, between 1846 and 1878, even as we saw that its leaders did this, as typed by Samuel's sacrifice at Bethlehem (16:2-10). They did this under the eyes and approval of the crown-lost leaders (before Eli). Little, indeed, was the new Truth given the Church in Babylon during 1846-1878 (the word of the Lord was precious in those days). Not only so, but this is true of the entire nominal church (no open [public] vision), despite the fact that the nominal church was God's mouthpiece then. It will be noted that the thing meant by the words, it came to pass (v. 2), is not mentioned in vs. 2 and 3. It is first mentioned in v. 4, *i.e.*, the Lord called Samuel. The other things noted in vs. 2 and 3 are set forth to give us the circumstances amid which God called Samuel in type and antitype. The condition of the crown-lost leaders (Eli, 2) was a sad one for persons in their office. They betook themselves to rest at their post of duty (laid down in his place); for they were among the foolish virgins who slumbered and slept (Matt. 25:5), while they should have been wide-awake at their post of duty in the nominal church. As a rule, these had fought the Miller movement, and when its 1844 expectations were not fulfilled, the crown-lost leaders as a class largely gave up special consideration of prophecy, and gave up almost altogether the study of prophetic time, even in an oppositional sense. Hence so far as the old truths were concerned, they became increasingly unclear thereon (his eyes began to dim), and so far as the advancing Truth in its blessing the part of the cleansed Sanctuary that was separate from Babylon was concerned, they were entirely blind (he was not able to see). Thus the crown-lost leaders were in a sad plight indeed,

furnishing a marked example of the blind leaders to whose lot it had fallen to be leaders of the blind.

(29) By the lamp of God antitypical of v. 3 we understand the Truth to be meant, even the Bible (John 17:17). We do not understand the typical lamp of God here to mean the lampstand in the Holy, for that never went out, either in the tabernacle or in the temple; but it was some lamp that burned in the evening in that structure which is called here the temple, and which enclosed the tabernacle. This lamp was allowed to become dimmer and dimmer, until finally it went out entirely. Apparently, the temple attendants laid down to sleep before the lamp went out entirely. In the antitype the Bible to the nominal people of God began to grow dim in 1835, when, as shown under another figure, the symbolic sun (New Testament) and moon (Old Testament) began to darken to the nominal people of God (Joel 2:30, 31). The dimming of this symbolic lamp (Ps. 119:105; 132:17; Prov. 6:23; 13:9; 20:20) was from 1835 to 1878, when its gradual going out set in and became complete for the nominal-church members in 1955. Hence, antitypical Samuel laid down after 1835 and before 1878. From the fulfilment in the parable of the ten virgins we know that it began in 1846. Thus it was the Little Flock among the nominal people of God (in the temple of the Lord) who are represented here as lying down to sleep from 1846 onward. The twelve stewardship truths (the ark) were then with the nominal people of God (where the ark of God was) at that time. We say this, because the ark is the depository of God's full arrangement as due at any time with which the ark is associated. This view clarifies the antitypes of the ark in 1 Sam. 4-7.

(30) While vs. 1-3 treat antitypically of things from 1846 to 1878, the rest of the chapter treats of things subsequent to 1878. V. 4 has its antitype's beginning from 1886 onward. The call antitypical of that indicated in v. 4 was voiced through *Studies*, Vol. I, which, as we know, was issued in 1886. This was

circulated in a variety of ways, the most important and fruitful being by colporteur. As it was circulated it came in touch with many Little Flock brethren, and its message was so attractive, clear and winsome that Little Flock brethren made a ready response, as having been called by it, with the antitype of the words, Here am I (4). As they thought over its contents they wondered who the author was, and concluded that he was one of the leading Christian writers in the world; hence they concluded that he was one of the Church leaders. This led them to go (he ran, 5) and to inquire of their pastors and still more prominent Church leaders (Eli) what they meant by giving them such a call (Here am I; for thou calledst me), since they felt such a call could come from one alone who was of their class. But these crown-lost leaders lost no time in disabusing the minds of such inquiring Little Flock brethren of the thought that *Studies*, Vol. I, could have emanated from one of their class (I called thee not). Do not bother your head about things that you read in that book. Disabuse your mind of its thoughts (lie down [literally, return]), *i.e.*, go back to your former tranquil state of mind and rest yourself from worry or study on the subjects of that book, which did not originate with one of us Church leaders. The section of the Little Flock here typed followed the suggestion of the crown-lost leaders and composed themselves to rest content with the sleep of Babylon (and he went and lay down).

(31) Then when *Studies*, Vol. II, was circulated from 1889 onward, it reached the Samuel class in the nominal church (and the Lord called yet again, 6), and it reached an attentive ear, because, like *Studies*, Vol. I, its message was attuned to the ear of the class that was like God in character (Samuel, *name of God*). To them it had the ring of a message coming from God; and, accordingly, this class concluded that such a book must have come from a member of the crown-lost leaders. Hence, they betook themselves to such

(Samuel arose and went to Eli), assuring them that this message must have come from their midst (thou didst call me), and expressed readiness to respond to this message (Here am I). The crown-lost leaders denied that they originated the contents of Studies, Vol. II (he answered, I called not, my son), affirming that the message came from another source. And not only so, but the crown-lost leaders again charged the Samuel class to give no heed to a message that did not proceed from them, nor to let it disturb their peace of mind (literally, return, lie down). They spoke kindly (my son), which influenced the Samuel class to heed their exhortation. These two calls came to the Samuel class before they had come to an appreciation of the Lord as He really is (Now Samuel did not yet know the Lord, 7). This was due to the fact that they had not yet come into the Truth, and that what they had previously heard of it was not clearly grasped (neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed unto him). Again, Studies, Vol. III, appearing in 1891, came to the Samuel class, while it was yet in the nominal church (the Lord called Samuel again a third time, 8), and its message also had to this class the ring of a Divine origin, which they, therefore, concluded must have come through the agency of the crown-lost leaders. To these they, therefore, went to confer further on its subject matter (he arose and went to Eli), telling them that they were responding to their message (Here am I; for thou didst call me).

(32) Doubtless, in the meantime, some of the crown-lost leaders had been thinking seriously over the messages of Studies, Vols. I, II and III. Some of its light was dimly dawning upon some of them, at least enough of it to make some of them think that there was considerable of Truth in many of their positions; for not a few of them were taking things from the Studies for their lectures, sermons and writings, without, however, letting the source of their views become known to those who regarded them as their leaders

(Eli perceived that the Lord had called the youth). Accordingly, these crown-lost leaders assured (Eli said unto Samuel, 9) the Samuel class in Babylon that there were some truths in the Studies, but that they should not be disturbed over what they had already read in the three Volumes (Go, lie down), but if another message calling them should come (if He call thee), they should not only give to it an attentive ear, but should exercise to it a responsive heart (thou shalt say, Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth). Accordingly, the Samuel class dismissed serious thought on the contents of the first three Volumes of the Studies for the time being (So Samuel went); and without further distraction of thought went about their ordinary service (lay down in his place). In Studies, Vol. IV, appearing in 1897, the Lord, and that for the fourth time, came to the Samuel class in Babylon (the Lord came, 10). This time He took a firmer and stronger hold on the attention of the Samuel class in Babylon (and stood; literally, caused Himself to stand, set Himself). This riveted their attention all the more on the contents of the fourth call (and called). Yet, the fourth call was made in a way similar to the other three calls, *i.e.*, by the printed page, especially reinforced by conversations in most cases (as at other times). Yet, it was more emphatically impressive to Samuel, as is indicated by the repetition of the name (Samuel, Samuel). And the fourth time the Samuel class not only recognized that the messenger was not the crown-lost leaders, but the Lord's Truth itself as the representative of God, and, therefore, lent it not only an attentive and responsive, but also an obedient ear (answered, Speak, for Thy servant heareth).

(33) The message of Studies, Vol. IV, in so far as it concerns Babylon in its two ecclesiastical divisions, Romanism and Protestantism, is certainly finely summarized typically in vs. 11-14. It is this typical summary of that feature of Studies, Vol. IV, that enabled us to see the entire run of thought of 1 Sam. 3 and 4, as also helps to that end came from the statements of

vs. 1-3. Since the message of vs. 11-14 suggested Studies, Vol. IV, the other three calls naturally suggest the calls of the preceding three Volumes. The message of vs. 11-14 receiving its fulfilment in the events of 1 Sam. 4, the latter's events are naturally suggestive of certain Parousia and Epiphany battles with, and defeats of Nominal Spiritual Israel at the hands of the antitypical Philistines, certain sifting sectarians of the Parousia and the Epiphany in church, state, capital and, especially, labor; for through these the predicted wrath is poured out on Romanism and Protestantism. These considerations give us solid ground upon which we tread as we unfold the antitypical teachings of 1 Sam. 3 and 4. Now for some details on vs. 11-14. As we read these verses we are reminded by them of the prophecy in 1 Sam. 2:27-36; for vs. 12-14 directly refer to 1 Sam. 2:27-36, declaring that God would fulfill the prophecy there declared against Eli and his house. Above we showed that the man of God referred to in 1 Sam. 2:27 is Bro. Russell and his five successive special helpers. It was from these, especially from the first of these, speaking in Studies, Vol. IV, that the Samuel class while yet in Babylon received the message of Studies, Vol. IV; and it came to that class, in so far as it concerned Romanism and Protestantism, as typically epitomized in vs. 11-14. The many Scriptures on which Studies, Vol. IV, bases its descriptions and denunciations of ecclesiastical Babylon make its teaching of the pertinent matters the teachings of the Word of God (the Lord said, v. 11). To the Samuel class this was the Truth on the subject, coming from the Lord to Him (to Samuel), and was, therefore, final.

(34) The Lord, through Studies, Vol. IV, declared that He would perform an astounding act, a dumbfounding act and an unexemplified act in Christendom (I will do a thing in Israel, *etc.*). He stresses the declaration (Behold). And, certainly, the wordy battles of the Parousia and Epiphany against ecclesiastical Babylon and the violent battle against her in the World

War, phases I and II, and, especially, in the revolutionary feature of the Time of Trouble, have, so far as they have developed, been an astounding, a dumbfounding and an unexemplified act, and what is yet to come will be even more so. In the symbols of Rev. 14:10, 11 the antitypical tingling of both ears, not merely one, is described in some of its details. Yes, it will be in the Time of Wrath (in that day, 12) that the Lord will fulfill all the forecasts of the six above-mentioned brothers, especially those of Bro. Russell uttered in *Studies*, Vol. IV, against the crown-lost leaders of Romanism and Protestantism (against Eli), as these concern them, the Romanist and Protestant clergy and the principal of their flocks (which I have spoken concerning his house). This is no mere threat. Nor will it be commenced and then after a while be allowed to cease before a completion. It was to begin—it already has begun—proceed and come to a full completion in Armageddon. A fairly full description of the destruction begun, continued and completed, is given us in Rev. 18, as well as in numerous other places in Holy Writ. That the coming punishment does not come unheralded and unwarned against, the Lord emphatically declares (I have told him that I will judge his house, 13).

(35) Through the prophets of both Testaments this judgment was revealed and was expounded by the six above-mentioned brothers, especially by that Servant, who mentions it in *Studies*, Vols. I, II, III, comparatively briefly, and in very great detail in Vol. IV (I have told him that I will judge his house). It will be a final judgment (forever). It is due to its sin, known and unrestrained by the crown-lost leaders. This iniquity has been particularly in the Romanist and Protestant clergy (his sons made themselves vile), despite which the crown-lost leaders did not use sufficiently stringent measures to restrain it (he restrained them not). The matter is one of such overshadowing consequence that God has even bound Himself by an

oath (therefore I have sworn, 14) never to forgive the iniquity of ecclesiastical Babylon (unto the house of Eli). The sacrifice of Christ will not atone for it, because it is for Adamic sins, while ecclesiastical Babylon's sins are wilful. Nor will the sufferings of the repentant Great Company avail for more than the cancellation of the wilfulness of individual Babylonians; since it does not suffer for the wilfulness of the condemned systems of Babylon (shall not be purged by sacrifice). Nor will any effort of man or devils avail to save Babylon from utter and eternal ruin. And the wilful guilt of its non-Spirit-begotten members will require them to go through harrowing experiences in the Trouble Time to cleanse themselves of part of their uncleanness (Zeph. 3:8, 9; Is. 59:18, 19), and for the rest to pass through the resurrection by judgment in the Millennium (Zech. 13:9; John 5:29).

(36) The Samuel class was astonished by the phases of the Lord's Truth antitypical of what is contained in vs. 11-14, and refrained from telling of it to the crown-lost leaders for fear of hurting them overmuch, as well as from a natural respect that they cherished for such (lay until the morning ... feared to show Eli the vision, 15). His next activity (in the morning) was to help the evangelistically working justified and crown-lost workers (opened the doors of the house of the Lord) as they sought to win the penitent to faith in Christ. By now the Samuel class was about to leave Babylon, of whose necessity they first heard while reading *Studies, Vol. III*, and of which they became convinced by their reading and understanding *Studies, Vol. IV*, especially in its descriptions and condemnation of ecclesiastical Babylon. This step they took in connection with their announcing to the crown-lost leaders the contents of the "vision." Its fallen condition and imminent destruction, with the Lord's concordant charge, were given as the reason for their leaving ecclesiastical Babylon. Proper was the deference that restrained the Samuel class from

announcing the disagreeable tidings to the Eli class until asked about it by the latter itself. Still affectionally disposed (my son, 16) to the antitypical youth, whom they recognized to be zealous for God's glory (Samuel), the crown-lost leaders were curious to learn what they were satisfied was a message from the Lord in Studies, Vol. IV; hence they inquired of the former to give their attention to the latter's call (called). Filially, the Samuel class gave an attentive response to the call (Here am I). Instead of the crown-lost leaders expressly conceding that the message was from the Lord, a thing that they doubtless thought might have a to them undesirable effect on antitypical Samuel, they asked what they had learned from Studies, Vol. IV (literally, What is the thing which he [or it] said to thee, 17; the words, *the LORD*, are in italics, implying that they were interpolated into the text without corresponding words in the Hebrew). They desired no concealment to be made by antitypical Samuel in the matter (I pray thee hide it not from me). The earnestness of this feature of the antitypical request on a frank and full statement on the subject is typed by Eli's statement in v. 17: God do so to thee, and more also, if thou hide anything from me of all the things that he [the writer of Studies, Vol. IV] said unto thee. They were thus at least earnest.

(37) The Little Flock is candid in declaring God's message as due to be given, not holding back any real feature of it. Accordingly, the Samuel part of the Little Flock told the matter in its entirety (Samuel told him every whit, and hid nothing from him, 18). They emphasized every feature of the antitype of vs. 11-14, not holding back the crown-lost leaders' guilty part therein. Since the contents of the antitype of vs. 11-14 had in the writings and lectures of the six brethren mentioned above been already made known to the crown-lost leaders, who were only too well aware of the facts charged in the antitype against the guilty ones concerned, the Eli class accepted submissively

the message, believing it to be true; for in the Parousia writings and addresses of many of the crown-lost leaders such charges against the fallen condition of the nominal church and wrongs of its clergy are to be found (It is the Lord: let Him do what seemeth Him good). The Samuel class continued to grow in grace, knowledge and service (Samuel grew, 19), which fact, among other things, moved him to leave Babylon, and to come among the Truth people, for whom in the rest of this chapter Samuel stands as type. Surely, the Lord was with them in leading them out of Babylon, and in blessing them with all their privileges after coming into the Truth (the Lord was with him). After becoming of the Truth people their teachings as the advancing Truth unfolded factually, reasonably and Scripturally, and as such fulfilled without failing as due to be fulfilled (and [God] let none of his words fall to the ground). As the Harvest advanced all Christendom (from Dan [*judge*: those not in the Truth in any sense] to Beer-sheba [*well of the oath*: the Little Flock, Great Company, Youthful Worthies, the tentatively justified and Israelites, as those to whom various features of the Oath-bound Covenant belonged], 20) recognized that the Parousia Little Flock in the Truth was by God made a mouthpiece of His as the publishers of the Truth and righteousness (knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord). Nor did the Truth cease to advance with the giving of the antitype of vs. 11-14 to antitypical Samuel (the Lord appeared again; literally, *continued to appear*, 21); rather it unfolded on the nominal church (in Shiloh) and this continued unfolding of Truth on the nominal church (in Shiloh) was granted by the Lord to antitypical Samuel by the Truth (word of the Lord) coming to them through the Parousia Messenger. The first clause of 1 Sam. 4:1 should have been made the last clause of 1 Sam. 3:21; for putting that clause into Chap. IV, as in some other cases, is an unhappy cutting off of what belongs to the

end of one chapter from it, and an unhappy adding of it to a chapter to which it does not belong. It gives the reason for Samuel's having been recognized as a prophet of the Lord by all Israel, *i.e.*, because his speaking as the Lord's mouth came to the hearing of all Israel. In an antitypical way the Little Flock's witnessing the Parousia Truth throughout Christendom during the Parousia made its preaching as the prophet came to antitypical Israel's attention.

(38) 1 Sam. 4 types the fulfilment of the Lord's forecasts through the six above-mentioned brethren, as typed in 1 Sam. 2:27-36, and of the Little Flock, as typed in 1 Sam. 3:11-14. Part of these forecasts have already been fulfilled, part of them are now fulfilling and the climax of them is to be fulfilled a little later, in Armageddon. These we will now proceed to trace, as fulfilled, or fulfilling, or to be fulfilled, as the case of each may be. As already said, the battles antitypical of the two set forth in 1 Sam. 4 are different in the antitype from one another in their nature. The first antitypical battle was a wordy one and the second in part has been, and its yet remaining part will be, one of words and of physical violence. The wordy battle continued throughout the Parousia as a wordy fight only. The antitypical battle of both words and violence began as such in World War, Phase I, and has continued in both features in World War, Phase II. The second battle began with the revolution sifting in the nominal church in its wordy feature and will take on its violent feature in Armageddon, which will complete the antitypical second battle. The type does not clearly indicate the two features of the second antitypical battle. It is from the fulfilled facts of the wordy feature that we recognize these as the way the antitype will fulfill. This type says nothing of the anarchy feature of the Time of Trouble, because in Armageddon Babylon, civil, ecclesiastical and aristocratic, will be annihilated, and this chapter treats of the defeat and destruction of Babylon ecclesiastical. In

many places in the Bible the conflict of the radicals against the nominal church in the Parousia and in the Epiphany is set forth under the figure of a war or battle. The following are some of the passages that use this figure of the wordy battle: Is. 29:1-8; Jer. 51:1-4, 11, 12, 20-58; Ezek. 33:26-29; Hos. 10:13-15. The part that Jesus and the Church take in the wordy battles of the Lord's Word against the nominal church (Rev. 19:11-16) is not typed in 1 Sam. 4, though whatever of secular and religious Truth the antitypical Philistines use in their wordy battle has been, is and will be from the Lord Jesus (Rev. 19:17-21; Joel 2:1-11).

(39) The purely wordy battle, consisting of partisan (Philistines) attacks on Babylon's creeds in their doctrines, organizations and practices, and of her attempted defenses of these against the partisans who attack her, is set forth in vs. 1, 2. The antitypical Israelites took their stand on their creeds (pitched beside Ebenezer, *stone of help*, 1), on which as a whole they relied for vindicating their beliefs; and their partisan opponents took their stand on facts, reason and some Scriptures (the Philistines pitched in Aphek, *fortress*). The defenders of each denomination sought to vindicate its creed in its entirety, and because each one was contradictory of itself, as well as of Scripture, reason and facts in various respects, and because all of them contradicted one another from the standpoint of Scripture, reason and facts, their defense individually and in entirety was an impossible thing from the standpoint of their attackers, *i.e.*, from the standpoint of Scripture, reason and facts. Moreover, their contradicting one another divided the defenders of each creed against those of the rest of the creeds, which again weakened their defense. Their attackers consisted of all five sets of the Parousia sifters, from the threefold standpoint of each set of sifters—those in the sanctuary, court and city or camp. Each of these attacked every weak point in each creed, but

in general passed by the stewardship doctrine of each one without much of an attack. Thus the three sets of no-ransomers attacked Babylon's doctrines that contradicted the ransom doctrine, showing their inconsistency, like the ransom's being brought by a member of the Trinity, while the satisfaction of justice in each member of the Trinity is required by the Trinity theory; human immortality, and eternal torment as the penalty of sin as opposing death as the ransom process, *etc., etc.* The infidelistic sifters attacked especially the Trinity and the Bible as the alleged support of Babylon's doctrines, showing their inconsistency. The combinationists attacked the denominational differences, in defense of which Babylonians were very weak. The reformers in the name of progress, *etc.*, attacked the creeds' conservatism and thereby undermined their influence. And the contradictionists fought many vital things in Babylon's creeds and thus stirred up doubts, *etc.*, against them. Labor especially, and the state in certain cases also belong to the antitypical Philistines, for they attack various theories of the nominal church, by which they are leading multitudes against her and causing other multitudes to forsake her. The result is a divided, confused and ineffectual defense, resulting in a sore defeat for the Babylonians (they joined battle, Israel was smitten ... they slew ... about 4,000 men, 2). Certain features of this wordy battle, with the Little Flock's part coming thereafter, are typed by the battle between the four and five kings of Gen. 14, with Abraham's part therein coming thereafter.

(40) The ark of the covenant types God's plan in God and the Christ—Jehovah's full arrangement. Hence it may represent all the features of the plan as due at any time, and as it concerns any section of God's real or nominal people. As God's nominal people are treated of in 1 Sam. 4, only those parts of God's plan as seen by the nominal church in the Parousia and Epiphany before Armageddon are there typed. And this, of course, would mean the twelve stewardship doctrines

and such other Truth features seen by any denomination. Hence the ark, as in the possession of Eli and his two sons, represents the truths in possession of the crown-lost leader and the Romanist and Protestant clergy during the Parousia and Epiphany up to Armageddon. With these truths exclusively the nominal church did not engage in the first, the exclusively wordy battle, antitypical of that of vs. 1, 2. Yea, very little use of them did she make, because she devoted her energies mainly to defend the attacked creedal errors, which in each denominational creed its adherents took to be the Truth. *E.g.*, the Calvinists sought to defend absolute predestination of the saved and the lost, and met such a sore defeat thereon as to lead to their largely repudiating it, as can be seen in the revision of the Westminster confession. But for the wordy part of the second battle the leaders (elders, 3) after the defeated nominal-church apologists retired from the first battle to their fortified positions (the people were come into the camp) advised to use only their undoubted truths (Let us fetch the ark of the covenant of the Lord out of Shiloh unto us) and leave their creedal errors unused. For, as they reasoned over the wherefores of their defeat at the hands of hostile partisans (Wherefore hath the Lord smitten us today before the Philistines?), they concluded that it was due to their creedal errors; hence they felt certain of victory, if they would fight against the hostile partisans with their truths (that, when it cometh among us, it may save us out of the hand of our enemies). Therefore the nominal-church warriors began to revamp their long-neglected stewardship and other truths, refurbishing them to fitness for battle (So the people sent to Shiloh, that they might bring from thence the ark of the covenant of the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth between the cherubim [who acts in harmony with His wisdom, pictured by the light that comes out of the Shekinah, His power and love, pictured by the cherubim, and His justice, the antitypical Mercy Seat], 4). But as the

sequel will show, these stewardship and other truths were not well studied; nor did their wielders understand well how to use them effectively against the arguments of their enemies. Again, the Romanist (Hophni) and Protestant (Phinehas) clergy, who were the main custodians of these truths (were there with the ark of the covenant of God), had a very poor hold thereon. These things put the over-confident, nominal-church warriors to a great disadvantage.

(41) On all hands the nominal-church warriors expected victory because of their taking their stand on the denominational stewardship and other truths, and gloried in an anticipated sure victory (when the ark ... came ... shouted with a great shout, 5). And this confidence extended to various phases of society—state and aristocracy (so that the earth rang [moved]); for be it remembered that for the most part state and aristocracy sided with the nominal church. The boastful exultation of the nominal-church warriors came to the ears of their antagonists, *e.g.*, Mr. Bryan's boast of a sure victory over Mr. Darrow before their encounter at Dayton, Tenn., on Modernism and Fundamentalism (the Philistines heard ... the shout, 6). These soon learned the cause of the boasting of the so-called orthodox (they understood ... the ark ... was come into the camp). This first aroused fear in the enemies of the nominal church, and such fear moved them to exhort one another to the courage of desperation (were afraid ... God is come into the camp; Woe is us ... not ... such ... heretofore, 7; who will deliver us out of the hand of ... Gods that smote the Egyptians, 8; Be strong ... be not servants unto the Hebrews ... quit yourselves like men, 9). The enemies, therefore, knew that they would have to exert themselves to their utmost not to be defeated. Little did they know that God, who they feared was on the nominal church's side, had forsaken her. These antitypical Philistines consisted: first, of the religious revolutionists in the nominal church, the so-called

modernists, who use various phases of the five sifting errors of the Parousia and other errors of the Epiphany; then, of conservative and radical labor, including the trade-unionists, radical socialists, communists, syndicalists and anarchists; then, of inimical statesmen, like Calles of Mexico, Azana of Spain, Hitler of Germany, Lenin and Stalin of Russia, *etc.*, with the backing of the countries that they represent. It will later take in all the ten language-nations of Europe, after the violent revolutionists get control of them. Also antitypical Elisha has been doing his share in the damage. These are the antitypical Philistines during the second battle, *i.e.*, in the Epiphany. During World War, Phase I, *i.e.*, the late part of the first battle, both a wordy and a violent battle set in against the nominal church as part of the first battle. The wordy battle of that time especially attacked its doctrine of the Divine rights of kings, clergy and aristocrats. The armies inflicted much physical violence on the nominal church, by killing millions of its adherents, destroying much of its property and greatly injuring its prestige as that of the institution whose failure to fulfill its mission was more than any other institution responsible for the spirit that led up to the World War. In Russia both the Greek and Roman Churches were almost annihilated by the physical violence exercised during the World War, Phase I. Therein in the second battle will come the complete verbal and violent defeat of the nominal church (the Philistines fought, and Israel was smitten, v. 10).

(42) And since the end of World War, Phase I, the wordy and the physical violence war has been going on. The conflict between the Modernists and the Fundamentalists continues with the Fundamentalists ever going down to defeat after defeat, both in the arguments and in the practical measures adopted. The classic example for this period is the encounter between Messrs. Bryan and Darrow at Dayton, Tenn., where Mr. Bryan made a most dismal failure of defending

the Bible against Mr. Darrow's infidelistic attacks. In most Protestant denominations the Modernists are now in the chariot driving the organizations executively onward, *e.g.*, the Presbyterian Church in its general assembly and in most of its synods is controlled by the Modernists, who have even succeeded in getting the courts to give them the church buildings of Fundamentalist congregations! Rome and what it is pleased to call the Reds, *i.e.*, practically everything anti-Romanist, are waging a world-wide wordy and physical violence battle. First antitypical Ben-hadad and later antitypical Hazael joined the fray, with Rome getting by far the worst of it. Against both Protestantism and Romanism the sword of Elisha has been bared, with heavy losses inflicted upon both of the former. In both a wordy and a physical violence fight are various states in conflict with Rome. Certainly Calles in Mexico most disastrously struck Rome in such a conflict. Czecho-Slovakia made Rome retreat in their wordy conflict. Even Romanist Poland struck Rome a hard blow over the Romanist Cardinal of Cracow refusing to allow Carol of Roumania to view the body of Pilsudski in the Cracow Cathedral. Rome met another defeat over the concordat conflict in Serbia. In 1932 in the verbal battle between the Fascisti and the Vatican, the pope learned to keep his hands, burnt in that battle, out of Italy's political fires. Mr. Hitler struck Rome and Protestantism most disastrous blows both verbally and physically. In Spain both the verbal and physical violence conflict went on in a major catastrophe for Rome, which through the rebels, Germany, Italy and the Moors, and even its own priests, monks, *etc.*, struck back with physical violence, while everywhere Rome waged a verbal warfare on Republican Spain. In every Protestant country the Modernists have driven the Fundamentalists more or less into the background, and all phases of Modernism reign in Protestantism. The future will give the Fundamentalists more and more defeats at the hands of the

Modernists, while in every European country before Armageddon the nations have plundered and will devastate Rome of her privileges, powers and prerogatives. All this is a part of the antitype of the battle and the defeat of Israel described in v. 10.

(43) But the worst of the defeat is yet to be inflicted on Nominal Spiritual Israel. While it will be decidedly worsted in the yet remaining part of the second verbal fight and in the pre-Armageddon physical violence part of the battle antitypical of that of v. 10, the climax of its defeat is reserved to Armageddon, which, while there will doubtless be in it some of the verbal fight waged, will consist mainly of the physical violence part of the second battle. As the ally of both state and capital (though to stay off the coming revolution, Rome and Protestantism pretend to favor conservative labor, having been driven to take that pretended stand somewhat by the logic of argument and events and mainly by fear for their future safety) they will become a target for antitypical Jehu when antitypical Jezebel reviles him for his attack on the state (2 Kings 9:30-37), and will certainly go down into utter destruction. There will, as 2 Kings 9:35 shows, be nothing left of Protestantism and Catholicism, except the memory of their theories (skull), conduct (feet) and deeds (palms of her hands). It will, indeed, be a disastrous rout and destruction that mark and will mark their part in both features of this battle. The complete destruction of a large part of their following will mark their defeat (a great slaughter ... fell ... 30,000 footmen) and the disorganized retreat of their surviving warriors (they fled every man into his own tent, habitation). The clergy and the most prominent church members will be cut off in death in Armageddon, after being soundly refuted in the wordy battle (2 Kings 10:18-25; Is. 65:11, 12; Jer. 25:32-38). This is expressly shown of the clergy in our study (the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were slain, 11). And, worst of all for Nominal Spiritual

Israel, the custodianship of the stewardship doctrines and other truths that the nominal church has, will fall into the hands of antitypical Elisha and Jehu, both of whom will take these as their charge; for while the Little Flock will not be a part of the antitypical Philistines, antitypical Elisha, Jehu and Hazeal are of them (1 Kings 19:16, 17), antitypical Elisha taking part in the verbal battle only, even as the sword of all three of them refers to their theories used in the verbal battle (the ark of God was taken); for after Armageddon the Epiphany Levites will be the religious teachers of Christendom and will therein be supported by antitypical Jehu.

(44) All throughout these two battles, particularly throughout the second battle, news-bearers have carried intelligence of the progress of the conflict to the nominal people of God (ran a man ... to Shiloh, 12). These were especially crown-losers (a man of Benjamin) who were very much grieved at the continued ill success of the nominal-church warriors in the second battle (clothes rent ... earth upon his head). Their grief continually increased until it will reach a climax in the Armageddon stage of the battle, which seals the refutation and slaughter of the clergy, a thing that will occur before the nominal church is utterly destroyed in Armageddon, the crown-lost leaders still occupying the place of leadership in the nominal church at the place of access to, and egress from it (when he came, lo, Eli sat upon a seat [literally, *throne*] by the wayside, 13). These were intently on the lookout for tidings from the field of battle (watching). Knowing the ill preparation of the defenders of the nominal church's truths, they trembled for their safety in the conflict (trembled for the ark of God). The tidings of the verbal defeat of the antitypical Israelites in their battle with the antitypical Philistines, particularly of the taking of the ark and of the physical death of the Romanist and Protestant clergy, distressed unspeakably the nominal-church people (told it, all the city cried

out; Rev. 14:10, 11; 18:9-11, 15-19; Jer. 25:34-36). The cries of distress of the nominal-church members have been, are coming and will come to the attention of the crown-lost leaders increasingly (Eli heard the noise of the crying, 14). And they ask its meaning (he said, What meaneth the noise of this tumult?). They were not long left without an explanation (the man came in hastily, and told Eli). Old, indeed, in leadership are now the crown-lost leaders, who began to take the place of leadership about the beginning and middle of the second century, when Ignatius began to exalt bishops and Justin Martyr began the sectarianizing of the Little Flock movement begun by St. John and nourished by Polycarp, working onward gradually toward the sectarianizing of that movement into the Greek Catholic Church (Now Eli was ninety and eight years old, 15). But their spiritual vision had become dim, especially since 1846; and by the time the Parousia was over they could see nothing of God's Truth in its connection as a plan (his eyes were dim, that he could not see). The news-bearers, who gave their reports verbally and in writings, *e.g.*, in newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, books, *etc.*, gave evidence of having been in the thick of the fray (I am he that came out of the army [literally, *ranks*], and I fled today out of the army [*ranks*], 16). From eye witnesses the crown-lost leaders desire to know the news (he said, What is there done?). His question was put with the kindliness of a leader to a subordinate (my son), as it was fitting so to be.

(45) In the rest of the chapter the effects of the tidings of misfortune upon the crown-lost leaders and upon united Protestantism (the image) as a whole are described, and that first upon the crown-lost leaders. The news-bringers briefly sum up the evil tidings in four parts: (1) the flight of antitypical Israel before the antitypical Philistines (Israel is fled before the Philistines, 17); (2) a fearful refutation of many antitypical Israelites in the wordy part of the battle and

a fearful amount of deaths in the physical violence part of the battle (there is also a great slaughter among the people); (3) The Romanist and Protestant clergy, the new creatures among them, including the crown-lost leaders, excepted, are all slain (thy two sons also, Hophni and Phinehas, are dead); and (4) the nominal-church stewardship and other truths are taken by the "Russellites" and conservative labor as of their guardianship (the ark of God is taken). We note both in the type and the antitype how to Eli and the crown-lost leaders each succeeding calamity is greater than the preceding one until the climax of evil is reached in the fourth and last one. And it was the last calamity that brought fatal effects on typical and antitypical Eli. The tidings that the antitypical Philistines had taken away from antitypical Israel the stewardship and other truths and then used them against antitypical Israel (made mention of the ark of God, 18) caused the crown-lost leaders to fall from their symbolic throne, *i.e.*, to give up their place and authority as leaders (fell off the seat [literally, *throne*]), in despair (backward), thus declaring *publicly* their giving up the leadership (by the side of the gate). They will lose all will power for leadership (and his neck brake), and thus will cease acting as crown-lost leaders (and he died). This they will do at the dictates of wisdom (old man) and gravity (heavy), after having as a class been the leaders in Christendom throughout nearly the entire Gospel Age (he had judged Israel forty years). We are not to understand that Eli's death represents the actual physical death of the crown-lost leaders; for they, as well as the bulk of the rest of the Great Company in Babylon, will survive Armageddon, and come into the Truth, as other Scriptures show, and serve it (Rev. 7:14; Num. 8:5-26). Rather, Eli's death represents the crown-lost leaders' ceasing in Armageddon to be such; for at that time or shortly afterwards they will own that the Lord had cast off Babylon in 1878, and had been using the Priesthood especially as his mouthpiece

since that time, as well as the Great Company since 1917 as mouthpiece toward the public.

(46) In the Divine law both the Romanist Church and the Protestant Church have been daughters-in-law to the crown-lost leaders. Nothing in this type is said of the Romanist daughter-in-law of antitypical Eli; but something very marked is typed of his Protestant daughter-in-law, the symbolic wife of the Protestant clergy, antitypical Phinehas (his daughter-in-law, Phinehas' wife, 19). The Protestant section of the nominal church had in her midst her section of the Great Company, who, by the Truth preaching and writings and by the signs of the times, particularly those of the Epiphany, and most particularly those connected with Armageddon, will be about prepared to leave Babylon, only waiting until the Protestant section of nominal Zion will be in travail in Armageddon (was with child, near to be delivered; Is. 66:8). The Protestant nominal church loves her stewardship and other truths, and is and has been most deeply pained at the news that the "Russellites" and conservative labor had these truths in their possession and used them against antitypical Israel (heard the tidings that the ark of God was taken), that the crown-lost leaders had publicly renounced their office and authority as such and that the Protestant clergy had been refuted and literally slain (that her father-in-law and her husband were dead). United Protestantism thereupon will bow down to the travail of her Armageddon sufferings (bowed herself and travailed, for her pains came upon her), and these (Is. 66:8) will be so intense that she will be unable to survive them. The Societyites will not only have stirred up antitypical Jehu to bring the Roman and Greek Catholic Churches gradually to their destruction in Armageddon, but will have done the same with him as to the Protestant Churches. And it is these sufferings of Protestantism as a whole that are the antitypical pains of v. 19. And because it will be as she goes into destruction and thus experiences its pains

that her part of the Great Company will leave her as a movement, separate and distinct from her, the Bible represents her as travailing in birth, in v. 19 and in Is. 66:8.

(47) It will be at the time of the death of Protestantism as a whole (about the time of her death, 20; as soon as Zion travailed, Is. 66:8) that the remnants of the Protestant denominations (the women that stood by her) will seek to keep her in life with the prospect of a symbolic son being born, *i.e.*, of the Great Company as a whole leaving Protestantism to become a separate movement, to continue the name and office of antitypical Phinehas (Fear not, for thou hast borne a son). But expiring Protestantism as a whole will make no fitting response (she answered not), nor will she be heartened thereby (neither did she regard it; literally, set her heart [to it]). Summing up her little remaining strength she will give a name to the Great Company movement as it is being born, a name that will indicate the three unutterable losses that she will have experienced, especially the greatest of the three—that from her the stewardship and other truths (the ark) have been taken and have fallen into the hands of her enemies—Ichabod (*Where is the glory?* 21). What of Truth she had with her leaders and clergy was the glory of Protestantism in her better days; but they will now have been lost to her and hers forever. Yea, she will have lost the glory! It will have departed from her and gone to her enemies, the overthrowers of herself, her clergy and her crown-lost leaders (The glory is departed from Israel, because the ark of God was taken, and because of her father-in-law and her husband)! The unutterableness of her woe will almost surpass human power of thought to perceive and appreciate, which appears from the repetition of the statement: The glory is departed (22). The chief part of her sorrow will consist in the consciousness that her stewardship and other truths will have been yielded up by their defenders to their and her enemies (for

the ark of God is taken). Yea, Romanists and Protestants will be most sorely tested (tormented, *i.e.*, tested, Rev. 14:10) by the destruction (fire and brimstone) of their respective cherished institutions: the beast and Catholic Church, and its image and the Protestant Church, which they believe are Divine institutions, in full view of the Church (holy angels) and Christ (the Lamb). The memory of this sore trial will not only never be forgotten; but it will come up in the minds of men forever (the smoke of their torment [testing by the destruction of their revered and supposedly Divine institutions] ascendeth up for ever and ever, Rev. 14:11). If we should take the view of the Biblically unenlightened natural man, the destruction of these powerful institutions would be one of the last things in the world to expect, especially in so short a time as the Bible indicates; but, Biblically enlightened, we can see the day of Babylon's destruction hastening rapidly on. Surely, the next few years will have witnessed the most stupendous events of history. And our study of 1 Sam. 3 and 4 helps us the more thoroughly to see this rapidly approaching destruction coming on apace. How glad we should be that the institutions that have so grossly caricatured God's holy person, character, plan and works are soon to be sunk irretrievably into the sea of destruction, and that the true Zion will shortly begin her grand and glorious reign (Rev. 18:20). Halleluia! For the Lord God omnipotent reigneth (Rev. 19:6)!

(1) Under what two subjects will we undertake the study of 1 Sam. 1—15? Which of these will we study in this chapter? When the second subject? Under what condition? How in comparison to the usual run of our former expositions will these studies be made? Why so? What will not be found in the Samuel antitype? How will it be found in its first fifteen, especially its first eight chapters? *E.g.*, how does this principle apply to 1 Sam. 1 and 2 and the antitype of the following chapters? When will these changes of antitypes be brought out? What is the general setting of 1 Sam. 1 and 2? In general outlines like what

other antitype is that of 1 Sam. 1 and 2? To whom, in general, in this picture does Elkanah correspond? Peninnah? Hannah? With what differences? What is typed by Jacob in his family matters? Leah, Zilpah and Bilhah? Rachel? Joseph? Benjamin? Samuel in the Hannah picture? Hannah's other three sons? Hannah's two daughters? What are the correspondencies and differences in the Rachel and Hannah pictures? Of what Scriptural principle are the Jacob and Elkanah pictures a splendid illustration? Without what?

(2) How were the star-members and their special helpers during the entire Gospel Age before the real and the nominal Church? As what? How are these two things typed? Where? How is this typed? As such, what were their qualities? How is this typed? Of how many sets of truths were they made stewards? How was this typed? What were the nature and character of the first set of these truths and its applicators? How was this typed? Of the second set of these truths and its applicators? How was it typed? During what periods did the second set of truths and its applicators produce and develop ten (or twelve) denominational groups? How is this typed? What are these ten denominations? Under what picture are two denominations included in other denominations? Which two are these? In what denominations were they included in that picture? How are these two set forth in the tabernacle's camp picture? How may they be indifferently viewed? Why? How did antitypical Hannah stand, from the standpoint of antitypical children?

(3) Who started Little Flock movements? Who developed them? How many did they start and develop? What was later done with these? By what were these movements started and developed? Among whom? How are these things typed? In connection with what were these sacrifices made? In what did these result? Who later perverted them into denominations? In what kind of periods were they not started? In what kind were they started? To do this, what did they have to do? In whose interests were these services and sacrifices not made? In whose? Who ministered during the periods of these services and sacrifices? How is this typed? Who chiefly functioned then? Over what periods did these sacrifices extend? When, relatively to the functioning of

the Catholic and Protestant clergy, do the three elective movements operate? Why are the clergy typed by priests?

(4) What did the star-members give to one of the sets of truths and their applicers? When? What did these truths become? How are the greater and stronger denominations typed? The lesser and weaker? What did they give to the other set of truths and their applicers? How do these compare and contrast with those given antitypical Peninnah? What throughout the Age, until the Parousia, was antitypical Hannah not given by the Lord? How did antitypical Peninnah act toward her? How is this typed? How did this affect antitypical Hannah? How is this shown in Is. 54:11, 15-17? What is God's part in this?

(5) Who cooperated with the 35 star-members and their 35 special helpers in each of the ten (or twelve) Little Flock movements? What did antitypical Peninnah do in connection with each one of these Little Flock movements? How did this affect antitypical Hannah? As a result, what did she omit doing? How did her course affect antitypical Elkanah? In connection with what did this occur? What did antitypical Elkanah see and say? What did he suggest? How was this suggestion true? What was the last of the ten (or twelve) stewardship truths? What did antitypical Hannah thereupon do? How is this typed? Under what conditions? During whose rule did this occur? What was the position of antitypical Eli? How are these things typed? How is the word temple not used in this connection? How is it used? How was this temple built? What does it type?

(6) Who was the star-member and his special helper in the cleansed sanctuary? How did this class feel? Why? How is this typed? To whom did they go in their distress? What did they do to Him? How is this typed? What did they in their prayer vow? How? How is this typed? For what did they pray? How is this typed? What was the vow? How was it typed? How was it to be like a Nazarite? In what way was the antitypical prayer offered? What as to the movement did this move them to set forth? What did this prayer attract? How is this typed? What kind was their speech? What only did it utter? How is this typed? How did it affect the minds of the crown-lost princes? How is this typed? What did they judge the faithful to be? How is this typed? What

two things did they do to the faithful? How is this typed? What did they accuse them of being long drunken? How is this typed? How were the participants in the Miller movement regarded from 1846 to 1874? How is this typed?

(7) What did the accused faithful do as to the accusation? How is this typed? What did they then do? How is this typed? What did they again do? How is this typed? What two things were denied? How is this typed? What did they say that they did? How is this typed? What kind of an opinion of them did they not desire the crown-lost princes to have? How is this typed? What did this move them to give? How is this typed? What are we not to forget of the crown-lost princes? Despite what? How is this pictured forth? Of what was their course creditable? Wherein was it exercised? How is this typed? Had they been better informed, what would they perhaps not have done? Why? How is this typed? What effect did their exhortation and wish have on antitypical Hannah? How is this typed? Why did it so affect them? Why was this natural? How did these assurances affect the faithful, longing Little Flock? What did they do, as they neared 1874? How is this typed?

(8) What did Bro. Russell, the new star-member, and the five mentioned successive pilgrims, each in turn as his special helper, and the rest of the Little Flock as Truth applicers do? How is this typed? To what did they then give their special attention? How is this typed? So doing, what did Bro. Russell and these pilgrims do? How is this typed? What did God in this connection remember? How is this typed? What then occurred through God's interposition? How is this typed? How did antitypical Hannah regard the Little Flock Parousia movement? How is this typed? Why may it be so regarded? How is this typed? What did Bro. Russell, the five special pilgrims and the rest of God's people do during the Parousia? How is this typed? In what manner? What does this mean? How is it typed? To what did antitypical Hannah devote her attention? How is this typed? What would they afterwards do? How is this typed? What is thereby brought to our attention? How did Bro. Russell and the five pilgrims stand as to this work? How is this typed?

(9) What activities thus occupied Little Flock brethren? How is this typed? How long did they continue such work? How is this typed? After preparing such for public work, what did such Little Flock servants do? How is this typed? Why did they do this? In faith what three things did they do in this service? How is this typed by the three bullocks? What kinds of Truth did they appear preaching? How is this typed? While doing this, in what condition were their proteges? How is this typed? What is typed by Hannah's and Samuel's offering one bullock? In what ways did antitypical Hannah advance their proteges in public service? By so doing, to whose attention did they bring them? How is this typed?

(10) Why did it become necessary for antitypical Hannah to acknowledge antitypical Samuel? How is this typed? What is the relation of the praying and vow-fulfilling antitypical Hannah? How is this typed? What did they identify? How is this typed? What did they openly acknowledge as an accomplished fact? How is this typed? What could they confidently affirm? Why? How is this typed? As what did they tell this? How is this typed? What two facts did they state? How is this typed? What is the correct pertinent translation? How did they describe the nature of the vow? How is this typed? What is the correct translation of this thought? What does v. 28 show antitypically and typically? What proves the answer to be correct? Who is, and who is not, the "he" of v. 28?

(11) With what will the discussion of 1 Sam. 1 be concluded? What are the three involved types and antitypes? How do antitypical Sarah, Rachel and Hannah differ as to the truths of which they consist? As to the appliers of these truths? As to the time of operation? As to the time of bearing their children? As to the time of ceasing to operate? Which is the least inclusive of these types? The more inclusive? The most inclusive?

(12) Why is the study of 1 Sam. 2 joined to the study of 1 Sam. 1? What does Hannah type, as the mother of Samuel? What made them declare, with ardent yearnings, the antitypes of vs. 1-10? What do vs. 1-10 feature? From what standpoint? With what in mind will vs. 1-10 be studied? Who very helpfully translates this section? What will be done with this translation in the main on

these verses? What effect on antitypical Hannah did their success in developing antitypical Samuel have? How is this typed? Why such very great joy? In what fact did they exult? How is this typed? How were the Truth and its arrangements Parousially set forth? Why were they so set forth? How is this typed? What did such a setting of them forth enable antitypical Hannah to do? How is this typed? Despite what advantages, what were their foes unable to do? What proved to be their strength? Why? How is this typed?

(13) What did they set forth as the most important feature of the Harvest message? As having what characteristic? How is this typed? Against what did they stress God's sole Deity? How is this typed? As respects these four things, even over whose corresponding excellencies did they stress God's superiority? Let alone those of whom else? How is this typed? What did they exhort as to antitypical Peninnah and her children? How is this typed? What had been their past course? How is this typed? What did they rebuke? To what did they pertinently exhort? How are these two things typed? What two reasons are given for this rebuke and exhortation? How are they typed? What is the next Harvest feature proclaimed here typically by Hannah? How is it typed? What were the Parousia means of breaking up the creeds? How is this typed? How were the Truth warriors qualified thereto? How is this typed? According to Heb. 4:12 what was the Harvest Truth to antitypical Hannah?

(14) What were the next parts of the Harvest message proclaimed by antitypical Hannah? How are these typed? What resulted to antitypical Hannah? How is this typed? What resulted to antitypical Peninnah? How is this typed? What were additional parts of antitypical Hannah's Parousia message? How is this typed? What is still another part of the Harvest message proclaimed by antitypical Hannah, as to the nominal people of God? How is this typed in v. 7? In what particulars did God make His nominal people poor in the Harvest time? How is this described in Rev. 3:17? On the other hand, what did antitypical Hannah proclaim as the contrasted blessings of the Little Flock? How is this typed? In what did this enrichment consist, according to Rev. 3:18?

(15) What was antitypical Hannah's proclamation as to the proud and the humble? How is this typed? Wherein are these contrasts seen? What does the exposition of the two clauses of v. 7 show? From what did God raise up the poor (humble)? How do Is. 52:2 and Ps. 137:1 show this? How is this typed? From what and to what did God uplift the needy? How is this typed? With whom has He thereby given them to dwell? How is this typed? Why did He do this? How is this typed? How do the cited Scriptures teach this? Of what will they become pillars? How is this typed? As such pillars what will they also be made? How is this typed? What is the next proclamation? How is this typed?

(16) What verse types another proclamation of antitypical Hannah? Of how many parts does it consist? What is the first of these? How is it typed? What is the proper translation of the word translated saints in v. 9? How does the literal translation describe the feet members? What relevancy has Ps. 91 to the thought of the first feature of v. 9's proclamation? What is the second feature of this proclamation? How is it typed? What is the third feature of this proclamation? How is this typed? What verse types a final proclamation of antitypical Hannah? In how many parts? What is the first of these? Who are the foes to be shattered? How is the first point typed? What is the second of these? When did the New Heavens begin to be set in their place? By what acts? How will the pertinent controversies end? How is the second point typed? What is the third of these? Why will this striping be inflicted? How is the third point typed? What is the fourth of these? How is it typed? What is the fifth of these? How is it typed? With the light of this exposition cast upon 1 Sam. 2:1-10, what will a review of these verses enable us to recognize.

(17) What did Bro Russell, *etc.*, do after introducing antitypical Samuel to his public work? How is this typed? In what way did antitypical Samuel do his work? How is this typed? Whom do Hophni and Phinehas type? In what sense were these sons of Belial, in type and antitype? How did they not know the Lord, type and antitype? How did they not, and how did they use their positions, type and antitype? What was the typical and the antitypical hook with three teeth? What were the antitypical pan,

kettle, caldron and pot? What is typed by putting the hook with three teeth into these and drawing out much sodden flesh? How did they do this in the antitype? How was this custom conducted, especially by the Catholic churches? In a word, what did the Catholic and Protestant clergy do to God's people as sacrificers? Where was this custom universal? Where nearly universal?

(18) What worse thing was contained in the "custom" of the Catholic and Protestant clergy? How is this typed? What is the choice part of a real sacrifice? By what is this typed? As what particular thing is this offered? How is it typed? What does this precede? How is this typed? What demand against this condition was made by the clergy? Through what? How are these things typed? What did these clerics take to themselves for themselves? How is this typed? As a result, what did they become? How did they use the opportunities of their office? How not? How is this typed? How does their office seem to be to them? What results from this practice? What did this make of the clergy? How did the prophets speak of this course of the clergy? How do the cited passages show this? What happened when the consecrators desired and worked against such a course of the clergy? How is this typed? What did they force the consecrators to give up? By what means? What did their kindred-minded clerical brethren do before the Parousia? By living out the same principle in what did the Parousia clergy partake? How and against whom did they thereby sin? How is this typed? What result did their course effect on the more prominent people as to the religious life? Upon the clergy?

(19) What is the character of the translation *child* in v. 18? What is the word *naar* used to designate? What are some examples in proof of this, How should the word be rendered in v. 18? What is meant by the expression, the Little Flock as the Parousia Movement? How was it engaged in service? How is this typed? What is meant by being girded with the Truth? How is this shown by Eph. 6:14? How is it typed? For what does the ephod stand? For whom alone in the type was it to be had? What passages prove these answers? Of what tribe was Samuel not a member? Of what tribe was he a member? As what was he perpetually devoted to

God's service? What character did this give him? Typical of whom? How? What did the Little Flock Truth servants give antitypical Samuel? How is this typed? How did they give them these? During what times? How is this typed? With whom did such Truth servants especially serve? How is this typed? While they were so serving what did antitypical Eli do to them? How is this typed? How not? How did they do it? In return for what? How is this typed? Into what two classes did such consecrators fall? Into what class later did the bulk of the new creatures fall? Why is this said? What types this? When did antitypical Eli in part bring part of this seed into existence? When do, and when do not the births take place? In what sense? Despite what? What did all the Truth servants do after each call and sifting period? How is this typed?

(20) What did God, according to v. 21, do after 1914? How is this typed? Who then were antitypical Elkanah and Hannah? When this fruitfulness will be complete, what will have emerged therefrom? How is this typed? What do we learn from this eventuality as to the Hannah type in its widest sense? How do the antitypes of Sarah, Rachel and Hannah compare and contrast? What as yet do we not see? What may we see on this head? Even what else? Why are these two or three things possible and in harmony with the Oath-bound Covenant?

(21) In what time in the ministry of the crown-lost leaders do the first Samuel antitypes fall? How is this typed? What have these in the Parousia and the Epiphany learned? How is this typed? In what two forms did the pertinent wickedness exist? Of what other evil of the clergy did the crown-lost leaders learn? How is this evil typed? Of what did this evil consist? Whence did this knowledge primarily come? Secondly? Thirdly? What did this knowledge prompt the crown-lost leaders to do? Wherein do we see these protests in part exemplified? Who were these protesting evangelists? Pastors? How is this typed?

(22) What will some of the readers recall of Billy Sunday's speeches pertinent to this subject? What antitype did he illustrate thereby? What can be said of the character of the reports on the clergy? How is this typed? What did the clergy cause the Lord's people to do? How

is this typed? What did they show the clergy? How is this typed? What must be said of the pertinent rebukes? How is this typed? With what, in type and antitype, was the matter allowed to go on? How did the evil-doers act as to these too gentle rebukes? How is this typed? What is the natural effect of an executive's too much leniency? What did their impenitence arouse in the Lord? How is this typed? In contrast with the clergy's course, what marked that of antitypical Samuel? How is this typed? To whose course was Samuel's similar?

(23) Who appeared before the crown-lost leaders with a denunciatory and sentencing message? Who know this? How is this typed? As what did these come? How is this typed? What question did their message raise in the crown-losers' minds? How is this typed? Why is the answer true, in type and antitype? What is the sense of the question following the first question that the pertinent speeches and writings raised in the crown-losers' minds? How are the questions of this set of questions typed? Why are the answers true, in type and antitype? What other question was thus raised in the crown-losers' minds? How is this typed? Why is the answer true, in type and antitype? How as to excuses do these questions leave the sinning clergy? What demand did God then make on the clergy through the said speeches and writings? How is this typed? How did these oppose God's pertinent ordinances? How is this typed? Why did God pertinently blame the crown-lost leaders? How is this typed?

(24) After pointing out the pertinent wrong-doings, what did God then proceed to do? How is this typed? What was the first piece of retribution forecast? How has it been fulfilling? How was it typed? The second? How has it been fulfilling? How was it typed? The third? How has it been fulfilling? How was it typed? How has God dealt with His Parousia and Epiphany priesthood? How was it typed? The fourth piece of retribution? How was it typed? The fifth? How was it fulfilled? How was it typed? What did it mean to the clergy? The sixth? How was it fulfilled? How was it typed? Of what type and antitype would the pertinent things be a sign?

(25) What sign did the Lord give the crown-lost leaders? What are its two parts? How is this typed? How

do the cited Scriptures prove both parts? How would this be a sign to them in its two parts? How is this typed? What will happen in Armageddon to the cleansed crown-lost leaders? What will all the rest of the surviving crown-lost leaders see? How is this typed? What did God then proceed through these brothers to forecast? How is this typed? How do the cited passages prove this thought? How would that wise and faithful servant administer his office? How is this typed? What did God promise to raise up to him? How is this typed? How does the cited passage show this? As what would he function for Jesus? How is this typed? What did God on this subject finally affirm, in the first place, of every true priest who in Babylon had been under the crown-lost leaders? How is this typed? In the second place? How is this typed? What do we witness as to these forecasts?

(26) What will we now study? What remark will be recalled as made in the opening part of this article? Of what was there in the Samuel antitype a chronological succession of events? To what did the study of 1 Sam. 1 and 2 bring us? How does the antitype of 1 Sam. 3 and 4 stand on this point as to the antitype of 1 Sam. 1 and 2 as a whole? As to that of 1 Sam. 2:27-36? How do the antitypes of 1 Sam. 1 and 2 and 1 Sam. 3 and 4 differ? How may this be summed up? How does this line of thought manifest itself in the Samuel antitype in the following chapters? Where have we seen this line of thought presented? Why are these matters stressed?

(27) What does the opening statement of 1 Sam. 3 prove as to the Little Flock movement and the time involved in it? Why is this true? Not even what part of the Little Flock does it type? Why not? Whom does the language of v. 1 fit antitypically? What first point proves this? Second? How long did some of these sleep? Others? And the last sleepers? What other facts prove that Samuel in vs. 1-3 types the Little Flock from 1846 to 1878? What two things does this prove?

(28) How should the word, *naar*, be translated in v. 1? In what kind of work did the Samuel class serve the Lord in Babylon from 1846 to 1874? By what is this shown? Under whose eyes and approval did they do this? How much Truth came to this Samuel class in Babylon from 1846 to 1878? Of whom else is this true?

Despite what fact? What are the types of these two antitypes? Where is the thing that is said to come to pass in v. 2 mentioned? What is that thing? Why are the things set forth in vs. 2, 3 mentioned? What kind of a condition was that of the crown-lost leaders mentioned in v. 2? What was the first thing in this sad condition that made it bad? Why was this so? What put them into this condition? What was the second thing that made their condition bad? Of what did they thus furnish a marked example?

(29) What is the antitypical lamp of God? Otherwise expressed? How does the cited passage prove this? For what is this typical lamp not to be taken? Why not? What was it? Where did it burn? How did it seem to go out? What did the temple attendants do before it went out? What is the antitype of this lamp's growing dim? Under another figure how does Joel 2:30, 31 prove this? How do the cited passages prove that the Bible is a lamp? When was the dim-growing time of the Bible to the nominal church? When did its going out begin and end? What conclusion follows from this as to the period of the Little Flock's falling asleep? What section of them? What is the antitypical ark for the pertinent time? Why is this said? In what will this view help?

(30) What is the time difference antitypically between vs. 1-3 and the rest of this chapter? How was the call antitypical of that in v. 4 voiced? When was Studies, Vol. 1, issued? How was it circulated? What was the special method of its circulation? What occurred through its circulation? How did its message appear to the Little Flock? What did they conclude as to its authorship? What did this lead them to do? Why so? What was the crown-lost leaders' answer? What did it mean? What effect did it produce in antitypical Samuel?

(31) When was Studies, Vol. II, first circulated? To whom did it come? Where? How is this typed? What kind of a hearing did antitypical Samuel give it? Why? How is this typed? What did its character suggest to antitypical Samuel as to its writer? What did this prompt them to do? How are these things typed? What readiness did they express? What did the crown-lost leaders disavow? How is this typed? What did they charge antitypical Samuel to do? How is this typed? How did they

speak to antitypical Samuel? How is this typed? What effect did their charge have? How is this typed? In what condition did the two calls so far described find the Samuel class? How is this typed? To what fact was that condition due? How is this typed? What else came to the Samuel class while yet in Babylon? How is this typed? What kind of a ring did the message have in their ears? What conclusion did this prompt them to draw? What did this prompt them to do? How is this typed? What was told antitypical Eli? How typed?

(32) What had some of the crown-lost leaders been doing in the meantime? What resulted therefrom? What facts prove this? What did they conceal about this course of theirs? How are these things typed? What two things did the Eli class say thereon to the Samuel class? How is this typed? What third thing did the Eli class say to the Samuel class? How is this typed? What did antitypical Samuel thereupon do? How is this typed? By what did the Lord come to the Samuel class, and that for the fourth time? How is this typed? What kind of a hold did the Lord this time take on antitypical Samuel? How is this typed? How did this affect antitypical Samuel? How is this typed? How, comparatively with the other calls, was the fourth made? How is this typed? How did it differ from the others? How is this typed? As what, and as what not, did the Samuel class recognize the fourth message? What did this prompt them to do? How is this typed?

(33) Of what is the message of vs. 11-14 a fine typical summary? What did this typical summary have to do with the understanding of the antitypes of 1 Sam. 3 and 4? Whence also did helps therein come? How did it help to see the antitypes of the three other calls? How did it help to open up the antitypes of 1 Sam. 4? As what did it show the antitypes? Why? What do these considerations give us? Of what do vs. 11-14 remind their reader? Why so? What was shown in our April issue as to the antitype of the man of God in 1 Sam. 2:27? Especially which of the antitypical six constituting this man of God brought the message to the Samuel class? Through what? How did this message come to them? What fact makes the pertinent message of Studies, Vol. IV, the word of the Lord to antitypical Samuel? How is this typed?

(34) What did God through Studies, Vol. IV, declare that He would do in Christendom? How is this typed? By what is this stressed? What do the facts so far fulfilled show as to the fulfilment? How is this indicated in the symbols of Rev. 14:10, 11? When is the fulfilment to be completed? How is this typed? Through whom has He made these forecasts? Especially through whom? Where? Against whom? What is it not? To what will it progress? By what will it be ended? Where is this especially shown? How does this punishment not come? How is this typed?

(35) Through whom was this judgment revealed? Where? Explained? Especially through whom? Where briefly? Where detailedly? How is this typed? What kind of a judgment will it be? How is this typed? To what is it due? In whom is this iniquity especially? How is this typed? Despite this wickedness, what did the crown-lost leaders fail to apply to the situation? What did the gravity of the situation impel God to do? How is this typed? To what did God swear? How is this typed? What will not atone for it? Why not? How is this typed? Whose sufferings will not atone for it? Why not? How is this typed? What cannot prevent the forecast judgment? Through what twofold suffering experiences will the unbegotten Babylonians have to pass to purge themselves from their defilements due to their support of Babylon and indulgence in her practices?

(36) What was the first effect, type and antitype, of the vision of vs. 11-14? The second effect? What did antitypical Samuel then do? How is this typed? What was by now the attitude of the Samuel class? How was this brought about progressively? When did they leave Babylon? What reason did they give for taking this step? What prompted them to refrain from telling antitypical Eli of the vision? In what spirit did antitypical Eli ask as to the antitypical vision? What did this move them to ask of antitypical Samuel? How did he respond in spirit and fact? In what did the crown-lost leaders show a lack of generous candor? Why this? What did they ask? How is this typed? How is this hidden from the A. V. readers? What kind of a statement did they desire? How was this emphasized? How typed?

(37) What is a Little Flock quality? How did antitypical Samuel do? How is this typed?

How much of the antitype of vs. 11-14 did they emphasize? Even to what extent? What helped antitypical Eli to be prepared to receive antitypical Samuel's message? Of what were they thereby made aware? How, accordingly, did they regard antitypical Samuel's message? What in their own course made them recognize much of Samuel's statement as true? In what ways did the Samuel class continue to grow? What was he moved thereby to do? Henceforth with whom did he become identical? How did the Lord indicate His favor on antitypical Samuel? How is this typed? What did his teachings not do? What does this mean? How is it typed? By whom was he recognized as the Lord's mouthpiece to the world? When? How are these things typed? With what did God's revelations to him not cease? With respect to what? How are these things typed? Through whom did these revelations come to him? Where does the first clause of 1 Sam. 4:1 belong? Is such a phenomenon unique? How did the fact of Samuel's becoming set as the Lord's prophet to Israel become recognized? What is the antitype of this?

(38) What antitypical forecasts did 1 Sam. 4 type? What threefold time stage does the antitype show? How will they be traced here? How are the two antitypical battles of 1 Sam. 4 comparatively related? When did the exclusively wordy battle occur? When does the battle of words and violence take place in its two parts? What does the type omit as to the second battle? How do we know of these omitted things? Why is this type silent on the anarchy feature of the Time of Trouble? Under what figure are the battles set forth in the Bible? How do the cited passages indicate this? What is also not typed in the wordy battle of 1 Sam. 4? Despite what fact?

(39) Of what did the wordy battle consist? Where is this typed? On what does antitypical Israel take its stand? How is this typed? Why? On what did the antitypical Philistines take their stand? How is this typed? What did each denomination's defenders seek to do? For what three reasons was the defense of each creed and of all of them an impossible thing? From what standpoints? What did the creeds' contradicting one another effect? Of whom in part do the attackers consist? In what three aspects? At what especially did the attackers strike? What in general did they pass by with

out especial attack? How did the no-ransomers conduct their attacks? The infidelists? The combinationists? The reformers? The contradictionists? What has labor and the state done in this attack? With what effect? What was the result of the battle? How is this typed?

(40) What does the ark of the covenant type? What, accordingly, has it always represented? How does this affect its relation to the real and the nominal church? What does the ark in 1 Sam. 4 type? Why? What would this include as the ark to the nominal church at the involved time? What, accordingly, does the ark represent as in the guardianship of Eli and his sons? With what exclusively did the nominal church not engage in the battle of vs. 1, 2? Why did she use these very little then? How does the course of the Calvinists illustrate this matter? What did the leaders counsel for the wordy part of the second battle? When? Why? What did they expect to result therefrom? How are these things typed? Of what did they feel certain? How is this typed? What resulted from the acceptance of this counsel? How is this typed? What is typed by God's dwelling between the Cherubim? What two things did the sequel show? What effect did antitypical Hophni's and Phinehas' custodianship of the antitypical ark have on the battle? What was the result of these conditions?

(41) What was the universal expectation among nominal-church warriors? What did this lead them to do? To whom did this over-confidence extend? How are these three things typed? To whose ears did this boasting confidence come? What example illustrates this? How is this typed? What effect did this have on the antitypical Philistines? How is this typed? With what spirit did they encourage one another? How is this typed? What as a result did they know that they would have to do? How is this typed? Of what were they ignorant? Who were the first class of the antitypical Philistines in the second battle? The second? The third? The fourth? What are examples coming under these? Who else nationally will become antitypical Philistines? In what period are these the antitypical Philistines? How was the wordy conflict waged during World War, Phase I? What inflicted physical violence then? How did they injure the nominal church? What did this feature of the battle effect in

Russia? What will then take place? With what result? How are these things typed?

(42) What has been going on since World War, Phase I? Between whom is the conflict? With what effect? What is the classic example on this head? How is this phase of the conflict going on in the Protestant denominations? What example illustrates this? With whom is Rome now waging a world-wide warfare? What radicals have been joining in the fray? Who is being worsted? Who else is wielding his sword against Romanism and Protestantism? Who else is fighting them verbally and physically? What countries have struck Rome hard unto eating her flesh? In what way did each hurt her? In Spain through whom is Rome striking back with physical violence? What is she everywhere waging against Republican Spain? What have the Modernists done to the Fundamentalists in every Protestant country? What has the future in store for the latter? What will be done in every European country to Rome before Armageddon? Of what is all this the antitype?

(43) What yet is in store for Nominal Spiritual Israel? How do the two stages of the second battle contrast with one another as to injury on it? How will the two phases of that battle be comparatively manifest then? Whose ally is the nominal church? Despite what? Why do Romanism and Protestantism pretend to be the friends of conservative labor? Whose target will they become? When? In what will they end? What three things alone will then be left of Romanism and Protestantism? How is this typed in 2 Kings 9:35? What will be the character of their rout and destruction in both features of the battle? What will mark their defeat and retreat? How is this typed? Who will be cut off in death? How is this typed in 2 Kings 10:18-25? Prophesied in Is. 65:11, 12 and Jer. 25:28-32? Typed in v. 11? What will be the nominal church's supreme evil in this battle? How is this typed? Who of the Lord's real people does not and will not, and who of them does and will participate in this battle? Who else, as typed in 1 Kings 19:16, 17? In what only does and will antitypical Elisha share in this battle? What is typed by the sword of all three? How is their verbal victory typed? Who will be the religious teachers in Christendom after Armageddon? As such by whom will they be supported?

(44) What have news-bearers been doing throughout both battles? How is this typed? Who especially have these been? How is this typed? How did they regard the ill success of the nominal church's apologists? How is this typed? What characteristic did their grief exhibit as the second battle went on? When did it reach a climax? What did Armageddon seal? When relatively will this occur? Where will the crown-lost leaders occupy the place of leadership? How is this typed? What made them tremble for fear of the stewardship and other truths of the nominal church? What distressed unspeakably the nominal-church people? How is this typed? Prophesied in Jer. 25:34, 35 and Rev. 14:10, 11? To whom do the signs of their distress come? How is this typed? What do they ask? How is this typed? How long did they have to wait for an explanation? How is this typed? How long have crown-losers been leaders among God's people? What did Ignatius and Justin Martyr do with the movement begun by St. John and furthered by Polycarp? How is this long period of leadership typed? Since when did their spiritual vision become dim? From when on could they see nothing? How are these two things typed? In what forms did the news-bearers give their tidings? For example? Of what did such reports give evidence? How is this typed? From what kind of witnesses did antitypical Eli desire news? How did he request it? How are these things typed?

(45) What two things are described in the rest of the chapter? In what order? What is the first piece of news declared to antitypical Eli? How typed? The second? How typed? The third? How typed? The fourth? How typed? How in the type and antitype was the order of the news given? What worst affected Eli, type and antitype? The mention of what proved fatal to typical and antitypical Eli? How is this typed? What did it cause, type and antitype? With what feeling? What is typed by this happening at the side of the gate? What will the crown-lost leaders lose? How typed? What will they cease doing? How typed? Why will they do this? How typed? How long will they have been leaders? How typed? What are we not to understand Eli's death to type? Why not? How is this Biblically shown in Rev. 7:14 and Num. 8:5-26? What does Eli's death type? Why?

(46) By Divine law what have the Romanist and Protestant churches become to the crown-lost leaders? What in this respect is not here typed as to the Romanist Church? Of whom is something here markedly typed by Eli's daughter-in-law. Phinehas' wife? What has the Protestant Church had in her midst? By what were they affected unto preparedness to leaving Babylon? For what had they been kept waiting? How is this typed? What has Is. 66:8 to say on this line of thought? What does the Protestant section of the nominal church feel as to her stewardship and other truths? How have their capture and turning against her apologists by the "Russellites" and conservative labor affected united Protestantism? How is this typed? The crown-lost leaders' giving up their leadership? How typed? The refutation and destruction of the Protestant clergy? How typed? What did United Protestantism thereupon do? How typed? How intense will they be? How typed? What light does Is. 66:8 throw on this line of thought? What will the Societyites have stirred up? Of what are the Armageddon sufferings of Protestantism the antitype? What will she be undergoing when her part of the Great Company will be leaving her? As what? How is this typed? Prophesied?

(47) When will the remnants of the Protestant denominations stand about her? How is this typed? Prophesied? What will they seek to do with her? By what tidings? How typed? What will be her reaction? What will she do? The loss of what three things will the name indicate? Especially which one? What does the name Ichabod mean? What does the giving of the name here type? What does her lamentation imply? How typed? How intense will her woe be? From what does this appear? How typed? What will be the chief part of her grief? How typed? How does Rev. 14:10 here apply? Before whom will this sore trial be experienced? How does Rev. 14:11 here apply? How does the unenlightened natural man take to these forecasts? Especially as to their near fulfilment? The Biblically enlightened? What will be the character of the pertinent events within the next few years? What does our study of 1 Sam. 3, 4 help us to do in this respect? How should we feel on these matters and their succeeding events?

CHAPTER II

SAMUEL

(Continued).

1 Sam. 5–8.

THE ARK AT ASHDOD; AT GATH; AT EKRON. WORK OF THE PHILISTINE LORDS. BETH-SHEMITES. KIRJATH-JEARIMITES. WAR WITH THE PHILISTINES. DESIRING A KING.

AS WE SAW that the line of thought in 1 Sam. 3, 4, differed from that of 1 Sam. 1, 2, in that these two sets of two chapters did not type things chronologically successive, so the same remark applies to chapters 5, 6; for the things typed in these two chapters began in the second century of the Christian era and ended in the seventeenth century. The possibility of such a reaching so far back in this Age for the beginning of the antitype of these two chapters lies in the definition given to the antitypical ark of the covenant—the full depositary of God's arrangement as seen in the Truth due at any time in question. Another thing that suggests that the antitypes of chapter 5 reach so far back into the Age from our time is the nature of the antitypical Philistines and their five cities: antitypical Ashdod, Gath, Ekron, Askelon and Gaza (1 Sam. 6:17). For the Gospel Age the Philistines (*villagers*) represent sectarians at any time during the Age. Their five cities represent the five chief Gospel-Age sects, *i.e.*, those that have been during this Age united with the state as state churches. These are the Greek Catholic Church, the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, the Lutheran Church and the Calvinistic Church. Is. 19:18 describes these five denominations. It calls them cities, because in Bible symbols a city represents a religious government. This we can see from the city of Babylon representing the nominal church as a religious government (Rev. 14:8; 16:19; 17:5, 18;

18:2, 10, 16, 18, 19, 21), and from Jerusalem as representing the true Church (Matt. 5:35 [the word, *is*, here means *types*]; Is. 66:13; Zech. 14:4, 8, 17, 21; Rev. 21:2, 10—22:3). Accordingly, these five cities represent five religious governments, *i.e.*, five religious denominations.

(2) These five religious governments are spoken of in Is. 19:18 as being in Egypt, *i.e.*, symbolic Egypt, which is the present evil order of affairs (Is. 19:1, 12-25; 20:3-5; 30:1-3; 31:1-3; 52:4; 63:10-14; Rev. 11:8). In symbolic Egypt antitypical Pharaoh, Satan, is king or god (Ex. 1—15; John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:2). And certainly, these five denominations, united with the state, are in this Egypt in the sense of being parts of Satan's empire. They speak the language of Canaan, *i.e.*, of the Canaanites, error (Zech. 14:21), not the language of the Hebrews, the Truth (Rev. 9:11; 16:16; Neh. 13:24). All five of these have required consecration of their clergy and of their laity. It is true that in most cases the consecration was not a true one, but they required it to be made at the ordination of their clergy and at the confirmation of their laity, all five of them practicing confirmation in European countries, where they are united with the state (swear to the Lord of hosts, Is. 45:23). And one shall be called, the city of destruction. This one is the Roman Catholic Church, to which such a name is applicable, not only because it goes into a more emphatic destruction than the others, but also because it has wrought destruction more emphatically than any of the other four denominations. These five denominations in the Gospel-Age picture that we are now studying are typed by the five cities of the Philistines. Our study will show us that Ashdod types the Greek Catholic Church, that Gath types the Roman Catholic Church and that Ekron types the Church of England. The other two cities represent the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches, Askelon probably the Lutheran Church and Gaza probably the Calvinistic Church.

Perhaps later the Lord will give us certainty as to which types which; the most that we now can say thereon is "probably." It is the typical significance of the three first-named cities that enables us to locate the time setting of this and the next chapter's antitypes. The general reasons why we understand Ashdod to type the Greek Catholic Church is the time setting and the fact that Chapter 5 gives it as the first of the three denominations especially afflicted by symbolic plagues, sifting errors and siftings; for the same general reasons we understand Gath to type the Roman Catholic Church in these two chapters; and for the same general reasons we understand Ekron to represent the Church of England. This will come out more clearly as we examine the details further on in this chapter.

(3) The ark of the covenant (1) at the time of the antitype of v. 1 was the doctrine that the Apostle John used to begin the movement that was later by crown-lost leaders perverted into the Greek Catholic Church. As we have already learned in EH, 225-236, this was the doctrine of our Lord's pre-human, human and post-human natures and offices as God's appointed Executive. As John gave this doctrine, and as Polycarp fostered it, it being the Truth then due, it was the antitypical ark of v. 1. Under the manipulation of crown-losers, like Justin Martyr, Origen, Dionisius of Rome, Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory Nyssa, gradually over a period of about 250 years while holding the office of our Lord more or less after a manner in harmony with St. John's teachings, they increasingly grossly perverted his teachings on our Lord's natures into the God-man theory. This perversion was completed by 381 A.D., at the second general council, the first of Constantinople, the God theory of it having been completed by 325, at the first general council of Nice. Hence, the stewardship doctrine of the Greek Catholic Church was more or less perverted, even as every other denomination of Christendom more or less perverted its

stewardship doctrine. The antitypical Philistines (Greek Catholics) took the pertinent doctrine from the apostolic Truth (Eben-ezer, *stone of help*). Please note the difference in the antitypical significance of the Philistines, *etc.*, here from that of them in Chapter 4, though always they stand for sectarians. Ashdod (*stronghold*) here types the Greek Catholic Church, to which the crown-lost leaders pervertingly brought the stewardship doctrine under consideration. The bringing of the ark to the house of Dagon (2) types the efforts of the crown-lost leaders to harmonize it with the errors that they taught on Christ's person and office, and their setting it beside the image of Dagon types the crown-lost leaders' claim to have harmonized the two teachings. Dagon was an image consisting of a part fish and part man figure. His lower part was the image of the body of a fish without a head and his upper part was the image of the body of a man without legs. His lower part types the man in the God-man theory and his upper part types the God in the God-man theory. Hence Dagon types the nominal church's counterfeit theory of Christ's natures. All the while the God-man theory was developing the Truth teachers refuted each of its developing phases (Dagon falling [the literal translation] upon his face to the earth before the ark, 3), the morrow of v. 3 representing the periods after each of such refutations up to the completion of the antitypical Dagon in 381; and the morrow of v. 4 representing the periods after each refutation up to the end of the monothelite controversy, as we will see later. We know that in the heathen religions Satan before Christ counterfeited every part of God's plan of which he could get glimpses, from its parts, as they were gradually revealed. *E.g.*, he knew from Gen. 3:15 that the seed of the woman would do a delivering work, and from the expression *seed* he concluded that the Deliverer would be human, but more than a human being, else He could not destroy Satan. This he apparently inferred also from Deut.

18:15-18, where he saw that a Prophet greater than Moses would come, as he also inferred this from Gen. 22:17, 18, where the seed is veiledly referred to as heavenly and as bringing the race back from the dead, and from Gen. 49:10; Num. 24:17. The chief blessing that Gen. 9:26, 27 assigns to them Satan also wove into his counterfeit God-man Messiah, Osiris, *etc.*

(4) Hence he palmed off a counterfeit of this coming Deliverer as both human and spiritual, by the fish-man god of Ashdod, Dagon. And in due time he made a more exact counterfeit for Christendom; for we are not to forget that, while in the ancient heathen religions Satan, by conclusions erroneously based on God's gradually increasing revelation, sought to anticipate the Lord's plan by what he gave the heathen before the New Testament times, after the full revelation was given by Christ and the Apostles he counterfeited in the papacy every doctrine, practice and organizational feature of The Christ that in an entirety stood before his mental eyes in that revelation. And he used the speculative minds of the second, third and fourth centuries' crown-lost leaders as the means of palming off his counterfeit of our Lord's natures and His office. The mental twists and contortions of these crown-lost leaders produced the antitype of Dagon in the God-man theory. They had the hardest kind of mental gymnastics to perform in their efforts to harmonize even seemingly the teachings of St. John on Christ's natures and office, particularly the former, with their God-man theory. The deepest thinker of all of them, Augustine, had to admit that the God-man theory and the trinity, of which it was a part, were unexplainable. Additionally, they were unreasonable mysteries of iniquity. And all their efforts to make antitypical Dagon and the antitypical ark stand side by side, *i.e.*, be in harmony with one another, dismally failed. This will appear not only from an analysis of the two opposing teachings as we now see them in the light of the Parousia and the Epiphany, but from a

knowledge of the history of the God-man theory from its outstart until it was completed at the first council of Constantinople, 381, where it was decreed as a doctrine of orthodoxy, with anathemas to eternal torment pronounced upon all who taught contrary to it.

(5) All sorts of foolish conclusions have been drawn from the God-man theory by its exponents. One of these is that Christ's humanity had no personality of its own, though it was alleged that it possesses its own intellect, sensibilities and will—the very essence of personality. Again, they taught that on account of its personal union with His divinity, His human nature shares in the use of the attributes of the Divine nature and vice versa, hence it is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, *etc.*, and that the Divine nature suffered, *etc.* Hence they said that God suffered and died, that God was born of the virgin Mary and that Mary is the mother of God and the God-bearer. It was these latter expressions that occasioned a controversy that resulted in the antitype of the second falling of Dagon before the ark of the covenant (Dagon was fallen upon his face to the ground before the ark of the Lord, 4). Keeping in mind that the God-man theory was completed as a dogma of the so-called orthodox faith at the Council of Constantinople, 381, and keeping in mind the above-mentioned absurd conclusions that it involves, and the consequent expressions flowing from it, we are prepared to see how such expressions would grate on the ears of reasonable men. The one who was most prominently so affected by these absurdities was Nestorius, the pious, eloquent and learned patriarch of Constantinople, who, next to the pope, was the most prominent churchman of the time. He was trained at Antioch, Syria, where the theology there entertained was opposed to such expressions. He brought with him from Antioch to Constantinople Anastasius, a presbyter, who was offended by the expressions, *mother* of God, *bearer* of God, and called them to Nestorius' attention. The latter, handicapped by the

hatred of Proclus, his unsuccessful rival for the Constantinopolitan See, by the rivalry of Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, and by the resentment of Celestine, patriarch of Rome, for his having protected the exiled Pelagians, began to denounce the view of the God-man that warranted such expressions to be used of it. He opposed it with a modified error that so emphasized both natures as contemporaneous in contrast with each other that it made Christ really two persons, which also was wrong (1 Cor. 8:6). The error of both views is that they made Christ have, while on earth and since, two natures contemporaneously. The Truth on the subject is: Christ had only one nature at a time, though during the transition from the Logos to human nature the Logos' disposition was decreasingly had until it entirely passed away, changed into Jesus' human disposition, and during the transition from the human to the Divine nature the human disposition was decreasingly had until it was entirely changed into the Divine disposition in our Lord; but in each of these modes of existence He had only one nature at a time, *i.e.*, for the first, the Logos' nature, for the second, the human nature and for the third, the Divine nature. Hence while He was the Logos, He had only the Logos' nature; while He was a man, He had only the human nature (John 1:14); and when He became the life-giving Spirit (1 Cor. 15:45), He had only the Divine nature. We might here say that at that time there were, apart from the true view, three views: (1) the one held by the Syrian theologians, that so separated the human and Divine natures while supposedly now existing in our Lord as to have made Him two persons; (2) the one held by the Alexandrians, which so fused the two natures supposedly existing now in our Lord as to have made them but one nature combined out of the two; and (3) the Roman view, that held the two natures now supposedly existing in our Lord as separate and distinct as natures, but forming a union into one person. The third view

united what the "orthodox" considered the truths in the other two views and avoided what the "orthodox" considered their errors. All three views are erroneous.

(6) The debate over this matter was long (428-444) and acrimonious, particularly on the side of Cyril of Alexandria, who was shrewd enough to conceal in his view what the Roman bishop would reject, and to emphasize in Nestorius' view what he knew the pope rejected, and in this tricky way he won the pope over to fight with him against Nestorius. In the same way he won over to his side the patriarch of Jerusalem and the bishop of Ephesus, there being then five patriarchs. Thus on one side were three patriarchs and on the other two: John of Antioch and Nestorius. And the entire Syrian Church, with their patriarch, John of Antioch, took Nestorius' side. The Emperor's family was also divided, some siding with Nestorius, and some, especially his sister Pulcheria (*beauty*), with Cyril. These two patriarchs were irreconcilably opposed. The pope (430) demanded that Nestorius recant within ten days; Cyril (430) held a synod at Alexandria through which he anathematized Nestorius on 12 counts. Nestorius returned the compliment on just as many counts. To settle the trouble the Emperor called the third general council, that at Ephesus (431). The Emperor and his plenipotentiary sided with Nestorius. Cyril appeared with many bishops and monks, the latter ready to vindicate their side with their fists. Additionally, the bishop of Ephesus had an immense retinue of bishops, priests, monks and laity who also were ready to use the same kind of proof for their orthodoxy. Before the bishops of the West, the pope's legates and the Syrian bishops arrived, Cyril in inordinate haste opened the council and had by *its infallible* (?) decree Nestorianism condemned, Nestorius excommunicated and Cyril's 12 propositions adopted as the standard of orthodoxy. The pope's legates acknowledged the council's decrees as genuine; but not so the Emperor and his plenipotentiary.

(7) During this and the subsequent disputes the Arians maintained the Truth as we gave it above; and thus they refuted both sides in the argument. This refutation and the following refutations are the antitype of Dagon falling to the ground face downward in the presence of the ark, losing head and hands (behold, Dagon was fallen [literally, falling—present participle] upon his face to the ground and the head of Dagon and both palms of his hands were cut off, 4). While active as to antitypical Ashdodites, all of the disputants for the two natures coexisting saw their God-man refuted (Dagon falling). Their efforts to save the antitypical Dagon from being refuted is the antitype of the efforts of the Ashdodites in setting up Dagon again in his place (3). Thus the scene in v. 4 finds its antitype in the controversy on what in Church History are called: dyoprosopism or Nestorianism, the doctrine which virtually taught that since His carnation our Lord was, because of allegedly having two natures, two persons; monophysitism, the doctrine that the human and Divine natures are united by a mixture into but one nature—the Divine, and monothelitism, the doctrine that though Christ supposedly now has two natures they have but one will. The first of these was fought out first, as described above, then afterward the other two arose and were fought out. We will briefly explain the second and third controversies as the further antitype of v. 4. Cyril's successor, Dioscurus, though less acute than the former, exceeded him greatly in ill temper and tyranny. The aged head of a Constantinople monastery, called Eutyches, taught monophysitism, claiming that since Bethlehem our Lord had only the Divine nature and that His human body as the supposed body of God was not in substance like ours. First, Domnus, patriarch of Antioch, and then Theodoret, his chief theologian, intrigued against him, but in vain appealed to the Emperor against him. Then they began to write against him. Dioscurus, the patriarch of Alexandria, entered

the fray on the side of Eutyches. He won over the Empress and the prime minister, and through these worked on the Emperor in his favor, resulting in the Emperor's passing severe measures against the Syrians, especially Theodoret, whom the Emperor forbade to pass out of his diocese. In a synod held under Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople (448) Eutyches was accused of heresy, and despite the Emperor's favor and protection was excommunicated and deposed as abbot of his monastery. He and Flavian appeared before Leo I of Rome for his favor; Leo, taking Flavian's side against Eutyches, wrote acutely against monophysitism. The Emperor called a general council at Ephesus (449) to discuss the question. Here Dioscurus presided and would not allow Flavian and his party to be heard. The absence of Theodoret, the chief opponent of monophysitism, by the Emperor's order above-mentioned, handicapped his side.

(8) This council was one of extreme arbitrariness and violence and is called in Church History the Robber Synod. It condemned the doctrine of two contemporaneous natures, and when Eusebius, bishop of Doretæum, in Phrygia, sought to defend it, the Egyptians shouted, "Away with him! Burn him! Tear him into two pieces, as he has torn the Christ." Both Flavian and Eusebius appealed to Pope Leo I, called the Great. But they were excommunicated and anathematized by the council. When certain bishops expostulated with Dioscurus, he called soldiers, monks, ruffians and an unruly rabble, who raised a riot. In it Flavian was killed and a speedy flight alone saved the Roman legates and Eusebius. Eutyches was restored and his leading opponents, Theodoret, Ibas and Domnus, one of the five patriarchs, were deposed and excommunicated. Under Leo's protest the Emperor changed sides. A new general council was called at Chalcedon (451), which deposed and banished Dioscurus and condemned monophysitism and Nestorianism, and decreed the following, dictated by Leo as orthodoxy:

"Christ is true God and true man (dyophysitism), according to His Godhead begotten from eternity and like the Father in everything, according to His humanity born of Mary, the Virgin and God-bearer in time, and like to us men in everything, only without sin; and after His incarnation the unity of the person (monoprosopism) consists in two natures which are conjoined without mixture and without change, but also without rending and without separation." This council war marked with almost as much violence as "the Robber Synod at Ephesus." The Egyptians, the monophysites, were as violent against Theodoret as their party had been against his supporters at the Synod of Ephesus. Years later in the efforts to win back the monophysites a concession was made by many, even by Pope Honorius (who is the classic example of a pope erring while speaking *ex cathedra*, and is an inescapable thorn in the sides of the infallibilists), to them, to the effect that, while, since His becoming human, our Lord has two natures, the false claim of orthodoxy, yet He had only one will. This question led to much controversy until the error was finally accepted as orthodox, *i.e.*, that our Lord has since Bethlehem two contemporaneous wills. The Truth on the subject is that our Lord having only one nature at a time, *i.e.*, as Logos, the pre-human Son of God, as the man, Jesus, the human Son of God, and since His resurrection, as the glorified Christ, Divine Son of God, there could not at any one time have been more than one will in Him, if His sinlessness is to be maintained. The one-will doctrine was called monothelitism (from *monos*, one and *thelema*, will).

(9) All these heresies arose from the errors on the Son's alleged consubstantiality, coequality and coeternity with the Father, as a part of trinitarianism. From the standpoint of these three errors, from Bethlehem onward there had to be two natures held as subsisting in our Lord at once, leading to the gross error quoted above and decreed at Chalcedon, which

gross error condemned Nestorianism and monophysitism, and which logically from its wrong position involved the denial of monothelitism, when later it arose. All the time these errors were combating one another (for it will be noted that by them Satan was opposing the various forms of error against one another, so that the Truth on the subject would be forgotten), the Truth on these subjects was held by the Arians, and it overthrew both the contemporaneous two-natures idea and the form of the one-nature idea presented against that two-natures idea, and also overthrew the two-will and the one-will ideas as they were opposed to one another. The refutative effect of the Truth against the doctrine that finally became established as orthodox, one person in two contemporaneous natures with two wills, is also typed by Dagon's falling down and having his head and hands cut off, the two natures being represented in the human body and fish body and the one person as held by the orthodox in the severed head; and the refutative effect of the Truth against the doctrine that finally became established as orthodox, two contemporaneous wills in Christ: one in the human, the other in the Divine nature, is typed by Dagon's two hands being cut off—the will being the real active agency in personality, two wills are well typed by two hands, the active agents of one's body (4). The Ashdodite Philistines' arising on the morrow of v. 4 types the Greek Catholics' proceedings after each refutation by the Truth, *i.e.*, in the Nestorian, in the monophysite and dyophysite (two natures) and in the monothelite (one will) controversy (arose early on the morrow, 4). The expression, only Dagon was left on him (the words *stump of*, as shown by the italics, were interpolated), shows what the Truth left of the God-man theory; it left its antitype without any real will and without having a real personality. It is because the two contemporaneous natures and wills were officially declared to be the orthodox teachings that the type

does not specifically point out in v. 4 dyoprosopism, monophysitism and monothelitism. These, with their opposing errors, are brought out in the plague of vs. 6, 7, as will be later shown.

(10) The Greek Catholics, clergy and laity, proceed by mental steps to the theory of their God-man with two wills. But their thoughts (steps) pass over from figurative steps into figurative leaps in making their mental trips to the theory of their God-man with two wills (priests of Dagon, nor any that come into Dagon's house, tread on the threshold [they leap over it] of Dagon in Ashdod unto this day, 5). That is, they stop thinking out the various mental steps that must be taken as to their God-man with two wills and spring to the conclusion, contrary to correct and Scriptural reasoning, which at the very entrance to this theory refutes it; and thus, not to tread upon the ground on which their theory lies prone in utter defeat, they jump over such Scriptural reasoning, *i.e.*, evade it, under the plea that this is not a matter to reason out, but to be believed; hence they thus leap over the ground where their God-man with two wills lies refuted. And they continue this course unto the present and will continue it until their theory through Armageddon's devastations will utterly sever from it the exponents of that theory. Thus in vs. 3-5 we see typed the Truth (not the errors) controversies on the God-man with two natures, but in vs. 6, 7, we see the types of the great errors and siftings connected with these errors that set in among the antitypical Philistines in the Greek Catholic aspects. Above, we sketched only the controversies that were connected with the God-man with two wills, in order to show how the Truth refuted the involved errors, without referring to the great siftings that these occasioned among them. This is because vs. 3-5 type these controversies in so far as the Truth refuted them, without referring to the divisions that they occasioned and accompanied. These divisions and errors are typed in vs. 6, 7, which

will be taken up for our study now. In Bible types and symbols siftings, with the errors that are their heart, are set forth as plagues. This we have already seen in the types of the five great harvest siftings (1 Cor. 10:5-14). The sixth sifting, *i.e.*, the Epiphany sifting, with its errors, is set forth in Ps. 91:6 as the pestilence that walketh in darkness. From all six of these the Parousia and Epiphany Little Flock is, in Ps. 91:7-10, promised immunity for its faithfulness. And in principle such immunity from each error as it arose was promised to, and enjoyed by, the Little Flock always.

(11) But not so the unfaithful and the nominal people of God. As an illustration of the latter fact, the account in 1 Sam. 5:6, 7 shows typically how the Greek Catholic Church was plagued and rent by these pestilences of error. The plague of vs. 6, 7 seems to be the bubonic plague, which is spread by rats and mice. This thought is suggested by the emerods of that plague and by the golden mice offered the Lord by the Philistines as an atonement. In describing above the errors and the conflicts on them, we did so in order to make clear what the errors were that the antitypical Ark, the Truth (brought out by St. John as the stewardship Truth of the Greek Catholic Church, by it more or less perverted), in its unperverted form refuted, *viz.*, the God-man and two-wills-in-Christ theories. This made it necessary to say some things on the plague antitypical of vs. 6, 7. We will now explain other things on this plague. Let us remember that a symbolic plague is a sifting error and the sifting that it occasions. Thus seen, the above-described errors were a part of the plague typed in vs. 6, 7. Now we will describe the other main sifting activities and resultant divisions that marked the antitypical plague. The ancient Greek mind was primarily a theoretical and speculative mind, contrasted with the practical mind of the Romans. In our times these two aptitudes are respectively well represented by the German mind, on the one hand, and the English and American mind,

on the other hand. And the Greek speculative mind was exactly the kind of a mind for Satan's purposes in palming off, on the assumption that the basal error was true, in seemingly logical consistency various errors involved in the trinity and the God-man theories. To the speculative Greeks these mysteries (in truth, mix-upteries) were indeed a sweet morsel to roll on their symbolic tongues; for it was among the Greeks that the pertinent errors and siftings arose and were fought out. Nor must we conclude that only the theologians and clergy occupied themselves with these matters, though they, humanly speaking, originated them; additionally the so-called laity took an ardent part in them. For these questions were discussed by the families of the emperors and peasants, in the stores and shops, in the churches and homes, in synods and councils, in the factories and ships, in the market places and parks, in the barber shops, dressmaking shops and shoe shops, in the theatres and hippodromes, and in the Emperor's cabinets and courts. In a word, they were the principle topics of conversation and debate in all ranks of society and walks of life. Crowds even on the streets debated these questions and everywhere sides were taken. They were as lively topics of the day as the New Deal was in the 1936 campaign.

(12) Yes, indeed, on all hands sides were taken, households were divided, even in the Emperor's palaces various members of the imperial families were lined up on opposite sides, which lining up made parties of the various members of their officers and servants. Of course, the party spirit was enkindled and increased until there were great divisions made, the first of these being that between the so-called orthodox and the Nestorians. Literally millions left the Greek Catholic Church and organized the Nestorian Church, which included, first of all, a large party of the Syrian Church, whence Nestorius and his doctrine came; then it spread to Persia, where it took over the whole of that church as its adherents. Thence it passed on into

India; and in the dark ages it spread widely in China and Tartary. Thus Nestorianism as a creed and as a sect was a part of the plague upon the orthodox. Part of it was also their own pertinent error. While Nestorianism was nearer the Truth than orthodoxy, to the orthodox it and orthodoxy's own errors were some of the emerods (great boils of the symbolic bubonic plague) upon the men of antitypical Ashdod (6; Greek Catholicism), and the antitypical coasts thereof (the Roman, Syrian, Egyptian, *etc.*, Catholics). The Lord smote them by putting His Word on the pertinent subjects in its peculiar form (the hand of the Lord was heavy upon, *etc.*), and by stirring up the sectarians, as well as the faithful, against them. The same things in principle were carried out as the antitype of v. 6 in the monophysite and monothelite controversies. Almost all of Egypt was committed to the monophysite teaching; and it and the breaking away of almost the entire Egyptian Church from the Greek Catholic Church, as well as the orthodox pertinent error, were the symbolic emerods on all the orthodox. Monothelism was offered by some of the orthodox as a concession to the monophysites in the hope of winning them back to orthodoxy and the Greek Catholic Church. But the conciliators only stirred up more controversy and, while winning back some of the monophysites, made the consistent ones among them all the firmer against the orthodox. And as the Nestorians persist to our day in Syria, Persia, India, *etc.*, so in the Coptic Church of Egypt and Ethiopia the monophysites and monothelites continue to our times.

(13) Throughout these controversies on the two natures and two wills the so-called orthodox fought the truths on these subjects. Indeed, they began to fight the Truth on the various natures in Christ and His relation to the Father in His pre-human, human and post-human natures long before the dyoprosopic and monoprosopic, monophysite and dyophysite and monothelite and dyothelite controversies. As said above,

about 140, through Justin Martyr, who introduced the human immortality and eternal torment theories into the Church from his Platonic philosophy, the first squints toward trinitarianism were made. Origen, about 235, introduced the Son's alleged coeternity with the Father, while yet holding to His subordination to the Father. Dionesius of Rome, about 270, introduced His alleged consubstantiality with the Father, and Athanasius, about 320, His alleged coequality with the Father. Each of these steps in the development of this gross error was taken against the protests of the defenders of the pertinent Truth that St. John set forth on the Son, that Polycarp fostered, that many others defended before Arius, and that the latter and his supporters defended against these gross errors. With his usual subtlety Satan set defenders of the extremes of error on these subjects against one another, that the Truth lying between these extremes might be lost from sight. This course marked the controversy from Origen's time until Arius in 318 stepped forth in the defense of the Truth against the errors of Christ's alleged coeternity, consubstantiality and coequality with the Father. The refutations of these three errors were the first of antitypical Dagon's falls in the presence of the antitypical Ark, while the truths brought out refutatively against the so-called orthodox views—dyophysitism and dyothelitism—in the Nestorian monophysite and monothelite controversies, were the antitypical Ark's second felling of antitypical Dagon and of its bereaving him of his head and hands. The efforts of the orthodox to refute and banish the pertinent Truth is the antitype of the Ashdodites' determining to send away the ark from their midst (The ark of the God of Israel shall not abide with us, 7). This began with Origen's efforts to suppress the Truth on Christ's having been created in time as distinct from His being eternal. This started the first emerald on the Greek Catholics; Dionesius' error started the second; and Athanasius' invention started the third.

Others came during the later controversies above-mentioned—the full fixing of the God-man theory at the first Council of Constantinople, 381, and the use of this doctrine against Nestorianism, monophysitism and monothelitism (His hand [the Lord's] is sore upon us, and upon Dagon our god); for certainly the orthodox and their God-man were sorely put to it by the Truth during those four centuries of controversy. Their many subterfuges, twists and self-contradictions, their hiding in the hole of mystery (mix-uptery) and their inability to give a clear, reasonable answer to the Truth in these controversies, are the antitype of the statement, the men [leaders] of Ashdod saw that it was so.

(14) The calling and gathering together of the hierarchs in numerous councils and synods to discuss the involved questions were the antitypical calling and gathering together of the lords of the Philistines (8). And all of these gatherings decided to send away the pertinent Truth—reject the truths and anathematize its holders—from the Greek Catholic Church (answered, Let the ark of the God of Israel be carried about unto Gath, the type of the Roman Catholic Church). It is noteworthy that in all these controversies the bishop of Rome was appealed to by the so-called orthodox Greeks; sometimes their antagonists did this also; and the pope (as is to be expected of Satan's special representative on earth) with but three exceptions, two of which are more or less doubtful as such, Pope Honorius being the only sure exception, gave the answers that were accepted as orthodox. This fact gave the pope more influence in these councils, *etc.*, than any other hierarch. There is also another thing typed in deciding to send and in actually sending the ark to Gath—it indicates typically the way of the transition of the Truth from tormenting the Greek to its tormenting the Roman Catholics: The Greeks ridded themselves from the necessity of defending the Truth that they in common with the Romans held on

there being but one Church, which is the steward of the Truth and the agent of salvation; for they had plenty of occasions to raise the question controversially through the divisions that arose in their midst; but they did not so do, but left it to the Roman Catholics to fight out the controversies on that subject. In this sense also they sent the antitypical Ark to antitypical Gath (*wine or oil press*, which certainly the Roman Catholic Church has been to the true Church). We have seen in these columns that through Irenaeus, about 180, the Lord gave the stewardship Truth that aroused a Little Flock movement, later perverted by crown-losers, especially by Cyprian and Augustine, respectively of Carthage and Hyppo, of North Africa, into the Roman Catholic Church. It was about 251 that Cyprian began to pervert this doctrine by setting forth the one Church as being summed up in the bishops as the alleged successors of the Apostles.

(15) Cyprian started the course that raised this emerald (they had emeralds, 9) on the members of the Roman Catholic Church as follows: There were divergent views in the Carthage Church on how to treat those who in times of persecution abjured Christ. Some favored a mild course, allowing them to come back with a mild acknowledgment of this wrong; others a stricter course, refusing to receive such at all. Cyprian at first favored the latter course. When he returned, 251, from his flight to the desert during the Decian persecution, the mild party fought him. This resulted in a division. Cyprian set forth the thought that in separating themselves from him, their bishop, they severed themselves from the Catholic Church, whose unity, he alleged, is centered in its bishops as successors of the Apostles. When the persecution was renewed Cyprian went over very largely to the milder practice of the other party, and thus he ended the schism at Carthage. But the same questions arose in disputes at Rome. The party that stood for the strict practice came under the lead of a presbyter, Novatian.

The Roman bishop Cornelius (251-253) stood for the mild practice. Novatus, the leader of the mild party at Carthage, fought Cyprian for his strict practice, for which Cyprian excommunicated him. Thereupon Novatus went to Rome. There he took up with the strict practice group; and with it he opposed Cornelius' mild practice. He did this under the lead of Novatian, the unsuccessful candidate for the bishopric of Rome as against Cornelius, in 251, and the leader of the strict party in the Roman Church. In the strife a division came; and the rigorists elected Novatian as their bishop. Both heads of these parties by correspondence and messengers sought to obtain the recognition of the most celebrated churches. Cornelius falsely represented Novatian, who was a blameless man and elder, as a monster, intriguer and long-standing evil-doer. Cyprian, and Dionesius, head of the Church of Alexandria, took sides with Cornelius, the former being in part influenced thereto by Novatus' adherence to Novatian. Forgetful of the facts that he had up to very recently espoused the same principles as Novatian, and that for those principles he had excommunicated Novatus, Cyprian with the zeal of a new convert attacked Novatian's view to the effect that while Christ might forgive His deniers and gross sinners who fall after their baptism, the Church as the communion of saints had no right to absolve them, even after they had undergone ecclesiastical repentance; for Novatian argued that the Church consists and must consist of the pure only. Both sides went to an extreme. The Novatianists spread all over the Roman Empire, having many and large churches, and stood with the orthodox in their controversies against the Arians. The Council of Nice, 325, consisting in the main of the Greeks, maintained a friendly attitude toward them, so did the first Council of Constantinople (381), though in the meantime the Occidental Church (Romanist) persecuted them as heretics, but Emperor Honorius, who in the West succeeded Theodosius, the convener

of the first Constantinopolitan council, persecuted them, at the instigation of the Occidental Church. The Novatianists persisted into the 6th century.

(16) Both sides had some truth and some error. The error of the Novatianists was that they attempted to cast sinning ones as crown-losers out of the true Church, a thing that must be left to the Lord alone, who forbade such judging until the Second Advent (1 Cor. 4:5). Moreover, He forbade a judging between wheat and tares before that time (Matt. 13:28, 29). Yea, the fulfilment of the parable's prohibition occurred during the pertinent controversies. But a worse error was on the other side—the loss of the thought that the true Church consists of the saintly only, and the defense of the thought that the true Church consisted of all who profess faith in Christ, living under and in obedience to the bishops as the center of the Church's unity. This second thought Cyprian elaborated in his celebrated treatise on *The Unity Of The Church*. Here, then, we see the first antitypical emerod breaking forth on the leaders and led of antitypical Gath (and they had emerods [the expression, in their secret parts, is a mistranslation; it is in fact an interpolation], 9). Here, then, the hand of the Lord (9) is seen to be heavy on the Roman Catholic leaders and their ledlings as well. It was indeed a very great destruction from the Lord. But 60 years later a greater and longer-drawn-out controversy over practically the same question broke out and made a by far greater division in the Roman Catholic Church. We refer to the Donatist controversy, which continued from 311 to 415. As the root question was practically the same as that in the Novatianist controversy, we need not here enter into its details. The Donatists were the strict party that wanted only saints in their churches. The Catholics, claiming that the Church consists of all professed Christians who are united under obedience to the bishops as successors of the Apostles, objected to the excommunicating of

everybody who did not seem to be saintly, as practiced by the Donatists. The controversy spread all over North Africa. The Emperor, the bishop of Rome and a great Western synod at Arles, 314, decided against the Donatists. Persecution set in against them, which but increased their zeal, as always in the sincere.

(17) They rebelled against the civil power, which brought the army out against them, none of which things crushed them. So things continued throughout the fourth century. In 400 Augustine started his long-drawn-out controversy with them, in general using the same truths and errors against their error as Cyprian did, but with greater dialectical skill. He at first counseled mild measures, but their stubbornness moved him to advocate, on a misapplication of Luke 14:23, the use of force (the word should be rendered, constrain, not compel) to draw them back from damnation into the ship of salvation. Thus Augustine became the father of the doctrine that force should be applied to heretics to restore them to the Church, a principle that reached the height of its hideousness in the crusades against heretics and in the Inquisition. Previously, he had sought to draw their leaders into a debate with him; but they declined, fearing his superior ability as a debater. Finally, they were by the Emperor forced to enter into a debate which was held at Carthage, 411, Petilian and Primian being the chief Donatist debaters and Augustine and Aurelian the chief Catholic debaters, and 279 Donatists and 286 Catholic bishops being in attendance. No real results were gained thereby. In 415 the Donatists were by the Emperor declared bereaved of all rights and death was threatened upon all who attended their meetings. The Vandals (Arians) in conquering Africa oppressed both Donatists and Catholics as being both in the wrong. This led to the reunion of Donatists and Catholics. In this controversy the question was also debated as to whether bishops who were unbishoply in character forfeited their powers as bishops, and thus could perform

no valid bishoply acts, like the valid administration of the sacraments and the valid conference of ordination, confirmation and absolution, the Catholics affirming that they could, and the Donatists that they could not. Both of these parties erred in ascribing the conference of grace by the mere application of the sacraments and other sacred rites just mentioned. Had they held to the truth that neither water baptism nor the Lord's Supper conferred grace, but that grace came through the actualities symbolized by these two acts and that the other three rites were human inventions, they would have seen that they were debating the extremes of error against one another and were forgetting the pertinent Divine Truth altogether. As a result of this phase of the debate the Roman Catholics had another antitypical emerod break out on them, *i.e.*, that the sacraments of themselves convey grace where no stubborn resistance is offered to their administration. The Truth on these controverted subjects in the Donatist controversy was especially defended by Tichonius, a member of the Pergamos star.

(18) But the worst of all of the antitypical emerods that broke out upon the Roman Catholic leaders and ledlings were the further developments of the hierarchical idea. This was embedded in the doctrine of the Apostolic succession of bishops, and out of this view sprang its higher expression: Archbishops over the bishops in the various provinces of the Empire; five patriarchs of equal standing in the entire Church over the archbishops; and finally, the pope as supreme, supported by his college of cardinals, who were originally the presiding priests in the various churches at Rome, and who were later exalted over all archbishops, but not over the other four patriarchs, for the reason that in the meantime they became Greek as opposed to Roman Catholic patriarchs. These antitypical emerods reached their most festering and foul condition in the exaltation of the pope to absolute supremacy and infallibility. While there were minor differences

between the Greek and Roman Catholics that led up to temporary divisions among them, like the 35 years' division due to the monophysite controversy and the split of 50 years due to Pope Vigilius' vacillation during the later parts of the monophysite controversy, connected with the Emperors' efforts to make peace, new fuel was added to the fiery feeling between the East and the West over the monothelite controversy, on account of Pope Honorius' heresy making a division, which was soon healed, following his excommunication and anathematization by a general council. But the Trullan Council at Constantinople, 692, added more fuel to the fires burning between the two halves of the Catholic Church. There were six matters there passed displeasing to Rome: (1) Disapproving certain of Rome's canons and approving 35 of which Rome disapproved. (2) Disapproving Rome's enforcement of the celibacy of the presbyters and bishops. (3) Forbidding certain of Rome's enjoined fasts. (4) Renewing the decree of the Council of Chalcedon, predicating the equality of the patriarch of Constantinople with the pope. (5) Disapproving Rome's permission to drink blood and eat things strangled, forbidden by God (Gen. 9:4), when He gave them permission to eat meat, as the Apostles also charged (Acts 15:29). And (6) prohibiting the Roman custom of representing Christ by a lamb, a thing quite general in the West.

(19) These six points stirred up more or less feeling between the two parts of Catholicism, and later, especially point (4), were to play an important role in the separation between the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches. Rome's continued and increasing claims of the pope's supremacy, which was at the background of many practical differences between the East and the West, at last made the breach so wide as to lead to a final division between the Greek Catholic and the Roman Catholic Churches. Photius, the patriarch of Constantinople, 867, held with the eastern patriarchs a council at Constantinople and charged the popes with

falsifying the creed by adding to it the phrase that the Holy Spirit in their sense proceeded from the Father *and the Son*. This resulted in great controversies, with reciprocal anathemas and conspiracies on both sides. These differences came to a head in the controversies between Caerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, and Pope Leo IX. The result was that, while hitherto their reciprocal anathemas had been hurled at individuals and their followers, now, in 1054, the pope excommunicated the whole Greek Catholic Church; and the four Greek patriarchs returned the compliment solemnly to the whole Roman Catholic Church—the papal supremacy being at the root of the trouble. Despite many efforts at reunion, none was ever achieved. Thus each antitypical emerod (error) led to a division among the Roman Catholics, in fulfilment of v. 9.

(20) We now come to a study of the antitype of v. 10, which types the Church of England. The Roman Catholics' worst emerod, the unity of the Church is summed up in the absolute supremacy and infallibility of the pope, was the cause of the Church of England's coming into existence as a sect, separate and distinct from Romanism; hence Rome's pertinent emerod made this division also. This will appear as the facts are considered, surrounding the presentation of the stewardship Truth of the Church of England, which was used by Thomas Cranmer, supported by Hugh Latimer especially, to start a Little Flock movement, later by crown-losers perverted into the Church of England. The circumstance that led to the promulgation of the pertinent Truth was this: Henry VIII of England, for whom no Truth person would hold a brief, was right in being conscience-troubled over his marriage to his brother's widow, a thing forced upon him by his father, Henry VII, against his solemn protest. It is not necessary for us to go into the pertinent details here, since we have already given them in EH, 254-265. Suffice it to say that due to the pope's temporizing on the matter of the divorce, the question was

raised by Cranmer as to who had the right to grant divorce, the pope or the civil power. Cranmer answered the question as follows: The State, not the Church. He gave two main reasons for it: (1) Marriage, being an earthly, not a spiritual matter, was subject to the rules set up by the State, according to God's ordinance. (2) The Church in earthly matters is subject to the State, not *vice versa*, as Rome claimed. Hence, as Rome views the question, in ultimate analysis the matter of Henry's marital relation touched the question of the unity of the Church as being in an infallible and sovereign pontiff—one of Rome's worst emerods; hence Rome stood out for its alleged powers in the matter. This resulted in the English Church separating from Rome, and the resultant controversy was the sending of the antitypical Ark from antitypical Gath to antitypical Ekron (Therefore they sent the ark of God to Ekron, *settlement*, 10). And in the Church of England a resultant deadly destruction went on (for there was a deadly destruction, 11), and certainly the Lord permissively sent them many emerods, as we will now proceed to show (the hand of God was very heavy there) from the many pertinent facts.

(21) Let us not forget that the Truth which Thomas Cranmer, especially supported by Hugh Latimer, taught was the following: God has subjected the true Church in civil matters to the civil powers. Of course, God did not subject The Christ to the civil powers in spiritual matters; for it is His will that The Christ preserve the Truth and its Spirit against all assaults from the civil powers or from any other human source (Acts 5:29). Hence only in His earthly interests was the Christ subject to the civil powers (Rom. 13:1-6; 1 Pet. 2:13-16). But Catholics being used to having an earthly head, the Church of England as such accepted the English king as its "head under God," who was, therefore, in the pope's stead made "by the grace of God [Divine right] under God head of the Church of England." This was the first and chief emerod (12) that afflicted the clergy and laity

of the Church of England, and it proved to be a sore boil indeed, as the after history of the English Church proves. This made the tyrant, Henry VIII, control the English Church at the outstart of Cranmer's promulgation of the pertinent Truth and of the Anglican Church's separation from Rome (as the ark of God entered Ekron, 10), and he used that control in matters of doctrine, organization and practice to the great injury of the Reformation. Hence he gave a Romanist doctrinal setting to the Church of England, which on his death was considerably modified in an anti-Romanist sense. He appointed the hierarchy and decided its form, and he maintained most of Rome's evil practices, including the burning of heretics. He had a law enacted called the Six Articles, which must be believed in England, requiring the following points: (1) transubstantiation; (2) non-necessity of communion in both elements; (3) celibacy of the clergy; (4) obligatoriness of all vows; (5) private masses; and (6) auricular confession. Unconditional burning was the penalty for denying the first; and for the others deprivation of goods and imprisonment for the first offense, and death as felons for the second. The marriages of priests, monks and nuns were dissolved. If they married again they were to be hanged. Abstaining from attending mass and confession was held as offenses against these articles. Under former laws, if heresy was abjured the abjurer was spared; under this, whether he abjured or not, he was unconditionally exposed to its penalties. This was the most blood-thirsty law ever inscribed in English law books, and Henry VIII originated it, required its passage and saw to its enforcement. Hence, almost solely apart from the question of papal supremacy Henry was a bigoted (Roman) Catholic. At least 30 were put to death under this law. There were, according to Burnet, the historian of the Anglican Reformation, at one time 500 persons in prison by virtue of its penalties. All these six laws, or one law in six parts, were antitypical emeralds that came upon the clergy and laity of the

Church of England by virtue of the antitypical emerod, that the king was by the grace of God under God head of the Church of England, which doctrine was a gross perversion of the stewardship Truth of the Church of England, that The Christ is by God subject in earthly matters to the civil power, and not *vice versa*.

(22) Henry VIII died in 1547 and was succeeded by his son, Edward VI, a mere lad, but a sincere Protestant. Guardianed, trained and influenced by Cranmer, he favored Protestant reforms in doctrine more on Calvin's than on Luther's foundations. Under him the law on the six articles was revoked, Romanists were tolerated but not favored, the book of Common Prayer was promulgated and a confession of faith in 42 articles was sanctioned by law, both these devotional and doctrinal features being, with Ridley's help, largely Cranmer's work, who as a part of antitypical captive Samson ground out the grain for the antitypical Philistines. This service book and confession of faith proved to contain some more emerods. In these 42 articles as a matter of doctrine the king's headship was set forth and this error was soon (in Mary's days) to produce worse results than it effected in the days of Henry VIII; for Edward VI died in 1553, before attaining his majority, his nominee as successor, a cousin, Lady Jane Gray, a real Protestant, was set aside and a bigoted Romanist, Mary, a daughter of Henry VIII, ascended England's throne. She dismissed all Protestant high officials, beheaded Lady Jane, her husband and father, and charged those, including Cranmer, who advised her succession, with treason, beheading all of them, except Cranmer, whom she spared to reserve him for burning as a heretic. All the pro-Protestant laws of Edward VI she then abrogated and reinstated the law of her father, Henry VIII, on the six articles. Then she reinstated Romanism as the state church. While she annulled the law making England's sovereign head of the church, which for her the pope was, she used all the

power that that law gave the sovereign in restoring and operating Romanism. All Protestant bishops were displaced by Romanists. Those who could not escape she imprisoned. The bigoted Bishop Gardiner, made prime minister, enforced the law on the six articles. The Protestant leaders were all imprisoned, the bones of their eminent dead leaders were exhumed and burned, and married priests with their wives and children were by the thousands driven out of the land. In 1554 the exiled Cardinal Pole returned as papal legate, absolved the penitent kneeling Parliament and received back into the Romish den all England. The next year, 1555, the literal fires of persecution were lit at Mary's order, who, therefore, became known as bloody Mary, and whose cruelty became so great that almost the whole nation, ashamed of having such a fiend on England's throne, hated her and rejoiced at her death, 1558.

(23) The persecution was indeed a very sore one. The legal records of the burning of 288 Protestants have been discovered, and how many more (for there were more) were burned cannot now be proved by the records of men; but we may be sure the Lord has kept an accurate record of this barbarity and will publish it to the praise of His name and the vindication of His suffering children. During 1555, among many other Protestants, four Protestant bishops: Latimer, Ridley, Ferrar and Hooker, were burned; and Archbishop Cranmer, the primate of all England under Henry VIII and Edward VI, a Philadelphia star-member, was burned the next year. In 1554 Mary had married Philip II of Spain, one of the most bigoted and cruel Romanist monarchs of all times, who kept arousing Mary to her persecuting career, for especially from the time of her espousal and marriage onward she acted the persecutor in true Spanish style. His return to Spain in 1555, never again returning, greatly depressed her, which made her hate and persecute Protestantism all the more. She instituted a heresy tribunal after the pattern of the Spanish Inquisition

under the presidency of "bloody Bonner," bishop of London, who consigned to the flames crowds of faithful Protestants, clerical and lay, men and women, old and young. Beside those who were burned at the stake, literally thousands died of starvation and exposure for their faith, while awaiting trial for heresy, in England's prisons; for in those days the prisons were not heated, nor did jailers feed or medicate the accused, who had to starve unless friends fed them. After the persecution had raged for nearly five years Mary died of a rupture of the heart and dropsy, unwept, unmourned and unloved, a female hyena in human form. As though by a providential visitation nearly all of her main assistants in persecution died within a year of her death, some just before, some just after it. Of all England's sovereigns she easily carries off the palm for cruelty, inhumanity and bigotry. Her persecuting course raised up in England such hatred for Rome, as the embodiment of cruelty, as has not yet, after nearly four centuries, died out. The terrible suffering and many deaths incident to Mary's persecution were a part of the deadly destruction throughout the Church of England (there was a deadly destruction throughout all the city, 11). The sufferings and deaths due to Henry's persecution were also a part of these deadly destructions. But these were not all of them; some more of these came in Elizabeth's day; yea, also in the days of James I, Charles I and II and James II, all of them more or less due to making England's sovereigns head of the Church of England, and all of them acting as though they were such. While the Romanists, bloody Mary and James II, refused to use the title, they did use the power of that office, in favor of the pope, as loyal Romanists.

(24) At Mary's death Elizabeth, the only then living child of Henry VIII, Mary's half-sister, ascended the throne. How she faced the exacting problems germane to the political and religious situation in England and Europe, we described with some detail in EH, 272-278.

However, she accepted the position of head of the Church of England. Cranmer had educated her in the Protestant faith of her mother, Anne Boleyn, who, though innocent, was by Henry VIII beheaded, under the accusation of adultery. She was one of the ablest sovereigns that ever lived; and her 45 years' reign almost obliterated Romanism from England. She abrogated the law on the six articles, stopped the persecution of Protestants, burned no Romanists for heresy, though she caused not a few of them to be beheaded for treason, especially for attempting to depose her and to assassinate her. She proceeded with great prudence and moderation, so that the pope for a while was deceived into believing her to be a Romanist. In 1559 Parliament passed the Act of Uniformity, which reasserted the royal supremacy over the Church, fixed penalties of loss of goods, imprisonment and exile for perversion to Romanism, and death for a repetition, as treason to the country. It was the pope's, *etc.*, attitude and course in the Marian persecutions, a repetition of which would have been ruinous to the country, that caused Elizabeth to declare the effort to embrace, spread and reintroduce Romanism as treason to the country; for such it is in deed and in truth, because of Romanists' doubled allegiance, the allegiance to the pope superseding that to the state in case of conflict between them. A revision of the book of Common Prayer was made. Cranmer's 42 articles were reduced to 39 and adopted as the creed of the Anglican Church. As adopted, the 39 articles swerved away from the Calvinistic character of the 42 articles and took on a form half-way between Calvinism and Lutheranism. These 39 articles were adopted by convocation in 1562, and were made a fundamental law of the land by Parliament in 1572, subjecting all England thereto.

(25) Thus the Anglican Church was set up by law as the state church, with an episcopal form of government, claiming Apostolic succession, under royal supremacy. It thus became the law of the land that uniformity

of worship with diversity of creeds was to be practiced; hence severe penalties were meted out on attendance at other than Anglican Church services, attendance thereat being compulsory. This caused persecution to fall to the lot of non-conformists, and endless troubles to come between Anglicans, on the one hand, Puritans (Presbyterians), Independents (Congregationalists, Baptists and Quakers), *etc.*, on the other hand, leading to house searching, to torture of the suspected and to not a few deaths for treason, as non-conformity was regarded. Thus the Act of Uniformity proved to be another emerald, and caused endless troubles with the non-conformists, which those who would not accept and practice uniformity were called. And these troubles increased in England during the days of James I, 1603-1625, in the sense that the non-conformists increased in numbers and power. James' son, Charles I, 1625-1649, even more arbitrary than his father, sought with his Divine-rights ideas to down the ever-increasing non-conformists in church and state, and exercised such tyranny as to rule for years without Parliament, and through England's primate, Laud, sought to high-church the Church of England and to suppress the non-conformists, to such a degree as to force a bloody and long-drawn-out revolution, as a result of which both he and Laud were beheaded. Then followed the ascendancy of the Puritans and Cromwell's protectorship, with all the bloodshed attending the various religious wars at that time in England, Ireland and Scotland. When the son of Charles I, Charles II, was restored, the Church of England again became the state church, but persecution of the Puritans was diminished. And to offset Charles' favoring Catholicism Parliament passed the Test Act, requiring all civil, military and naval officers to deny under oath transubstantiation, the worship of saints and allegiance to the pope, as well as to be communicants in the state church. Charles II died, surrounded by his many mistresses and bastard children, after

receiving papal communion and extreme unction. His brother, James, was a bigoted Romanist, who in Rome's interests decreed religious liberty, and then proceeded to fill all civil, military and naval offices in England with papists. Then he started on a course intended to disestablish the Anglican Church, preparatory to introducing the Romanist Church. This led to a revolution, in which, as James II declared, for the mass he lost three kingdoms: England, Scotland and Ireland; for the Protestants called in from the Netherlands James' son-in-law, William of Orange, in 1688, as their leader, by whom James II in England and Ireland was defeated. His and his Irish Catholic army's defeat at the River Boyne, Ireland, July 12, 1690, still celebrated by the Irish Protestants and Orangemen, ended Rome's serious blows at English Protestantism. William's Toleration Act exempted all English non-conformists, but not papists, because of their double allegiance, from all civil disabilities. Thus we see that the royal supremacy as a most malignant ulcer—emerod—wrought deadly destruction in England for over 150 years. Indeed, the Lord's hand was heavy upon the Anglican Church and England because of this emerod.

(26) Above, without detailed references to vs. 10-12, we have given their antitypes. We will now briefly summarize the antitypes. After the stewardship Truth given by Cranmer made its entrance into, and spread over the Anglican Church (after they had carried it about, 9), trouble began to come upon its members (a very great destruction) through the error of the royal supremacy in the Church, as we saw in the pertinent acts of the English sovereigns from Henry VIII to James II; for the Lord permitted this trouble because of the great error (emerod) on the sovereign being head of the Church (the hand of the Lord was against the city). Certainly, trouble was upon all of them, high and low alike, during those over 150 years, particularly during the first 70 of them, due to this great error and its evil consequences (He smote the

men of the city, both small and great, and they had emerods). While v. 9 applies to antitypical Gath, the things there typed are the same in principle as those that came upon the men of antitypical Ekron, hence we used v. 9 to illustrate the principles operative in antitypical Ekron. Note that just as the antitypical Ark entered antitypical Ekron trouble started, as Henry began, immediately after Cranmer's true teachings went forth, to insist on his headship in the Church of England (as the ark of God came to Ekron, 10). And the antitypical Ekronites began to cry out against the troubles incidental to the immediate abuse of the pertinent stewardship Truth, as the facts given above prove (the ark of God ... to slay *me* [so the Hebrew] and *my* [so the Hebrew] people). The leaders of the Anglican Church sent for help to the leaders of other churches, some sending for Lutherans (in Henry's day), others for Calvinists (in Edward's day); some to Romanists (in Mary's day) and some to the Greek Catholics (in Elizabeth's and James I's day), to counsel over how they could rid themselves of their evils, actually due to their misusing the stewardship Truth (sent and gathered the lords of the Philistines, 11). The gatherings were in the many councils, synods, colloquies and convocations of those days, as we will show when explaining 1 Sam. 6. The Anglicans briefly explained their sad experiences to the antitypical lords of the Philistines, and that by the experiences themselves (said, Send away ... very heavy there). In v. 12 we are not to understand that those who died were not smitten by emerods and that those who did not die were. Rather, all were so smitten, some mortally, others not mortally. This types the fact that some of those who were injured by the gross error became through their gross errors Second Deaths, others not (And the men that died not were smitten with emerods, v. 12). Certainly, the great sufferings in persecutions, wars, *etc.*, occasioned such distress as touched God (the cry ... went up to heaven).

(27) From our study of 1 Sam. 5 we have learned that sectarians (Philistines, 1 Sam. 6:1) began to exercise control as to Truth teachings from early in the Smyrna period, *i.e.*, from about 140 A.D., and, gradually securing that control, kept it until about the middle of the sixteenth century, when they began to relinquish it. This means that gradually one after another the five involved denominations, the Roman Catholics (1564), the Anglicans (1572), the Lutherans (1577), the Calvinists (1581) and the Greek Catholics (1576), began to let go their hold upon the truths of God's Word, and dismissed them from their midst at the dates just indicated for each one. Thus the *completed* period from 140 A.D. to about 1581 is the antitype of the seven months of v. 1. Just before the end of this period, varying with each denomination, as the above-given dates indicate, each of the denominations set into operation the antitype of v. 2; for in each of these denominations there was a gathering together (called for, 2) in council, synod or convocation, accordingly as they variously called their authorized legislative bodies, of their higher ecclesiastics (priests) and theologians (diviners) to pass such ecclesiastic teachings and laws as would in creed form be their authorized confessions of faith and practice, by which they dismissed the antitypical Ark. We are not to understand that in so many words such leaders inquired in each denomination of one another how they could get rid of God's Truth as due. (What shall we do to the ark of the Lord? Tell us [literally, Cause us to be made to know] wherewith we shall send it to his place). Rather, as we have often seen, typical speeches are usually antityped in pantomime; what these leaders sought and did was ridding themselves of what really was the Truth as due, though they regarded it as error to be put aside.

(28) This will appear from a short study of how the antitype was fulfilled in each of these five denominations. The Reformation movements struck hard blows, first of all at Rome. Thus the Lutheran, Calvinistic

and Anglican Churches by their stewardship truths struck Rome hard blows; and she sought to defend herself against these blows. Among other ways, she sought to do this through calling the Council of Trent (1541-1543, 1549, 1563-1564), to discuss the involved questions, to define her attitude thereon and to set forth her pertinent defenses and attacks. But, from the Divine standpoint, what they were actually doing was discussing and arranging ways and means to cast off the due Truth from their midst (Cause us to be made to know wherewith we shall send it to his place). The Anglican Church received such blows against her doctrine of royal supremacy in the Church from Romanist, Lutheran, Calvinistic and Independent sources that to defend herself against these she called a convocation together in 1562 and Parliament in 1572, to legislate on this matter. Actually, from the Divine standpoint, their object was to get rid of the pertinent Truth due on the subject. The Lutheran Church received such blows against her doctrine of total depravity (one of her chief emeralds), of the real presence and the communication of the Divine attributes to Christ's human nature, *etc.*, from Romanist, Greek, Calvinistic and certain Lutheran sources, that to defend herself against these she gathered her chief theologians, 1574-1577, to draw up arguments thereon. Actually, from the Divine standpoint, her object was to get rid of the pertinent Truth due on the subject. The Calvinistic Church received such blows from Roman, Greek, Lutheran, Anglican and certain Calvinistic sources against her emerald on absolute predestination to eternal life and eternal torment, that to defend herself against these she called in various countries and times various synods, to legislate thereon. Actually, from the Divine standpoint, her object was to send away the antitypical Ark from her midst. The Greek Catholic Church, suffering blows from Lutheran and Calvinistic sources against her mass and Apostolic succession, and under blows from the Unitarians

against her trinitarianism, God-manism, *etc.*, to defend herself against these called the Council of Jerusalem, 1672, to give creedal authority to the reply of Jeremiah II, Patriarch of Constantinople, issued in 1576 thereon. Actually, from the Divine standpoint, these were gatherings to send away the antitypical Ark from their midst. Thus was antityped v. 2.

(29) The antitypes of vs. 3-11 occurred at councils, synods and convocations. We would remark that, as usual with speeches, the antitype of the speeches of vs. 3-9 occurred in pantomime. The period from 1530 to 1581 above all other periods in Church history was marked by the meetings of creed-making councils, synods and convocations. The Augsburg Confession, with its Apology, the joint product of a number of Lutheran theologians, Melancthon being the principal worker thereon, the Schmalcald Articles, written by Luther and signed by the leading Lutheran theologians, his small and large Catechisms and the Epitome, 1576, and Solid Declaration, 1577, of the Formula of Concord, prepared by a number of Lutheran theologians, Andreae being the main author of the former, and Chemnitz the main author of the latter, were all in 1580 incorporated in the Book of Concord, the special creed of the Lutheran Church. The first five of these creedal expressions were brought into existence through the conflict with Rome and the Formula of Concord through the controversies that arose after Luther's death among the Lutheran theologians themselves. It was Chemnitz's part in such creed-making that effected his fall from the Little Flock, a member of which he was while writing the ablest anti-Romanist work of all times, his four-volumed work entitled, *The Examination of the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent*. On the Romanist side the Council of Trent, which sat intermittently, *i.e.*, 1541-1543, 1549 and 1563-1564, was the great creed-maker of Romanism, publishing its decrees and canons in 1564, in which are defined the Romanist views contrasted with those of

non-Romanist Churches, particularly their views as against those of Greek Catholicism, Lutheranism, Calvinism and Anglicanism. Its creed-making was supplemented by the work of Pius IX, who *ex cathedra, i.e.*, officially as pope speaking to the entire Church, in 1854 decreed the Immaculate Conception of Mary, in 1864 issued the Syllabus Of The Principal Errors Of Our Time, and through the Vatican Council of 1870 proclaimed its decrees on the supremacy, absolute authority and infallibility of the pope as Christ's vicar. However pertinent to the Romanist creed these utterances of Pius IX are, they are not included in the things typed by 1 Sam. 6:1-12.

(30) In paragraph (22), among other things, we showed how Cranmer, aided by Ridley, prepared the 42 articles of the Church of England, largely in a Calvinistic sense, in the days of Edward VI, as a creed for the Anglican Church, and how the convocation in 1562 revised these articles into a sense midway between Calvinism and Lutheranism and reduced them to 39, which, ever since Parliament's legalizing them in 1572, have been the creed of the Anglican Church. While the Lutheran creeds drawn up in Germany between 1530 and 1577 were accepted by the Lutheran churches in countries outside of Germany, the Calvinists of each country where they became the dominant, or a more or less influential Church, drew up for their churches in the involved countries separate creeds. Thus for Switzerland they drew up the Second (1566) Helvetic Confession; for Germany, the Heidelberg Catechism (1563); for France, the Gallican Confession (1559); for Belgium, the Belgic Confession (1561); for Scotland, the Second (1581) Scotch Confession. Later Calvinistic Confessions do not enter into the antitype of 1 Sam. 6. The Greek Church, in a writing of Jeremiah II, Patriarch of Constantinople, co-operated with in its production by a number of higher clerics and theologians, 1576, rejected Romanism, Lutheranism and Calvinism; but she did not deem it necessary to

decree this rejection as her creed for nearly a century later, when the Synod of Jerusalem, 1672, approved Jeremiah II's confession and gave it creedal sanction as the doctrine of the Greek Catholic Church. Thus we see that the creedal views of all five of the pertinent denominations were issued by 1581, as a final time-point. And this, we see, is the period to which 1 Sam. 6 assigns them, as was shown above.

(31) The decision, reduced to an act, to cast off the Truth given by the various star-members was made not as works devoted only to such rejections (send it not empty, 3); but these rejections were made as a part of a larger work that embraced the presentations of their more or less caricatured stewardship truths and gross errors embodied in their creeds. Thinking these caricatures of truths and these gross errors were truths, and feeling that by issuing them they were doing a Divinely-pleasing work, they also thought that such work would make good before God for the evils that they recognized they had committed in pertinent word and act (return Him a trespass offering); for they recognized that they had been more or less faultful amid the controversies that led up to their creed-making, for which faults they thought their creed-making would heal them, *e.g.*, after Luther's death Lutheran theologians fell into great controversies among themselves on total depravity, justification, sanctification, the Lord's Supper, the omnipresence of Christ's human body, things indifferent, *etc.* Much of evil was wrought on all hands by these controversies, and their leading clergy and theologians sought to make good these evils and bring peace about through their adopting the Formula of Concord contained in the Book of Concord. Again, the Reformation caused much controversy to arise among the Roman hierarchy and theologians, all of which the creed-making Council of Trent sought to end by their becoming one, and thus making good for their former wrongs. The same things in principle preceded and marked the Greek, Anglican and Calvinistic creed-making procedures.

And all of them looked upon their pre-creed-making experiences as calamities from the Lord (be known why His hand is not removed from you), which calamities they thought their creed-making would end, despite the fact that hitherto they could not clearly understand why they came to them.

(32) The antitypical Philistines, having received the answer antitypical of that given in v. 3, inquired of the leading clergy and theologians by what service (What shall be the trespass offering, 4) they could make good the wrong done the Lord, connected with the antitypical Ark. They were told by the acts of the leading clergy and theologians in each of the five involved denominations (the number of the lords of the Philistines), in their creed-making, that the (caricatured) stewardship truths and their (by them unrecognized) errors should be offered to the Lord. Of course, they considered all of these teachings to be true. The (caricatured) stewardship truths (mice) and their (as such not recognized) errors (emerods), by them believed to be true, they thought would be a proper offering to God and would procure peace and healing for them. That they thought that these teachings, as supposedly true, would placate God, is typed by the fact that they were to be of gold, which symbolizes something divine (five golden emerods and five golden mice). But that these creedal teachings, as set forth in the creeds, are erroneous, is evident from the fact that mice were among the unclean foods (Lev. 11:29; Is. 66:17—here Protestant error, as the swine flesh is Romanist error, the *abomination* being the mass). That the emerods represent errors is apparent not only from our previous study, but also from the fact that they were sores, ulcers (Lev. 13:42, 43; Rev. 16:2). We know that images (5) in the prophets represent creeds (Ps. 97:7; Is. 21:9; 30:22; 41:29; 42:8, 17; Jer. 50:2, 38; 51:47, 52). These creeds, therefore, are alike error (one plague was on you all, and on your lords). But these antitypical Philistines, not knowing the true God, and thinking their prospective creeds

would be true, thought that they would be just the thing to glorify the Lord (give glory to the God of Israel). So doing they expected to obtain relief as to themselves (lighten His hand from off you), their doctrines (gods) and the sphere of their spirit (land).

(33) The clergy and theologians in each of the five involved denominations considered their creed-making work one of making harmony in their respective denominations, hence a work that would please God, and hence not to do it would be a hardening of the involved hearts, a thing against which they pleaded by word and act among those opposing their plans and purposes (Wherefore, then, do ye harden your hearts, 6). The chief of the clergy and theologians in each of the five denominations, in exhorting one another to creed-and-harmony-making in the sense of each involved denomination, cautioned their fellows not to harden their hearts against such activities, since that would be worse than the course of the Egyptians and Pharaoh, who, while temporarily hardening their hearts, finally under the plagues relented and let the people go (wrought wonderfully ... let the people go, and they departed). Then they advised that a new organization be formed (make a new cart, 7), consisting of a council, or synod, or convocation, newly organized, to meet the crisis in each of the five involved denominations. They further advised that a new statement of their doctrines (one of the two milch cows) and practices (the other of the two milch cows) be drawn up, requiring that these doctrines and practices be such as had not before been put into creedal form (on which there hath come no yoke). But the implication products (calves) of such doctrines and practices that would interfere with the progress of these doctrines and practices should be kept out of sight, buried in oblivion (bring their calves home from them). Upon council, synod or convocation (cart) was to be placed the responsibility of carrying away the star-members' teachings from among the five pertinent denominations (take the ark ... lay it upon the cart, 8); and the

caricatured stewardship truths (those "jewels of gold" that consisted of the golden mice) and the pet errors of these sectarian Churches (those "jewels of gold" that consisted of the golden emeralds) were to be given a place of (supposed) authority (by the side thereof) over the star-members' teachings (the ark) in their creeds (coffer). In this way they felt sure they would rid themselves of the star-members' teachings (send it away, that it may go).

(34) At the time of the creed-making described above, all five denominations, while fighting one another, were a unit in fighting the so-called Independents (Beth-Shemesh, *house of the sun*, 9). These Independents consisted of undenominational Christians, Baptists, Unitarians and Congregationalists, all of whose stewardship teachings the creedists rejected, because they were not polluted then, as were the stewardship teachings of the pertinent five denominations. God considered such to be the house (Beth) of the Bible (Shemesh, *sun*), while the five denominations considered them to be arch heretics. The supposed errors (actually truths, *i.e.*, the Ark) of the star-members the higher clergy and theologians thought would be cast off, and as such would naturally go to the Independents. If they did, they would consider that they were plagued for having the errors, actually the truths, of the star-members in their midst (if it go ... to Beth-Shemesh ... He hath done us this great evil). If the antitypical Ark did not go to the Independents, all of whom the creedists believed to be gross heretics, the antitypical Philistines would conclude that their plagues were an accident (then we shall know ... not His hand ... it ... happened to us). The advice of the higher clergy and theologians was carried out (the men did so, 10); for they united (tied) their councils, synods and convocations (cart) to the pertinent creedal doctrines and practices (two milch cows), by causing these to make such creedal doctrines and practices—those of the councils, synods and convocations. And they carefully kept

among themselves, away from their published creedal doctrines and practices, certain distracting implications (calves) as the recent products of such creedal doctrines and practices (two milch kine). For example, the Papists kept out of the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent the doctrine of the pope's infallibility and its resultant practices; the Lutherans kept out of their published Book of Concord matters like the creation of the soul (in their sense of the word) and the omnipresence of Christ's humanity as the basis of their doctrine of the real presence; the Calvinists kept out of their creeds the question of supralapsarianism (God's predestinating Adam's fall and everything else that happens, *i.e.*, among other things, sin); the Greeks kept out of their creedal statement references to the Divine omnipresence being communicated to Christ's humanity; and the Anglicans kept out of their creedal statements all discussion of the Bible's directly teaching Apostolic succession. All such questions as are the direct products (calves) of their doctrines and practices (milch cows), because of their containing, to them, very inconvenient implications, they studiously kept away from their published creedal statements; but they have discussed these privately (at home) among themselves individually.

(35) The higher clergy and theologians, accordingly laid upon their councils, synods and convocations (the cart, 11) the duty of carrying away from them the antitypical Ark (ark), together with the duty of making their caricatured stewardship doctrines and practices (five golden mice) and their false teachings, viewed by them as true (five golden emerods), accompany the star-members' teachings, since they embodied all of these in their creeds (coffer): some (the truths) as rejected and anathematized teachings, the others (the caricatured stewardship truths and pet errors) set forth as truths held by the denominations and therefore fit to be offered to the Lord. Their doctrinal teachings and practical precepts (the two kine, 12)

led the councils, synods and convocations to direct the pertinent teachings straight at the Independents (the straight way to the way, direction, of Beth-Shemesh). This was done publicly (went along the highway), announcing, in their propounders, their thoughts continually (lowing as they went). These teachings kept on developing, as aimed by their propounders, in the direction of the Independents, without turning aside at all (turned not aside to the right hand or to the left). The leaders of the five denominations (the lords of the Philistines) kept on accompanying (supporting) their councils, synods and convocations, which were taking away from the antitypical Philistines the star-members' teachings, at the same time causing to accompany them their various caricatures of their stewardship teachings and errors embedded in their creeds. This they continued to do until this combination of things reached the Independents (the border of Beth-Shemesh).

(36) In construing this type we must remember that as the Philistines were not believers in the antitypical Ark and in the God that it represented, so the higher clergy and theologians were not believers in the star-members' teachings and in the God that they represented. When the facts of the case are considered in the way these five denominations by their creed-making cast off the star-members' teachings, the symbolism of vs. 2-12 certainly give us the understanding of the pertinent acts as outlined above. And we must marvel at God's wisdom in clothing the prophecy of these transactions in the story under study. Who of us would have thought that such a remarkable piece of typology is embedded in the story of the ark's experiences while in the hands of the Philistines? Certainly human wisdom and ingenuity could neither have put into, nor have taken out of this story such a remarkable piece of typology! Let us praise God for the gift of this understanding, as another evidence of His grace bestowed upon us richly and upbuildingly.

(37) It may strike some as contradictory that in the camp picture we teach that the five above-mentioned denominations are called the tribes of Reuben, Simeon, Gad, Judah and Ephraim, while here they are called the five cities of the Philistines. This is due to the fact that they are viewed from different standpoints in the two pictures. In the camp picture they are represented as the nominal people of God as existing in the pertinent denominations, as such doing some good service for God, even as some of them are called the honorable women of Christ's court, in Ps. 45:9; while in the picture under study they are pictured forth as sectarians opposing certain of God's teachings. Thus the different aspects of their activities account for their being typed by such antagonistic peoples. We find that Israel is variously used typically. In their good representatives and in their doing well they represent the real people of God during the Gospel Age, and in their bad representatives and in their bad acts they represent the nominal people of God. 1 Cor. 10:1-4 shows the former and vs. 5-11 show the latter line of thought. The same principle is seen in Israel and Moab, and Israel and Ammon, in their varied relations. Thus the phenomenon under study is in principle of frequent occurrence in Biblical types.

(38) The Independents of all kinds—the Baptists, the Unitarians, the Congregationalists and undenominational Christians from 1564 onward, in the case of the Congregationalists from about 1581 onward, were gathering very many adherents to themselves, as their contemporaneous history proves (And they of Beth-Shemesh were reaping their wheat harvest, 13) amid more or less oppressive conditions (in the valley). At this particular juncture of history they were engaged in earnest study of Scriptural subjects (lifted up their eyes) and, among other things, recognized the dismissed star-members' teachings (and saw the ark). Thus the Baptists, Unitarians and Congregationalists saw the Truth on the true Church in its

nature, organization and government, as opposed to Greekism, Romanism, Anglicanism, Calvinism and Lutheranism; the Unitarians in some of their representatives saw the full teaching of star-members on Christ's person and office, others saw them on His office; while undenominational Christians saw more or less of the star-members' teachings on all lines rejected by the five denominations. These facts made such believers rejoice greatly, for they loved these teachings and were glad that they were freed from the sectarian perversions and possessions of the five involved denominations (rejoiced to see it). This combination of things: the antitypical Ark, which by now consisted of eight star-members' teachings, cart (in their acts), kine, golden mice and emerods and coffer, came into the sphere of activity of the most salutary laborers (field of Joshua, Jehovah is salvation, 14) along Bible lines (the Beth-Shemite). There among them stood the great teaching (a great stone) that the Bible is the sole source of faith and the main rule of practice. They severed to pieces the councils, synods and convocations, *i.e.*, they destroyed them refutatively as such and used such remnants of them as were Scripturally available for sacrificial purposes (clave the wood of the cart) and used the remnants of the doctrines and practices (the kine), *i.e.*, such as were in harmony with the Lord's Word for sacrificial purposes in a way that manifested God's acceptance of their sacrifices under Christ (a burnt offering to the Lord). The manifest acceptance of God was recognized in the blessings with which He owned the services of the involved antitypical Joshua; for through their labors the star-members' truths were widely spread, many were won for the Lord, and error was refuted.

(39) Antitypical Levites (faith-justified ones) took part in this service by offering linguistic, interpretational, historical and systematic helps that forwarded the involved star-members' teachings (took down the ark, 15). Doubtless among these antitypical Levites

were many crown-losers, whom God before the Epiphany, as we have seen, anticipatorily viewed as antitypical Levites (Num. 16:8-11); for among the Unitarians crown-losers, leaders like Faustus Socinus, Valentine Schmalz, Johann Voelkel and Johann Crell, did very much in the way of taking down the antitypical Ark. Among the Baptists crown-losers, leaders like Christoph Ostorvat, Gregorius Paulus, John Smyth, Peter of Cologne, *etc.*, contributed their part to taking down the antitypical Ark. Among the Congregationalist crown-losers, leaders like Henry Barrowe, Henry Ainsworth, John Robinson and William Brewster, did their part in taking down the antitypical Ark. Among the undenominationalist crown-losers, leaders like Jacob Arminius, Hugo Grotius, *etc.*, took a helpful part in taking down the antitypical Ark. All of the above took a large part in laying hold of the creeds (coffer) in order to bring out in their proper light the caricatured stewardship doctrines (golden mice) and the peculiar doctrinal errors (golden emerods) of the five involved denominations (wherein the jewels of gold were). They submitted these to the test of the teaching that the Bible is the sole source of faith and the main rule of practice (put them on the great stone). And under their linguistic, interpretational, historical and systematic studies they vindicated the star-members' teachings (ark), cleansed the stewardship doctrines (golden mice) from their defilements and overthrew the errors of the creeds (golden emerods). In doing these things, which they did with the hearty and joyous co-operation of their like-believing denominational and undenominational brethren, they all, leaders and ledlings, in the three involved denominations, as well as those apart from denominations, offered up antitypical burnt offerings, *i.e.*, performed services in which God's acceptance appeared manifestly (offered burnt offerings), amid which they yielded up much of their humanity to God (sacrificed sacrifices), especially as they did this work amid many persecutions heaped upon them. This

sacrificing occupied a period of about 80 years (the same day), according to the pertinent facts.

(40) All these 80 years the leaders of the five involved denominations (the five lords of the Philistines, 16) were mental observers (had seen) of what the antitypical men of Beth-Shemesh did to the antitypical Ark, cart, kine, coffer, golden mice and golden emerods. These things were observed amid the controversies connected with the involved matters. While not plainly indicated in this type, these five groups of leaders did their observing by taking a more or less lively part in the involved controversies, and in them repudiated the antitypical Ark and defended their antitypical golden mice and golden emerods as things fitting to be offered to the Lord. England, becoming the chief sphere of the sacrificing of the antitypical Beth-Shemites, especially during the second half of the involved 80 years, the brunt of the controversy in defense of the creeds was allowed to fall upon the theologians of the Anglican Church (they returned to Ekron the same day). The leaders of the five denominations did a creed work that they felt sure pleased God in the sense of appeasing Him (a trespass offering to the Lord, 17); for to them their antitypical emerods, which were errors, seemed to be Truth.

(41) As vs. 17 and 18 recapitulate the thought of vs. 4 and 5, designating expressly what was not so expressly stated in vs. 4 and 5, that one golden emerod and one golden mouse was for each of the five cities of the Philistines, we will here recapitulate the antitypes. The grossest error (emerod) of the Greek Catholic Church (Ashdod, 17) is the trinity with its involved God-man, and its stewardship truth (mice, 18) is the pre-human, human and post-human office of our Lord Jesus Christ; the grossest error (emerod) of the Calvinistic Church (Gaza [?]) is absolute predestination of all things, including sin, according to the supralapsarians, and of some persons to eternal bliss and the bulk of the race to eternal torment and its stewardship

truth (a mouse) is: The bread and wine are a symbolic representation and commemoration of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus; the grossest error (emerod) of the Lutheran Church (Askelon [?]) is total depravity or the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ, with its implied doctrine of the omnipresence of Christ's humanity, and its stewardship doctrine (a mouse) is justification by faith; the grossest error (emerod) of the Roman Catholic Church (Gath) is the mass, and its stewardship doctrine (a mouse) is the doctrine that there is but one Church, which is the custodian of the Truth and its administrator for salvation; and the grossest error (emerod) of the Anglican Church (Ekron) is its doctrine of Apostolic succession of bishops, and its stewardship truth (a mouse) is the doctrine that the Church in secular matters is subject to the state. These were sent to the real people of God (returned) as a trespass offering of the five leaders of the five denominations (the number of all the cities of the Philistines *for* [literal translation] the five lords). Thus each of the five denominations (fenced cities) and their sectarian divisions (country villages) participated with their leaders in these trespass offerings. The five involved grossest errors and the five involved caricatured stewardship truths were by the five denominations and their five leader-groups sent to the Bible teachers (Beth-Shemite) stationed at the Bible as their sole source of faith and the main rule of practice (returned ... even to the great stone). And this great symbolic stone, the teaching that the Bible is the sole source of faith and the main rule of practice, abides to this day, when the antitype of the writing of 1 Sam. is taking place in the writing of this series of chapters on it (remaineth to this day), not among all professed Christian, many of whom repudiate the Bible as the sole source of faith and the main rule of practice, but in the sphere of service occupied by the

real and salutary servants of the Bible (in the field of Joshua, the Beth-Shemite) truths as due.

(42) But some of the antitypical Beth-Shemites did some of the antitypical gazing, speculating (because they had looked into [or at] the ark of the Lord, 19). It is more likely that the translation, *looked at*, is correct, rather than *looked into*, for death was the penalty for any one, except the priests, looking at the ark (Num. 4:19, 20). When it was taken by the Israelites into the battle during which it was captured, it undoubtedly was covered, and in all likelihood it remained covered while in Philistia and until it was placed upon the great stone in Joshua's field. It is very unlikely that Israelites would have opened the ark and looked at its contents; hence it is very likely that they merely uncovered it and looked at it. So far as the Hebrew is concerned, it may be rendered *looked at*, *in* or *into*. Antotypically, it would mean that some of the Bible believers and supporters speculated as to the eight star-members' doctrines, typed by the ark at that time, for at the time of each star-member's bringing out his special truth, it became a part of the ark; hence at this time there were eight star-members' truths in the antitypical Ark. From history we know it to be true that crown-lost leaders speculated at this time, *e.g.*, Faustus Socinus, the first and chief crown-lost member of the Unitarians' crown-lost leaders, speculating on the doctrine of justification by faith, denied the ransom. Others of the Unitarians' crown-lost leaders, speculating on Christ's person, denied His pre-existence, taught that His father was Joseph. Some of the Baptist crown-lost leaders, not seeing the distinction between tentative and vitalized justification, speculated themselves into denying justification by faith alone. Some of the Congregationalist leaders, speculating on the powers of the ecclesia and its elders, came to teach a hybrid doctrine, a mixture of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism on Church government. In such studies they looked at the antitypical

Ark; and God therefore caused them to die from their standing, *i.e.*, some Little Flock members lost their crowns; some Great Company members sank into the Second Death; some of the justified forfeited their justification and some of the campers became infidels in the form of Deism, which sprang up at that time (even He smote). Their fallen condition was, among other ways, manifest from the large numbers of them who renounced their faith under the rod of persecution. Many undenominational Christians went over to Deism at that time, which spread, especially in England.

(43) The following words (19) are mistranslated in the A. V.: fifty thousand and three-score and ten men. Dr. Young properly renders them as follows: seventy men—fifty chief men. A very similar mistranslation occurs in Mic. 5:2, in the A. V. and Septuagint (*thousands of Judah*), which inspiration corrects in Matt. 2:6 (*princes, i.e.; leaders, chief men*). This mistranslation is due to the fact that the word *eleph* may mean both *thousand* and *leader*, dependent on the connection. Little towns like Beth-Shemesh, a farming community (13), and Bethlehem did not have so many inhabitants as to warrant the translation to imply many thousands of them. Thus there were not 50,070, but 120 smitten, 70 not so prominent and 50 leading citizens of Beth-Shemesh. The proportion of leaders killed to the ledlings killed, compared with the probable population, was very large. In the antitype there was a disproportionate number of Unitarian, Baptist and Congregationalist leaders smitten for their speculating, while those of the smitten ledlings were comparatively few, considering the many of them. The fact that so many of their leaders and some of their ledlings went wrong on various very important doctrines was a great grief to the survivors. This grief was felt amid the accompanying controversies and the resultant apostasies and siftings. The histories of the Baptists, Unitarians and Congregationalists of that time are more or less full of such controversies,

apostasies and siftings, all of which is a proof that many leaders and ledlings were as a result of their speculations symbolically slain (smitten). That the stroke was a comparatively great one (with a great slaughter) is manifest from what we have just stated, considering the fact that these three denominational and the undenominational Christians were comparatively few at that time, even as the inhabitants of Beth-Shemesh were comparatively few.

(44) It was by their acts that the inhabitants of antitypical Beth-Shemesh asked, Who is able to stand before this holy Lord God (20)? To stand before the Lord means to minister to Him as a representative of Him. This the crown-losers and their main justified assistants in these three denominations and out of all denominations were. While so ministering certain ones speculated and went badly wrong, as shown above, and the unsmitten ones, *i.e.*, those who did not symbolically die, as described above, recognizing their fall, were very much afraid of the dangers connected with speculating while engaged in God's service. And it was their fear that was the antityping of the words of the surviving Beth-Shemites, "Who is able to stand before this holy Lord God?" The second question of v. 20 should be rendered, "and to whom shall it [the ark] go up from us?" for they wanted, not to get rid of God, but to get rid of so dangerous a thing as the ark was proven to be for speculating leaders and ledlings. This question was also antityped in pantomime. It was by discussing more or less unfavorably the by now eight star-members' doctrines typed by the ark when it came to them, including the doing of the same with the three star-members' doctrines that the three Little Flock leaders gave whose movements were perverted into the Baptist, Unitarian and Congregationalist sects, and their more or less discussing the perversions of their stewardship doctrines, that the antitypical Beth-Shemites pantomimed the question, "To whom shall it go up from us?" So far as v. 20 is concerned, matters

had not proceeded further in repudiating the eight star-members' teachings than a more or less unfriendly discussion of the eight involved Truth teachings and in a tendency to pervert their three involved stewardship doctrines, *i.e.*, things were taking a turn for the worse as to their attitude toward the involved truths, but they had not yet gone to the extreme of a fixed rejection of these eight truths, nor to a full perversion of their stewardship truths—they were only on the way toward these unhealthy steps.

(45) The books, confessions, reports, *etc.* (messengers, 21), that flowed out of the discussions just mentioned, spread among the more faithful consecrated Christians in and out of the then existing denominations (they sent messengers to the inhabitants of Kirjath-jearim [*city of the forests*—trees represent great ones, among God's people or among the world, here among God's people]). These books, confessions, reports, *etc.*, showed that the five large denominations of Christendom had by their creeds rejected the five involved star-members' teachings (saying, The Philistines have brought again the ark of the Lord). But these books, confessions, reports, *etc.*, more or less rejecting as they did all eight involved star-members' teachings, were by this fact an invitation to the more faithful consecrated to receive the rejected star-members' teachings (come ye down and fetch it up to you). The break between the chapters should not have occurred at the end of v. 21; chapter 6 should have continued to the end of 1 Sam. 7:2. These two verses belonging to our subject, we will treat of them here. The more faithful among the consecrated took to themselves these eight teachings (the men of Kirjath-jearim came and fetched up the ark of the Lord, 1). They brought these teachings to their like-minded clergy and principals of the flocks, *e.g.*, teachers and professors (brought it into the house of Abinadab [*my father is noble*]) and put them into the special care of the ablest and most helpful of these (sanctified Eleazar [*God is*

help] his son to keep the ark of the Lord). The historical facts corroborate this understanding of the antitype, as the following facts will prove: The eight involved denominations above described petrified their beliefs, set forth in their creeds (those of the three denominations were as yet unwritten as such), in voluminous works on dogmatics written by their chief dogmatical writers. This petrification became a putrification, because it led to the period of dead orthodoxy. These dogmatical works reduced the creedal views to the forms of so-called scientific treatises that were drawn up with the precision and dryness of mathematical formulas, and the result was that Christian life became stagnant and dead in these denominations. Concurrently with this dead orthodoxy came the 30 years' war in Germany and the revolution and its resultant wars in England. Thus piety was at its lowest ebb throughout Europe among the bulk of Christendom at the time that antitypical Beth-Shemesh was seeking in their folly to get rid of the ark of the Lord.

(46) But the Spirit of the Lord was not by God allowed to be entirely quenched; for He raised up certain consecrated ones in Germany, France, Italy and Britain (the inhabitants of antitypical Kirjath-jearim) to a closer life with the Lord. Among these were some of the clergy and the principals of the flocks (Abinadab), and also some of the ablest men and women of the time. All of these stood for the true doctrines in their churches, but they insisted on a consecrated walk with God. In Germany they were in ridicule called Pietists, in Italy Heretics, in France Quietists and in England Fanatics. Among the leaders of this movement in Germany there stands out most prominently the name of: Johann Arndt, really the forerunner of the movement and author of *The True Christianity*, one of the greatest books on Christian living ever written, and one of the ten most widely spread, translated and read books ever written; Philip Jacob Spener, whose influence for good was more

powerful than that of any other Pietist in Germany; and August H. Franke, who raised the influence of the Halle University for Christian living to as great a degree as the Wittenberg University had for doctrine and reformation in the days of Luther. In Italy the Spaniard, Michael Molinos, by his book, *Spiritual Guide*, wrought very fruitfully for Christian piety in the Romanist Church until the Jesuits secured his suppression as a heretic, despite the pope's remonstrances. In France Madame Guyon, Archbishop Fenelon and the Port Royalist scholars: Antoine Arnauld, his sister Angelica (abbess of Port Royal), Racine, De Sacy, Pascal, Quesnel and Tillemont, some of the ablest and most pious men and women of France, wrought most fruitfully for Christian living as against dead orthodoxy. In England George Fox, a star-member, and John Bunyan, author of *Pilgrim's Progress*, one of the ten books above referred to, wrought very fruitfully for the consecrated life. These men and women were the cream of all the leaders in this movement for Christian living. They were the antitypical Eleazar of v. 1, while their clerical and other (teacher and professorial) supporters were antitypical Abinadab in Christendom.

(47) These brethren, clerical and lay, professors and teachers, prominent and obscure, consecrated Christians, received the antitypical Ark. Indeed, George Fox was used by the Lord to bring out another truth that then became a part of this antitypical Ark. We are not to understand that all of these received all of the nine involved star-members' teachings. Some of them received more, some less; all of them received at least that star-member doctrine that in his church was perverted into an antitypical mouse. Their ministry was most fruitful, and always received persecution from the dead orthodox. Especially in Romanist countries did the Jesuits persecute these. It was they who secured the condemnation and imprisonment of Molinos and Madame Guyon. It was they who secured the

suppression of Port Royal, the headquarters of the French part of antitypical Eleazar, son of Abinadab, and the scattering of its able men and women. The period of the activities of these and their successors of like spirit, if we begin them with those of John Arndt, was from about 1610 onward until the Harvest (the time was long, 2); for the typical ark remained at Kirjath-jearim, which is the same as Baalah, or Baali (Josh. 15:9), until David (type of that Servant) brought it to Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6:1-11). The A. V. of v. 2 does not give the sense of the original when it implies that the ark was at Kirjath-jearim but 20 years. Dr. Young renders v. 2 as follows: "And it cometh to pass, from the day of the dwelling of the ark in Kirjath-jearim, that the days are multiplied—yea, they are twenty years—and wail do all the house of Israel after Jehovah." This rendering gives the sense literally. As a matter of fact, it was there about 90 years, *i.e.*, during the 40 years of Samuel's judgeship, the 40 years of Saul's reign and about 10 years of David's reign; for David had reigned 7½ years at Hebron, then transferred his capital to Jerusalem (2 Sam. 5:9). It was sometime thereafter that the ark was brought from Kirjath-jearim to Jerusalem. The thought of 20 years mentioned in v. 2 is that it was after the ark had been at Kirjath-jearim 20 years that Israel began to repent of their sins (all the house of Israel lamented after the Lord). This—and thus the end of the antitypical 20 years—was antitypically fulfilled just after the time that John Wesley, 1738, began his work as a star-member.

(48) Due to the inroads that the teachings and loose conduct of Deism made on matters of faith and practice among the British people, religion and morality were at a very low ebb in Britain in the second half of the 17th and in the first half of the 18th century. While Deists talked and wrote much on "God, virtue and immortality," the blighting effects on faith and morals that it wrought depraved the British public as

few others things in history did. At first it affected a great stand as loving Truth and righteousness. But the progressive ridicule and disregard of the Bible that it inculcated tore away the foundations of faith and righteousness from under the feet of the people, resulting in the most unblushing iniquity spreading progressively among all classes of society. The leading Deists of the old ethical school were Lord Herbert of Cherbury (died 1648), Charles Blount (died 1693), John Toland (died 1722), Anthony Collins (died 1729), William Whiston (died 1752), Matthew Tindal (died 1733), Thomas Morgan (died 1743), Peter Annet (died 1769) and Conyers Middleton (died 1750). These, one after the other, progressively deteriorated from a more or less respect for the Bible and Christianity into a disbelief in them as a revelation and in its miracles and prophecies. But a second class of Deists appeared who developed principles that undermined Christian ethics, and made ethics a matter controlled by selfishness. The leaders among these were Shaftesbury (died 1713), Mandeville (died 1733), Dodwell (died 1751) and Bolingbroke (died 1751). Their influence was very disastrous on religion and ethics. These were followed by a third class of Deists who will here be briefly described. Hume (died 1776) turned Deism into infidelity. Voltaire (died 1778) combined almost all forms of Deism into his system. He accepted the skepticism of Hume, the natural theology of the first class of Deists mentioned above, and the selfish ethics of the second set of Deists mentioned above. Later on Deism in France went over into irreligion and materialism, as is exemplified in Diderot (died 1784), Holbach (died 1789) and Helvetius (died 1771). Rousseau (died 1778) went back to the position of the first Deists. But the effect of all of these was in final analysis an evil one, undermining religion and morality, as the history of Britain and France proves was the case.

(49) It was this undermining of religion and morality that caused the widespread grief in Christendom

typed by the lamenting after the Lord on the part of Israel (all the house of Israel lamented after the Lord, 2), as they saw religion and righteousness ridiculed and unbelief and ungodliness spreading. Amid this condition the ministry of John Wesley set in. In EH, 403-416, we have given the main facts of his life and ministry, and will not repeat them here; rather we refer our readers to these details there. Samuel's speech in v. 3 summarizes typically the preaching of Wesley pertinent to the situation created by the first set of Deists. His star-membership dates with his quickening as a star-member in 1738, which he mistakenly called his conversion. From that time on he preached the message antitypical of v. 3. It will be noted that his ministry was a widespread one, described by him in his words, "The world is my parish" (spake unto all the house of Israel). In preaching and writing he greatly stressed a complete, whole-hearted repentance, faith, consecration, its faithful performance and disinterested love (If ye do return unto the Lord with all your hearts). These steps he showed implied that they put aside all forms of sin and selfishness and worldliness (put away the strange gods) especially sex sins (Ashtaroth). He strongly urged them to detach their affections from everything that had the tendency of turning them away from the Lord, and to fill their hearts with every affection that would dispose them toward God and things divine (and prepare your hearts unto the Lord). He likewise exhorted them to carry out their consecration by self-sacrificial service, holy meditation and faithful development of the graces of the Spirit (serve Him only). These things done, he assured them that God would deliver them from the doctrines, practices and effects of the Deists (He will deliver you out of the hand of the Philistines). Here we see that the Deists had become the antitypical Philistines of this particular period. While the antitypical Philistines are always sectarians, they are specifically such sectarians as are sectarianly

opponents of God's people in the particular times and forms of sectarian opposition. Hence we find the antitypical Philistines to be many different sectarians—but they are always such of them as fight God's people, and usually such as oppose these as they are led by the star-members.

(50) Wesley's ministry certainly had the effect typed by the statements of v. 4. The movement that he led is called the Great Awakening, or Revival. It is often called the revival of religion in Britain. George III, England's king during the latter part of Wesley's ministry, said of him, of his associates, and of the Great Revival, that they did more for religion and the common people of Britain than the entire established Church of England. The ungodliness and infidelity that Deism produced met their Waterloo from the Great Revival. The immense throngs that listened to Wesley and his assistants, and the great numbers that read the literature that this movement produced and circulated, felt themselves pricked to the heart by the thunderous appeals to repentance, by the tender pleas to faith and by the clear persuasives to consecration. And mighty was the effect of such preaching and reading. Literally multitudes repented and believed. Generous numbers took the second step, and got "the second blessing." Sin, selfishness and worldliness in all their forms were set aside (the children of Israel did put away *Baalim* [the ending *im* is the masculine plural in Hebrew, like *cherubim*, the plural of cherub, and *seraphim*, the plural of seraph; thus the many idols of Baal are meant] and *Ashtaroth* [sex sins], 4). The most hardened and degraded sinners were melted to repentance. The sternest unbelievers became believers. The bitterest opponents were made sweet and faithful friends of Christianity everywhere. A cleansing of thoughts, motives, words and acts characterized the converts. Those who became identified with the Wesleyan movement became exemplars of the Christian life and character. They were indeed a holy people (they

served the Lord only). While repentance and faith with their implications were the main themes preached by this movement to the public, in the meetings for the brethren—parlor meetings, class meetings, band meetings and the larger Church meetings—it was consecration made and carried out with its implications that was the special subject, the chief stress being laid on the cultivation of disinterested love. Holiness was the theme preached and lived by the faithful of this movement.

(51) The main other themes stressed among these brethren in their assemblies were watchfulness of conscience and prayer. They were, one and all, by Wesley exhorted to practice the watchfulness of conscience in their thoughts, motives, words, acts, dispositions, surroundings and the influences operating upon them (*Samuel* said, Gather all Israel to Mizpeh—*watchtower*, 5). Carelessness as to these seven objects for watchfulness of conscience was shown to be dangerous. All exhorted one another to practice daily the watchfulness of conscience (Gather all Israel). And Wesley, who was mighty and prevalent in prayer, as many examples of the Lord's answering his prayers prove, not only gave them the example to pray, and not only exhorted them to pray, but also promised them to pray for them (I will pray for you unto the Lord). The brethren gave heed to Wesley's admonitions and, encouraged by his promise to pray for them, in their consciences practiced self-examination and watchfulness (And they gathered together unto Mizpeh, 6). This they did not only privately, but also in their class meetings and bands; for Wesley arranged various kinds of meetings for them for their development in grace, knowledge and service. They faithfully studied the good Word of God, gathering out of the Bible, the well of salvation, those Truth teachings due at the time (drew water). These teachings they did not study for their personal enjoyment alone. While deriving therefrom great personal blessings, they also used them for the blessing of others; for they spread the good Word

by word of mouth, by distributing pertinent literature, by arranging for meetings where practiced preachers would deliver the message and by inviting friends, relatives and neighbors to such and other helpful meetings. Thus they spread the Truth widely as a religious service pertinent to, and in the interests of the Lord (poured it out before the Lord). They did these things through self-denying and world-denying service, for which those disciples are noted (and fasted on that day). Added to this in their watchfulness of conscience they humbly made confession of their shortcomings (said there, We have sinned). There were special class meetings held in which such confessions of shortcomings were a regular part of the service. In all these works Wesley acted as their leader, directing the Lord's work among these brethren in respect to their watching and prayer, somewhat after the manner in which Bro. Russell directed the Lord's work in the Parousia (Samuel judged the children of Israel in Mizpeh).

(52) This great Revival with its attendant righteous and holy living and serving soon attracted the inimical attention of the Deists, whose loose moral principles had a bad effect on the people, but whose doctrines, apart from undermining the faith of not a few, especially among the higher classes, gained no great acceptance with the common people, because of their abstruseness and lifelessness (the Philistines heard that the children of Israel were gathered together to Mizpeh, 7). The Deist leaders of the second group above-described (the lords), partly through previous writings and partly through contemporaneous writing and speaking, sallied forth against the brethren, who in ridicule were called Methodists (went up against Israel). This immense deistical literature and oratory frightened the pious Methodists (they were afraid of the Philistines), when they became cognizant of it (heard it). Naturally in their fears they came to their leader, Wesley (the children of Israel said to Samuel, 8), for comfort, protection and intercession before the

Lord (Cease not to cry ... for us), that God might deliver them from the Deists (He will save us, *etc.*). Wesley thereupon raised up the Methodist ministry, consisting in the most part of consecrated laymen, mainly circuit riders, and in small part of a few ministers, like himself, his brother Charles, Whitefield, Fletcher, Perronet, *etc.*, and encouraged them to sublime heights of sacrifice in an evangelistic work at least equal in love, zeal, fervor, self-denial and loyalty to any ever raised up between the Harvests. As a rule his lay preachers were uneducated and unrefined, but in all their efforts they were spurred on by Wesley's words, direction and example, to a most faithful and fruitful ministry (Samuel took a fat [not, suckling] lamb, 9). This ministry was by God manifested as acceptable to Him through our Lord's merit (a burnt offering). And it served with an eye single to the Lord's glory (wholly unto the Lord). Wesley by his strenuous ministry and ardent and believing prayer entreated the Lord on behalf of His people (cried unto the Lord for Israel); and the Lord answered in a most marked way (the Lord heard him). It was amid such sacrifices and prayers that the Deists launched their attack upon God's people (as Samuel was offering ... the Philistines drew near to battle, 10). But the Lord stirred up a great controversy against them (the Lord thundered with a great thunder ... upon the Philistines). Just as in their part of the controversy the Deists used past writings and current writings and speeches against the true believers, so did the true believers use past writings and current writings and addresses against the Deists.

(53) A brief mention of such writings and writers would be in place here, as showing with what great controversies God opposed the Deists. First we will give the names of the past pertinent writers, with their birth years and their books: Cudworth, born 1617, and his book, *The Intelligent System Of The Universe*; Boyle, 1626, *Things Above Reason*; Stillingfleet, 1635,

Letters To A Deist; Sir Isaac Newton, 1642, whose intellect was one of the greatest ever to grace a man, Observations On Prophecy; Leslie, 1650, A Short Method With Deists; Lowth, 1661, Vindication Of The Divine Author Of The Bible; King, 1669, Origin Of Evil; Samuel Clark, 1675, Evidence Of Natural And Revealed Religion; Waterland, 1683, Scripture Vindicated; and Butler, 1692, Analogy Of Religion To The Constitution And Course Of Nature. Because of their appropriateness to the controversy now under description, these works, though produced from 8 to 75 years before the controversy broke out, were republished and circulated by the antitypical Israelites. God had assisted the writers of these and subsequent ones that will shortly be mentioned (the Lord thundered with a great thunder). Of these so far mentioned undoubtedly the last one mentioned (Bishop Butler's Analogy), first published in 1736, was the most convincing; for it met the Deists on their own ground, and so thoroughly defeated them that to this day no Deist or other unbeliever has attempted to answer it. It is one of the few apologetic books that the intervening centuries have not antiquated; for its fruitful ministry still persists. The same is true in a less degree, however, of Leslie's Short Method With Deists. Among the able anti-deistical writers and books that appeared during the controversy under discussion, the following deserve special mention: Lardner, 1684, Credibility Of The Gospel History (a work of eight crown octavo volumes, which and Butler's Analogy are the two ablest works used in this controversy. It is still after two centuries the chief depository of learning on its particular subject. Though begun before the controversy had started, it was not completed until after it was in progress); Leland, 1691, View Of Deistical Writers, and Advantage And Necessity Of Revelation; Chandler, 1693, Definition Of Christianity, On Prophecy; Bishop Warburton, 1698, The Divine Legislation Of Moses; Bishop Warburton, 1698, The Divine

Legislation Of Moses; Bishop Newton, 1704, On The Prophecies; Richard Watson, 1737, Apology For Christianity (against Gibbon), also Apology For The Bible (against Paine); too numerous to mention are the writers and writings against Hume; and, finally, Paley, 1743, *Horae Paulinae*, Evidences Of Christianity, and Natural Theology. Paley brought to a successful close the controversy with the Deists.

(54) In this way the Lord answered Wesley's prayers; and thus He nonplussed the Deists (discomfited them); for they were surely defeated by antitypical Israel through the lines of thought indicated in the titles of the above-mentioned books (smitten before Israel). From their positions of conscientious watchfulness (Mizpeh), which implies, among other things, a study of the errors that attack the Truth and of the ways to refute them, as well as a quick conscience to perceive right and wrong, these warriors of the Lord and their less able fellow-soldiers attacked and stormed the positions of the Deists, followed them in their retreat from the field of battle (pursued the Philistines, 11), and pushed the attack beyond the utmost powers (Beth-car, *house of the battering ram*) of the Deists to resist. Wesley was by no means an idle spectator of this controversy. He participated in it by exalting the Bible (Samuel took a [Hebrew, *one*] stone and set it, 12) as the Truth and as the Divine Revelation. He set it forth as the object of study, both by Christian watchfulness in its function of conscience (between Mizpeh) and by sanctified reason (Shen, *crag*), both of which are heights on which one is to stand in studying the Bible. In his defenses of the Bible Wesley repeatedly appealed to the Christian conscience, which is a chief factor in successful watching, and to sanctified reason as supported by it. Well did he do in setting forth the Bible as the strengthener of the Christian conscience and as the helper of the Christian reason from the beginning to the end of the Age (Ebenezer, *stone of help*). In many ways he proved this to be true of it,

e.g., from its reasonableness, its harmony, its fruitfulness, its beauty, its strength, its sublimity, its adaptability to our needs, its efficacy, the character that it ascribes to God and Christ, the character it develops in the faithful, the honesty of its portrayals of its agents and foes, its harmony with all well-authenticated secular history and archeology, its effects on the nations, proportionate to their responsiveness, its prophecies, its miracles, its solution of the problem of creation and of the permission of evil, its refutation of all objections, its preservation against all assaults, and its transcendent superiority to the authoritative books of all other religions. Yea, by these things he proved that this unbreakable Rock has been a great means whereby God has been "our help in ages past, our hope for years to come" (saying, Hitherto hath the Lord helped us).

(55) In this controversy the Deistical sectarians were thoroughly refuted and brought into full defeat and subjection (the Philistines were subdued, 13). Their grounds are now no more taken by serious thinkers; for sectarian unbelief has shifted its grounds from those of refuted rationalistic Deism, and has taken other grounds, *e.g.*, those of atheism, agnosticism, materialism, pantheism, evolution and higher criticism. Thus Deism during the later days of Wesley made no more inroads among real Spiritual Israel (came no more into the coast of Israel); for God, through the writers and writings above-mentioned and the ministry of Wesley and his associates, successfully opposed them all the days of Wesley; and ever since they have been effectless in whatever efforts, feeble as they have been, they have put forth to discredit the Bible as the Divine Revelation. The teachings (cities, 14) that the Deists had taken from Christianity, *e.g.*, the natural revelation, God, virtue, the hereafter (which the Philistines had taken from Israel), and had perverted unto the subduing of some Christian doctrines under error, were retaken (restored), purged from Deistical error and used in harmony with

Biblical thoughts. Not one of these teachings taken from Christians was left in the hands of Deists (from Ekron even unto Gath). Any Deistical teachings that touched on Christian thought were taken from Deists by Spiritual Israel (coasts thereof did Israel deliver out of the hands of the Philistines). Sinners of all kinds were subdued by the Wesleyan movement (peace between Israel and the Amorites). Wesley presided as teacher and executive in the Priestly movement up to the end of his long life, living 88 years, 53 of which were spent by him as a star-member (Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life, 15). He continued unto old age to ride his circuits, where he addressed the nominal people of God (Bethel, 16), those rejoicing in justification with its various crises (Gilgal) and those living in the conscientious watchfulness of consecration (Mizpeh), and presided among all three of these classes as teacher and executive (judged Israel in all those places). But his habitual spiritual abode was in the height (Ramah [*height*] ... house, v. 17) of Christian character. Therein did he preside as teacher and executive; and there he gathered unto the Lord choice spirits like himself as sacrificers and comforters of sacrificers, prominent among whom were his brother Charles, the greatest hymn-writer of all times; Whitefield, one of the greatest pulpit orators of all times; the saintly Fletcher, a mighty controversialist; the humble and loyal Perronet; Richardson, the faithful companion of Wesley's last twenty years and the prayer and praise meeting leader of Wesley's last hours, and the conductor of his funeral; the devoted Asbury, the most of the Christ of that time (there he built an altar unto the Lord).

(56) In 1 Sam. 8 the antitype turns back to the Jewish Harvest and then covers certain phases of the Gospel Age until about 1850. Aged Samuel (old, 1) represents as developed the twelve Apostles and the seventy prophets in the Jewish Harvest, also the twelve star-members and their twelve special helpers shortly

after beginning the twelve Little Flock movements, which were later perverted into the twelve denominations of Christendom, in their capacity of arranging for elders in the ecclesias (Acts 14:23; 20:17; 1 Tim. 5:17; Tit. 1:5; Jas. 5:14; 1 Pet. 5:1). In the days of the Apostles these elders were of two kinds: the abler or leading elders, and the less able or more or less led elders. This distinction was not based on there being different grades officially among the elders. Rather, it was based on the difference in them from the standpoint of the spirit of consecration, talents and providential situation. Officially they were all equals; but among these equals some were abler in the three standpoints just mentioned. The ablest in these three matters became in the Lord's providence and arrangement the first among equals, and as such doubtless were entrusted with the most responsible and important services, just as occurs in our day, and as occurred in our Pastor's day; for we know that in this way God sets by the ecclesia's vote the leaders in local ecclesias where there are several elders varying in the above-mentioned three things. This is the way matters stood with the elders, *i.e.*, bishops, until the death of St. John, though during the Apostles' day, but by their disapprovals, some were already striving in unholy ambition for more power (2 Thes. 2:7; 3 John 9-11). This distinction did not imply two grades among the elders, or bishops, but by the way of designating some as the first among equals in office, all of them executing the duties of their office as decided by the ecclesias (judges over Israel). These two kinds of elders, or bishops, are typed by Samuel's two sons at the beginning of their judgeship.

(57) Shortly after John's death the leading elder or bishop by way of distinction began to be called *the* elder, or *the* bishop. At first this was merely used as an emphasis on the idea of a first among equals; but in only a few years, *i.e.*, about 115 A.D., under the lead of Ignatius of Antioch, the distinction was emphasized

into a real difference in office, the name *bishop* being restricted to the actual ruling teaching official and the name *elder* to the not ruling teaching officials of the ecclesia. This misdevelopment increased into the creation of a graded hierarchy as distinct from the lower clergy, called *priests*, a corruption of the Greek word *presbyter*, *elder*. Samuel's two sons in their continued deterioration continued to represent these two deteriorating classes among the clergy. The firstborn, Joel (*Jehovah is mighty*, 2), types this misdeveloping hierarchy; and the second born, Abiah (*my father is Jehovah*), types the misdeveloping lower clergy. Thus we see that at first they typed the elders as God constituted such, but later as Satan perverted such. In each of the twelve Little Flock movements before their perversion into sects set in we find two kinds of elders, like those of the Apostolic days; and shortly after these twelve Little Flock movements were being perverted into sects they began in most denominations to change into the misdevelopments mentioned above. Thus we see a twelve-fold fulfilment of the type of this entire chapter, as we will find it also to be the case in certain of the experiences of Saul, who types the crown-lost leaders. At first they were teachers of Truth (judges in Beersheba, *well of the oath*; the Oath-bound Covenant being the sum of the Gospel Age truths). In their falling and fallen condition these two clerical classes sought riches of money, honor, position, power and luxury (lucre, 3), took bribes to effect the promotion of the bribers or to favor the bribers against others (bribes), and perverted the true teachings into error (perverted judgment). This these two classes did in every denomination of Christendom, as Church history abundantly proves, especially that of the larger denominations. Thus they did not follow in the paths of the star-members and their special helpers (not in his ways).

(58) The better leaders consulted over this situation (all the elders of Israel gathered themselves

together, 4). They also submitted the situation to the star-members and their Little Flock colaborers (came to Samuel) in their well-developed Christian characters (Ramah). These set forth the evil condition of these two clergy classes in the twelve denominations (thy sons walk not in thy ways, 5) and Samuel's inability to keep them in line with Truth and righteousness (thou art old). Then they requested in all twelve denominations leaders who would have power sufficient to curb these two evil clergy classes, to teach aright and act as executives in what they regarded as the Lord's affairs, like the leaders in the older denominations, the Greek and Roman Churches alleging the example of the Jewish kings and hierarchy (make us a king to judge us like all the nations). This matter grieved the star-members and their Little Flock colaborers, for they saw that it was not the best thing for the people, since it implied their rejection of the Divinely commissioned teachers and executives for the Lord, a thing sure to be fraught with evil consequences (the thing displeased Samuel; literally, the thing was evil in Samuel's eyes, 6). These star-members and their special colaborers did just what they should have done under those circumstances—prayed over the matter, bringing it to the Lord for His decision (Samuel prayed unto the Lord). God, knowing that the waywardness of the people could best be cured by the experiences of evil attendant on the course that they were intent upon following, gave the star-members through His Spirit, Word and providence to understand that the will of the people be granted (Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee, 7). God corrected His faithful servants who felt hurt at the rejection of themselves as teachers and executives and showed them that the real one rejected was not they, but He Himself from being their teacher and king (not ... thee but ... Me ... not reign over them). Both the type and antitype here show that God at times yields His preference to that

of others (Ps. 106:15). The Lord then gave His faithful antitypical Samuel some comfort to be derived from a consideration of the fact that they were being treated unkindly, ungratefully and neglectfully, in fellowship with Him, by the same class as had so treated Him continually, despite His having brought them out of the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of His dear Son, and had always helped them (the works which they have done since ... out of Egypt ... wherewith they have forsaken Me and served other gods, so do they also unto thee, 8).

(59) By His Spirit, Word and providences the Lord gave antitypical Samuel at the transition of each Little Flock movement into a denomination to understand that he should accede to the people's demand (hearken unto their voice, 9). At the same time and by the same ways God gave antitypical Samuel to understand that he should protest against their demand (protest solemnly unto them), and that he should seek to persuade them to give up their will to have a king by describing to them the unfavorable course of kings with their subjects (show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them). Thus while the Lord at times yields His preference to that of others, He at the same time offers them earnest advice and protests against their desired course, pointing out to them the disadvantages of rejecting His in favor of their preference. As charged by God, so antitypical Samuel did (told ... the people, 10). He showed them just what their crown-lost princes would do to them (this will be the manner of the king, 11): They would in their interests make their stronger ones (sons) serve their organizations and their organizations' officers (appoint ... for his chariots and [literally] for his horsemen) and in their interests make them apologists for their organizations (run before his chariots). They would in their interests appoint some of them to be their subordinate officers for warfare purposes (captains over thousands and ... fifties, 12). They in their interests

would make them prepare people for hearing the crown-lost princes' messages (ear his ground; literally, plow his plowing) and win ripe ones for their interests (reap his harvest); make them prepare controversial treatises (make his instruments of war) and treatises to vindicate their organizations (instruments of his chariots). They would make their weaker ones (daughters, 13) prepare appetizing spiritual foods (confectionaries), hunger-satisfying spiritual foods (cooks) and strengthening spiritual foods (bakers) for them. They would take from Spiritual Israelites their spiritual service-spheres (fields, 14), their Truth-producing spheres (vineyards) and grace-producing spheres (oliveyards), including even those that belong to the Little Flock (best of them) and give them to their favorites. They would require that they give up their consecrated rights in the Word ["the seed is the Word"] and its teachings (take the tenth of your seed and of your vineyards, 15) and let their favorites, great (officers) and small (servants), have them for their aggrandizement, to the detriment of those thus spoiled. They would take the Little Flock brethren (menservants, 16), the Great Company brethren (maidservants), the best Truth students and warriors (your goodliest young men) and their teachings (asses) and make them serve their interests (put them to his work). They would take their symbolic flocks, the Lord's people, as consecrated to them (tenth of your sheep, 17) and reduce them to be their servants (shall be his servants). These things would distress those who wanted such leaders and they would cry to the Lord to free them, but God would ... not hear, 18.

(60) The earnest counsels, expostulations and protests that the star-members and their special collaborators made against the people's taking the crown-lost leaders in their place as their special teachers and executives were unavailing; for the people refused to heed these counsels, expostulations and protests (the people

refused to obey the voice of Samuel, 19). They remained obdurate in their determination to take the crown-lost leaders as their special teachers and executives (Nay; we will have a king over us). This refusal to listen and determination to have their own way set in toward the end of each of the twelve Little Flock movements introduced by the twelve star-members, whose movements were perverted into the twelve denominations of Christendom. They wanted in each successive case from the third to the twelfth denomination to be in this respect like the Greek and Roman Churches and the others preceding each new sectarianizing movement, while the Greek and Roman Churches wanted to be like the Jewish Church in this respect (we ... like all the nations, 20), believing that the crown-lost princes would be more *practical* and *efficient* than the pertinent star-members, as special teachers and executives (kings may judge us), leaders and warriors (go out ... fight our battles). The star-members and their special collaborators in all the twelve Little Flock movements, undergoing sectarianizing perversions toward the twelve denominations into which they later developed, listened to the people's reasonings (Samuel heard ... the people, 21) and properly referred their words and course to the Lord (rehearsed them ... the Lord). The Lord by His Spirit, Word and providence gave the star-members and their collaborators to understand that He was yielding to the people's preference (Hearken unto their voice, 22) and commissioned them to train the crown-lost princes for their office (make them a king). Accordingly, they charged the people to abide in their particular stewardship truth (Go ... unto his city).

(61) As shown above, the antitype of 1 Sam. 8 occurred in every one of the twelve Little Flock movements that were later perverted into the twelve denominations of Christendom. Above we gave merely a general description of the antitypes, without offering

illustrations of how it was actually carried out. We will do it here by the example of the Wesleyan movement, as it was being turned into the Methodist Church. The corrupt, time-serving and worldly bishops and presbyters of the 18th century in the Church of England, in which Wesley remained until death, well illustrate the antitype of Samuel's two corrupt sons; the Wesleyan movement's efforts and failures to reform these two classes of the Anglican clergy, that of Samuel's efforts and failures at reformation of his two sons; the dissatisfaction of the better elements of that Church in the Wesleyan movement with the corrupt ways of its bishops and presbyters and with Wesley's inability to change matters, that of the Israelites dissatisfied with Samuel's sons and his inability to reform them; these better elements' desiring, through what proved to be crown-lost leaders, a reformation that Wesley was unable to affect, that of the Israelites' desiring of Samuel a king as a more effective method and agent of conducting Israel's public affairs. These requests came from Wesley's preachers, who for the most part were not ordained, and thus could not, according to high church ideas, administer the sacraments: through certain ones, like Dr. Coke, desiring ordination as bishops at Wesley's hands; through the desire for the deed of declaration that, when adopted, went far toward sectarianizing the Wesleyan movement; and through the conference of 100 preachers pushing the matter of a separation of the Wesleyan movement from the Anglican Church. Wesley's many-years-long protests against the desires of the Methodist people, with pertinent reasons against sectarianizing his movement by separating it from that Church, correspond to Samuel's protests and reasons' against a king. Wesley's final yielding to the clamors corresponds to Samuel's similar yielding. Wesley's telling the people to abide by their stewardship teaching, and to wait on the Lord corresponds to Samuel's charge to them to abide each one in his city, waiting

on the Lord's providence. Wesley's referring all the pertinent matters to the Lord corresponds to Samuel's bringing the similar matters to the Lord. The Lord's answering Wesley's queries by His Spirit, Word and providences pertinent to the case corresponds to His answering Samuel's queries. Thus we see the antitype's fulfilment, as it was wrought out in connection with the Wesleyan movement. But the same general lines of procedure occurred in the transition from the other eleven Little Flock movements toward the eleven denominations into which later they were perverted. But it will be unnecessary to trace these things in all of them, the one example of the operation of the antitype sufficing to clarify that in each of the twelve movements.

(1) What thought was brought out on the chronological features of 1 Sam. 1, 2 and 3, 4? How does this matter stand as to 1 Sam. 5, 6? What situation proves this? What makes this possible? What other things suggest this? What do the Philistines suggest for the Gospel Age? In general, what do their five cities represent? In particular? Where are they described? What do cities Biblically symbolize? What two proofs are offered for this? How do the cited passages prove the first point? The second point? What conclusion do we draw from these proofs as to the five cities?

(2) Where are these cities? What is symbolic Egypt? Who is its king or god? How do the cited passages prove this? In what sense are the five symbolic cities in Egypt? What is symbolized by their speaking the language of Canaan? And not Hebrew? How do the cited passages prove these two points? What have all five required of their clergy and laity? How is this symbolized? Which one is the city of destruction? What does this mean? By what are these five cities typed in our study? What does Ashdod type? Gath? Ekron? Askelon and Gaza? What does Askelon probably type? Gaza? When will certainty likely come on this? For what general reasons do we believe that Ashdod types the Greek Catholic Church? Gath the Roman Catholic Church? Ekron the Church of England? What will bring this out more clearly?

(3) At the time of the antitype of v. 1 what was the antitypical Ark of the Lord? What was this doctrine? What made it the antitypical Ark then? Who were the main crown-losers who perverted it? During how long a period? Into what did they pervert it? When was this perversion completed in its first part? Second part? What is typed by the Philistines' taking the ark from Ebenezer? What is to be noted in this connection? What does Ashdod mean and type? What is typed by bringing the ark to Ashdod? To the temple of Dagon? Setting it beside Dagon? What kind of an image was Dagon? What formed his lower part? His upper part? What did each part lack? What does Dagon type? His upper part? His lower part? What, accordingly, does Dagon type? What is typed by the morrow of v. 3? By that of v. 4? What did Satan do with God's plan from Eden on until some time before Christ? Whom did he especially seek to counterfeit anticipatorily? How did he do this from Gen. 3:15? Deut. 18:15-18? Gen. 22:17, 18? 49:10? Num. 24:17? Gen. 9:26, 27?

(4) What conclusion do we draw from this as to Dagon? When did Satan make a more exact counterfeit? In this connection, what are we not to forget as to Satan's pertinent activity before the Gospel Age? After he heard Christ's and the Apostles' teachings? In what three particulars did he work out this counterfeit? In what system? Through whom did he work out the counterfeit of our Lord's natures? As the antitype of what? What kind of a mental task did they have to harmonize even seemingly John's pertinent teachings and their God-man theory? Who was the deepest thinker of all of them? What did he accomplish in this matter? What in reality are their speculations? What characterized their efforts to harmonize these two teachings? How are these efforts typed? From what two things will their failure appear? From when on does this history belong? What was done as to it at the council of Constantinople?

(5) What kind of and how many conclusions have the orthodox drawn from the God-man theory? What was the first of these? Despite what did they hold this thought? What other absurd doctrine did they teach, based on the view of the personal union of the natures in Christ? What conclusion did they draw from these lines

of thought? What expressions did they, accordingly, use? What did the expressions, Mother of God and God-bearer, occasion? In what did this controversy result? How is this typed? What two things in this connection should be kept in mind? What will this prepare us to see? Who was the most prominent person so affected? What was his position? Where was he trained? What pertinent effect did the Antiochian theology have on him? Whom did he bring with him to Constantinople? How was Anastasius affected by the expressions, mother of God, bearer of God, *etc.*? What did he do about it as to Nestorius? Under what three handicaps did Nestorius labor? Despite these handicaps, what did he do? With what theory did he oppose the God-man orthodox theory? In what respects are both views wrong? What is the Truth on the subject? What happened in the two transitions with the Logos' and human dispositions? During His three modes of existence how many natures did He have in each mode of existence? In the pre-human mode of existence? The human? The Divine? How do the cited passages prove this of the human and Divine modes of existence? Apart from the Truth view on Christ's person, how many views were there in the first half of the fifth century? What were they? What did the third view do with the others? What was the character of all three?

(6) What were the two characteristics of the pertinent debate? On whose side especially? In what two ways did he exercise shrewdness toward the Roman bishop? What did he thereby win? Whom else did he in the same way win over? How many patriarchs were there then? Where was each one's see? How did they line up on this matter? What national church also stood with Nestorius? How did the Emperor's family stand on the question? Who, especially in his family, stood with Cyril? Who were irreconcilably opposed? What did the pope demand? What did Cyril do? Nestorius? Thereupon what did the Emperor do? Who especially sided with Nestorius? With what kind of a retinue did Cyril appear at the council of Ephesus? The bishop of Ephesus? Before whose arrival did Cyril open the council? What did he secure? What did the pope's legates do as to the council? The Emperor and his plenipotentiary?

(7) In the meantime, what did the Arians do on the subject? Of what is their refutation the antitype? What did the antitypical Ashdodites see? As antitype of what? What is the antitype of the Ashdodites' setting up Dagon in his place after his first fall? Wherein does v. 4 find its antitype? What is dyoprosopism or Nestorianism? What is monophysitism? What is monothelitism? How in time were the last two points fought out? Who was Cyril's successor? How did they compare in intellectual and moral qualities? Who originated monophysitism? What did he think on the subject? What two men intrigued against him? Before whom? With what results? What did they then do? How did Dioscurus then proceed? What course did the Emperor as a result pursue? What occurred in a synod held in Constantinople in 448, despite the Emperor? What did Eutyches and Flavian then do? With what result? Thereupon what did the Emperor do? Who presided at the council at Ephesus in 449? What did he do as to Flavian? The Emperor as to Theodoret?

(8) What characterized this council? What does Church History call it? What did it condemn? How was Eusebius, bishop of Doretæum, Phrygia, treated when he sought to defend the doctrine of the two contemporaneous natures in Christ? What did Flavian and Eusebius then do? What did the council do to them? What did Dioscurus do when a bishop expostulated with him? What happened as a result of this riot? Who were saved by flight? What was then done to Eutyches and his three chief opponents? What did Leo's protest effect in the Emperor? What was convened in 451? What did it do with Dioscurus? With Eutychesism and Nestorianism? Who dictated the formula of orthodoxy on the controverted point? How does it read? How was the spirit of the Chalcedon council, compared with that of "the Robber Synod of Ephesus"? How did the monophysite party act toward Theodoret? What concession was made to win back the monophysites? What pope espoused the so-called heresy of monothelitism? What did his pertinent teaching do with the teaching of the pope's infallibility? What is monothelitism? In the ensuing controversy what error was accepted as orthodox? What is the Truth on the subject? On what three planes of being? Why in each of

these three modes of existence could there be only one contemporaneous will? What was the one-will doctrine called? What does the word mean?

(9) What errors are the source of these errors? What do these errors hold as to our Lord's person from Bethlehem onward? To the condemnation of what two errors did this error lead? Where? What truth did it logically deny? What was Satan seeking to do by making the Greek Catholics fight over the above-mentioned questions? While they were so fighting what was done with the Truth on the subject? What did the Arians do with the involved errors? By what is the refutative effect of the Truth as to the second error typed? How so? By what is the refutative effect of the Truth as to the third error typed? How so? What is typed by the Ashdodites' arising early in the morning of v. 4? What is typed by the words, only Dagon was left on him? Why does the type not specifically point out dyoprosopism, monophysitism and monothelitism? Where are these brought out?

(10) With what kind of steps did the Greek Catholic clergy and laity proceed to their God-man with two wills? How do they proceed from mental steps to their God-man with two wills? How is this typed? What is meant by the antitypical not treading on the threshold of Dagon's temple? What as a result does their theory make them do? How long? What effect will Armageddon have on this subject? What, accordingly, do we see typed in vs. 3-5? In vs. 6, 7? How did we describe matters above? Without reference to what? Why was this done? Where are the connected divisions? Where are the pertinent divisions and errors typed? How does the Bible type and symbolize sifting errors and their accompanying divisions? How does 1 Cor. 10:5-14 prove this? Ps. 91:6? Who in Ps. 91:7-10 is promised immunity therefrom? Who in principle have the promise of the same immunity?

(11) Who does not have such immunity? What does the account in 1 Sam. 5:6, 7 type? What was the plague of vs. 6, 7? What two things seem to suggest this? Why was the above-given description on the pertinent errors and resultant conflicts set forth? What did this fact make necessary? What will now be done? What should here be remembered? How did the ancient Greek and Roman minds stand in contrast? What modern nations exemplify

this contrast? What adaptability did the Greek mind have to Satan's purposes on the trinity and the God-man theories? Who of the Greeks busied themselves with these subjects? Where were these subjects discussed? How universal comparatively were these discussions?

(12) What were taken on all hands? *E.g.*, where? What spirit was kindled and increased? What resulted? What was the first of these? How many went into the Nestorian from the Greek Catholic Church? The Catholics of what countries went over to the Nestorian Church? Where did it spread during the dark ages? Of what was this and Orthodoxy's own errors a partial antitype? What are the antitypes of the men of Ashdod? Of the coasts thereof? Of the Lord's hand being on them? What else are parts of the antitypical plague? To whom was the monothelism offered? By whom? As what? Why? What was the net result? What two great divisions of the Greek Catholics prevail to this day? Where?

(13) Throughout these controversies what did the "orthodox" fight? Before what even did they begin to fight the related truths? Who gave the first squints toward the orthodox pertinent errors? About when? What did Origen do in this matter? About when? Dionesius of Rome? About when? Athanasius? About when? Against what was each one of these steps of error taken? Who in the Smyrna period first announced this Truth? Who then fostered it? By whom was it then defended during the Smyrna period? Who was its staunchest defender? How did Satan throughout this controversy proceed? Until what period did he act out this principle rather freely? Who brought out the Truth thereon that Satan sought to hide? How are the refutations of these three theories typed? How was the refutation of dyoprosopism or Nestorianism, dyophysitism, monophysitism, monothelism and dyothelism typed? How are the orthodox efforts to refute and banish the Truth during these controversies typed? How and by whom did this antitype begin? What was thereby started? Who started the second? How? Who started the third? How? How and by what did other emerods come? In this what was heavy on them? How long? How did the antitypical Ashdodites show that they recognized this? What types it?

(14) What is the antitype of the Ashdodites' calling and gathering together the Philistine lords? Of their deciding to send the ark away to Gath? What is noteworthy in all these controversies as to the Bishop of Rome? How did he decide? With how many doubtful exceptions? Real exceptions? What resulted from these orthodox answers? What else is typed in deciding to send away the ark? What Truth did the Greek and Roman Catholics hold in common? Despite what did the former not enter into controversies on this Truth? To whom did they leave these controversies to fight out? Of what else is this the antitype? What, as implied in the meaning of the word Gath, has Romanism been to the true Church? Through whom was the second Gospel-Age stewardship Truth given? What did it arouse? What crown-lost leaders perverted this movement into the Roman Catholic Church? Where did each live? When did Cyprian begin this evil course? By what teaching?

(15) What evil did this produce on Roman Catholics? What views and conditions created the setting that occasioned Cyprian's false teachings? How did Cyprian first stand on the subject? What happened when he returned from his flight before the Decian persecution? In what did this result? What theory did Cyprian oppose to the dissidents? When the persecution was renewed what change of view did Cyprian advocate? What at the same time was taking place at Rome? Who led the strict party? The mild party? What adherent of the mild practice fought Cyprian for his strict practice? How did Cyprian treat him? What did Novatus thereupon do? What did he there do? Under whose leadership? What were the relations of Novatian and Cornelius? What did both sides seek to secure? How did Cornelius misrepresent Novatian? Who sided with Cornelius? What in part influenced Cyprian thereto? Despite what did Cyprian attack Novatian's view? What was it? Why did he hold it? Wherein did both sides err? How extensive did Novatianism become? With whom did they side in the Arian controversy? How did the councils of Nice and Constantinople regard them? The Occidental Church? Honorius? At whose instigation? How long did they persist?

(16) What did both sides have? What was the error of the Novatianists? Why was this an error? What even was then prohibited? How do the cited Scriptures prove these points? When was the second one fulfilled? What kind of an error was on the other side? What two things were implied in it? In what treatise did Cyprian elaborate this thought? Of what was this error a partial antitype? Of what antitype was the resultant trouble a partial antitype? What set in about 60 years later? What was it? How long did it last? Why need we not here enter into details on the Donatist controversy? Who were the strict party therein? The mild party? To what did the latter object? Where did the controversy spread? Who decided against the Donatists? What set in against them? How did this first affect them?

(17) How did it later affect them? How was this met? How did this avail? What did Augustine do as to this? When did he start this? Like Cyprian, what did he bring out against them? How did he begin against them? What effect did their stubbornness have on him? How did he pervert Luke 14:23 to this end? Why did he advocate this error? Of what evil principle did this make him the father? What were its worst expressions? What had he previously sought to do? Why did they decline? What were they finally forced by the Emperor to do? Where and when was this debate held? Who were the two leading debaters of the Donatists? Of the Roman Catholics? How many Donatist bishops were present? Roman Catholic bishops? What failed to be achieved by this debate? What did the Emperor in 415 do as to the Donatists? What did the conquering Vandals do to both sides? To what did this lead? What question was also debated in this controversy? How did each side answer this question? What error did both sides hold on the question? What truth, if held, would have ended the debate? As it was, what did each side defend and attack? What was neglected altogether? What was the result of this debate to the Catholics? Who especially defended the Truth pertinent to the involved controversies? What was he?

(18) What was the worst antitypical emerald on Roman Catholics? In what was it embedded? Into what did it first grow? Into what did the arch-episcopal idea develop? Into what did this grow? By whom was the pope surrounded?

Who were they at first? Into what did they develop? Over whom did they never come? Why not? In what did the Romanist emerald reach its worst development? What three divisions occurred between the Greek and Roman Catholics? What did the Trullan council add to their mutual feelings? What was the first point that it raised against the Occidental Catholics? The second? The third? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth?

(19) What was the effect of the council's passing these six points? What one had this effect especially? What did it later cause? What in Rome's claims was in the background of many controversies between the Occidental and Oriental Christians? In what did this finally result? Who was Photius? What did he and the other three Eastern Patriarchs and a council charge against the Western Catholics? In the consequent controversies what did each side do to the other? In whom did these controversies come to a head? What were the final results contrasted with previous results of their controversies? What was at the root of their differences? Despite what, what was never achieved? In what did each antitypical emerald result? Of what was this an antitype?

(20) What church is typed in v. 10? What was the cause of the Anglican Church's coming into existence as a separate sect? By what will this appear? Who was God's agent and the latter's supporter in presenting the stewardship Truth of the Church of England? What movement did they start? Into what was it perverted? What were the circumstances leading to its promulgation? Why will we not here go into detail on this question? What did the pope do in the matter? What question did Cranmer raise on this matter? What two answers to this question did he give? What answer does the papal view require? Why did Rome give this answer to the question? What was the result of this controversy? Of what was the resultant controversy the antitype? What resulted from the antitypical Ark coming into the Church of England? Of what two statements in v. 11 is this the antitype?

(21) What Truth set forth by Cranmer, with Latimer's support, must be kept in mind? What does this not imply? Why not? What does this Truth imply? How do the cited passages prove this? What influenced the Church of England to desire an earthly head? Whom did it

accept as its earthly head? Whose place in the Church of England did he take? What did this error become? What proves this statement? What did this make the tyrant Henry VIII? In what three spheres did he use that control? With what result? What kind of a creed did he give the Church of England? When was it modified? What evil things did he do and continue? What terrible law did he originate and have enacted? What was its first error? Second? Third? Fourth? Fifth? Sixth? What was the unconditional penalty of the first? Of the first offense against the other five? Of the second? What did it decree as to the marriages of priests, monks and nuns? If they thereafter married again? How did it regard abstinence from attendance at mass and confession? What was a marked difference between this and former laws as to abjurers? How does it compare with other English laws? What was Henry's relation to it? Apart from rejecting the papal supremacy, what in reality was Henry? How was this law enforced? In what did it result antitypically? By virtue of what? Of what was this doctrine a gross perversion?

(22) When did Henry VIII die? Who succeeded him? How did he stand? Who was his guardian, teacher and adviser? How did he influence Edward VI? What was under him revoked? How were Romanists treated? What two pen-products were adopted? How is this part of his work typed? What did these two pen-products contain? What gross error did the 42 articles contain? What did it effect in Mary's days? When did Edward VI die? What happened to his nominee as his successor as such? Who became his successor? What did she at once proceed to do? Why did she spare Cranmer the fate of others? What did she do with the pro-Protestant laws of Edward VI? With the law of the six articles? What did she then do? While annulling the law making the sovereign head of the English Church, how did she act on the subject? Why these two contradictory acts? What did she do to all Protestant bishops? Whom of them did she imprison? Who was made prime minister and the executor of the six articles law? What was done with the living and dead Protestant leaders? With married priests and their families? What did the exiled Cardinal Pole

do? What began in 1555? For her cruelty what attribute was applied to her name Mary? How did the nation react to her cruelty?

(23) What was the character of the persecution? According to the discovered records, at least how many were burned for rejecting Romanism and accepting Protestantism? What cannot now be proved by legal records? Who holds the record and will publish it? Who, among many others, were burned in 1555? What noted one was burned in 1556? Whom and when did Mary marry? What was his character and conduct? Why do we know that he aroused Mary's persecuting zeal? What effect on the persecution did his leaving her and never returning have? What as a result did she institute? Under whose presidency? What was his course as such? How else did thousands die? Why? How long did this persecution rage? What stopped it? How did she die in the public's view? What is her place in English history? The effect of her course after nearly four centuries? Of what were the Marian persecutions a partial antitype? What else was a part of it? When did more of that antitype come? To what were these more or less due? Who even acted on the principle, though denying the theory? Why so?

(24) Who succeeded Mary on the throne? How related to Mary? Where was her course given in some detail? What position did she accept? Who educated her? What is here said of her mother? What was Elizabeth's standing as a sovereign? What did her 45 years' reign accomplish as to Romanism? What did she do with the law on the six articles? What was not, and what was her course toward Romanists? How did she proceed? With what effect on the pope? What act did Parliament pass in 1559? What did it demand? On what penalties? Especially as to perversion to Romanism? On a second such perversion? What was argued in defense of such a law? What was done with Cranmer's 42 articles? What change did the revision of the 42 to the 39 articles make in their general character? What was done with these 39 articles in 1562 and 1572?

(25) As to what was the Anglican Church set up by law? What did the Law of Uniformity in favor of the Anglican Church require and tolerate? What was penalized? What was thereby made compulsory? What did

this bring upon Episcopalians and non-Episcopalians? Who were the latter? What evils did this law cause? What did also this law prove to be? What were the disobeyers of this law called? How did this condition show itself in the days of James I? In the days of Charles I? Why so? What evils did he practice in state and church? What resulted from his evil course? In what did the revolution result as to the chief of state and the chief of church? What followed thereupon? What was done on the restoration of Charles II? By Parliament in offset to Charles II's Romanizing course? How did Charles II die? What was the first course of his successor brother, James II? The second? Why this? To what did this lead? With what result? How was this result brought about? In what and by whom is his and his Irish Catholic army's defeat celebrated? When? What did that defeat end? What did William's Toleration Act do for all Protestants and Catholics? What is a summary on the nature and effects of the royal supremacy in the church? What did its effects prove as to God's part in these matters?

(26) What was done above without detailed reference to 1 Sam. 5:10-12? What will here be given? What is the antitype of the ark's entering Ekron? The deadly destruction there? Through what did it come? From whose to whose reign? Why did the Lord permissively send it? What is its type? What is the antitype of the trouble's being on great and small? How long? Especially in how many of them? Of what were these long-drawn-out sufferings the antitype? While v. 9 applies to Gath, why may its events be applied to Ekron? To what did this fact leads just before? What is the antitype of the trouble starting at Ekron just as the ark was brought here? What led to the troubles? When did the cries antitypical of those at Ekron start? What was the cry? What did it antitype? What is the antitype of the Ekronites' sending for the lords of the Philistines? The antitype of the lords of the Philistines? Why were they called, type and antitype? How was it done in the antitype? What were the antitypical gatherings? When will this be shown? What is the antitype of the Ekronites' telling their sad experiences to the Philistine lords? What are we not to understand to be meant by the statements

of v. 12? Rather, what are we thereby to understand? What in type and antitype reached up to God?

(27) What did we learn from our study of 1 Sam. 5? What does this mean? At what year for each of the five involved denominations did they dismiss the antitypical Ark? What period is the antitype of the seven months of v. 1? When did these denominations set into operation the antitype of v. 2? Why is this so? In antitype of what? What did they effect by their creed-making? How are we not to understand them to have expressed this thought? In antitype of what? How was it done? Why?

(28) From what will this appear? What occasioned it as to the Romanist Church? How did she attempt to repel these blows? What were the dates of the Council of Trent? What did the Romanists there do? What, from the Divine standpoint, did their creed-making actually effect? How was this typed? What occasioned it as to the Anglican Church? What did the Anglicans do as to this matter? Divinely viewed, what did they actually effect? What occasioned it as to the Lutheran Church? What did the Lutheran higher clergy and theologians do about it? Divinely viewed, what did they thereby actually effect? What occasioned it as to the Calvinistic Church? What did her higher clergy and theologians do about it? Divinely viewed, what did they thereby actually effect? What occasioned it as to the Greek Church? What did her higher clergy and theologians do about it? Divinely viewed, what did they thereby actually effect? What did these matters antitype?

(29) Where did the antitypes of vs. 3-9 occur? Usually how are speeches antityped? How above any other period is the time from 1541 to 1581 marked? What creedal parts appeared in 1580 in the Book of Concord? Who principally worked on each one? By what were the first five of these occasioned? The Formula of Concord? Who during its making fell from the Little Flock? What work did he write while yet a member of it? How did the Council of Trent sit? What did it publish in 1564? What did this make it? What are defined in its creed? In opposition to whom? Who supplemented its creedal expressions? By what three instruments? What do the antitypes under study not include?

(30) What, among other things, did our last study show of certain activities of Cranmer, aided by Ridley, and of the convocation in 1562 and of Parliament in 1572? What have the 39 articles been ever since? What territorial differences were there in the acceptance of the Lutheran creeds and the Calvinistic creeds? What is the name of the Calvinistic creed for Switzerland? Germany? France? Belgium? Scotland? What are not considered in the antitype under study? Through whom did the Greek Church reject the creeds of the other four involved denominations? What did she for nearly a century deem unnecessary? What did the Greek Synod of Jerusalem (1672) do as to Jeremiah II's pertinent declaration? What does this study show as to the limit of the pertinent creed-making? How is this related to 1 Sam. 6?

(31) How was the decision to cast off the antitypical Ark not made? How is this typed? Of what were these rejections made a part? How did the creed-makers regard their caricatured stewardship doctrines and gross errors? Their issuing of them? What did they thereby think they would effect Godward? How is this typed? Why did they think an atonement to be necessary? By what did they think it would be made? How is this illustrated by the Lutherans? Romanists? Whom else does this principle involve? How did all of them look upon their pre-creed-making experiences? How is this typically suggested? What effect did they think their creed-making would have? What could they not understand?

(32) After receiving the answer to their questions, what did the antitypical Philistines then ask? What were they told? How did they consider the involved teachings? Accordingly, fit for what two things? Of what were these things the antitypes? Why did they think the five golden mice and emerods a proper offering, type and antitype? What proves that the five antitypical mice were more or less erroneous? That the five antitypical emerods were erroneous? How do the cited passages prove this of the mice? What is the mouse of Is. 66:17? Its swine flesh and its abomination? How does our previous study prove this of the emerods? The first set of cited passages? The second set of cited passages? What conclusion as to all the creeds are we warranted in drawing? Why did the antitypical Philistines think their creeds would glorify

God? How is this typed? What did they expect to obtain by their trespass offering, type and antitype?

(33) Why also did the higher clergy and theologians consider their greed offerings pleasing to the Lord? What did they consider a refusal to make such creeds to be? How typed? Contemporaneously, against what was a caution given in type and antitype? Even worse than those hardening? Why? What did the higher clergy and theologians then advise? How typed? What further did they advise? How typed? What did they require of these doctrinal and practical expressions? How typed? What did they advise as to the implications of their doctrines and practices? How typed? Upon what was placed the responsibility of sending away the antitypical Ark, golden mice and emerods? How is this typed? What was supposedly assigned to the second and third as to the first? How is this typed? In what were the second and third placed? How is this typed? Of what were they sure, type and antitype?

(34) While making their creeds, what were the five denominations doing to one another? In what were they a unit? By what are the Independents typed? Of whom did they consist? What did the creedists do with the formers' stewardship doctrines? In what condition were these then, as distinct from that of the stewardship doctrines of the five involved denominations? How is this typed? How in contrast did the five denominations consider the Independents? How is this typed? Where did the leading clergy and theologians think the involved stewardship doctrines would go? How is this typed? What was their attitude of mind as to the source of their plagues? How is this typed? What did they think would give them certainty as to their source? How is this typed? What was done with the advice of the higher clergy and theologians? How is this typed? How do we know that their advice was carried out? How is this typed? What did they do with certain questions raised by their credal doctrines and practices? How is this typed? How is this fact illustrated in the Romanist Church? In the Lutheran Church? The Calvinistic Church? The Greek Church? The Anglican Church? What twofold course did they follow as to such questions? How is this typed?

(35) What, accordingly, did the higher clergy and theologians do? In antitype of what? What are the details of

these acts? What did their doctrinal teachings and practical precepts do under the circumstances? How is this typed? How was it done? How typed? What did these teachings announce? How is this typed? What did these teachings further do? How is this typed? What did the leaders do? How far? How are these things typed?

(36) What must be remembered in construing this type? How does this apply to the antitype? What do the facts of the case, considered in the light of the above presentation, suggest of our interpretation? At what, therefore, should we marvel? Why? What in this would we not have thought? What could not have put these thoughts into, nor taken them out of this narrative? What should our understanding of this prompt us to do?

(37) What in our study may strike some as contradictory? Why this seeming contradiction? How does the camp picture present the matter? The Philistine picture? What do we conclude therefrom? How do the various uses of the Israelites illustrate this same principle? What is the difference in the antitype? How does St. Paul's interpretation in 1 Cor. 1:1-4 show the picture of real Spiritual Israel? In 1 Cor. 1:5-11 show the picture of nominal Spiritual Israel? In what other pictures is the same principle illustrated? What conclusion are we thus warranted in drawing?

(38) What were the Independents of all kinds doing from 1564 and 1581 onward? In antitype of what? Amid what conditions? What types this? In what were they engaged? What types this? What did they recognize? In antitype of what? What did the Baptists, Unitarians and Congregationalists see on the true Church? In contrast with what? What did Unitarians see on the person and office of Christ? Udenominational Christians on all five star-members' teachings? How did these Truth views affect them? How is this typed? What combination of things is mentioned here? Where did it go? How is this typed? What prominent things stood in this sphere of activity? How is this typed? What did these do with the involved deliberative bodies and their doctrines and practices initially and progressively? As what? How was God's acceptance manifested? What types these things?

(39) Who took part in these services as to the star-members' teachings? How? Who else took part in them?

What Scriptures show this to be reasonable? How is this typed? What facts are in harmony with such an antitype among Unitarians? Among Baptists? Among Congregationalists? Among undenominational crown-losers? What else did they do? How is this typed? Why did they do this? How is this typed? What did they do with all these things? How is this typed? What did they do by their linguistic, interpretational, historical and systematic studies? With whose hearty and joyous co-operation did they do these things? What did they thereby offer up? What else did they offer up? Amid what? How are these things typed? How long a period did they do these things?

(40) Of what were the leaders of the five involved denominations observers during these 80 years? In antitype of what? Amid what were they such observers? How did they do their observing? What therein did they repudiate and defend? Upon whom did the brunt of the defense of the creeds fall? Why? How is this typed? Of what did the leaders of the five denominations feel sure? Why did they thus feel sure? How are these things typed?

(41) What do vs. 17 and 18 do? How do things differ in the presentation from that of vs. 4, 5? What are the grossest error and the stewardship doctrine of the Greek Church? By what are it and these two things typed? What is the grossest error of the Calvinistic Church? Its stewardship doctrine? By what are it and these two things typed? What are the grossest error and the stewardship doctrine of the Lutheran Church? By what are it and these things typed? What are the grossest error and stewardship doctrine of the Romanist Church? By what are it and these things typed? What are the grossest error and stewardship doctrine of the Anglican Church? By what are it and these things typed? As what were these doctrines and errors sent to God's real people? As whose offerings? How is this typed? Who participated with the leaders in this service? How is this typed? To whom were these teachings sent? Where were they stationed? How is this typed? Until when does this great truth persist? How is this typed? What is the antitype of the writing of the typical fact? Among whom does, and among whom does not, this great truth remain? How is this typed?

(42) What did some of the antitypical Beth-Shemites do? How is this typed? What is the more likely translation of the pertinent typical statement? What facts favor

this likelihood? What was quite unlikely in this case? Likely? So far as the Hebrew is concerned, what must be said? What would the antitype be? Give some examples of Unitarians doing this. Of Baptists doing this. Of Congregationalists doing this. What did they do in such studies? What did God cause to happen to them? To Little Flock members among them? Great Company members among them? Justified among them? Campers among them? Among other ways, what manifested their fallen condition? Into what did many undenominational Christians go?

(43) What in v. 19 are mistranslated? How does Dr. Young properly translate them? What similar mistranslation is there in the A. V. and the Septuagint? Where does God correct it? To what is the mistranslation due? What determines the meaning? Why in connection with Beth-Shemesh and Bethlehem should it be translated *leaders, chief ones, princes*? How many were not, and how many were smitten? How distributed? What made the proportion of leaders killed large? How is this typed? How did the proportion in the leaders and led smitten stand? How did these siftings affect the others? How is this typed? Wherein was this grief felt? Where are these facts found? What do they prove? What proves that the symbolic slaughter was great? How is this typed? What especially emphasizes the great smiting?

(44) By what did the antitypical Beth-Shemites ask the questions of v. 20? What is meant by standing before the Lord? Who were such? What happened to the speculators among them? How did their symbolic death affect the others? What did this fear prompt them to antitype? How should the second question of v. 20 be rendered? Why? How in general and in detail was this question antityped? So far as v. 20 is concerned, not further than what had the antitypical Beth-Shemites proceeded? In other words, what did they and what did they not do in this matter?

(45) How did the knowledge of the situation just discussed come to the more faithful? How is this typed? What did these messengers declare? How is this typed? How did these messengers invite faithful consecrated ones to accept the eight rejected star-members' teachings? How is this typed? To what does 1 Sam. 7:1, 2 really belong? What does that suggest as to them here? What did the

more faithful ones among the consecrated do in the premises? How is this typed? What did they then do with them? How is this typed? Into whose special care did they put these? How is this typed? What corroborates these statements? What did the eight involved denominations do with their beliefs? What did this petrification become? What did the involved dogmatical works do with the creedal views? In what did this result? What occurred concurrently with this dead orthodoxy? In what condition was piety when antitypical Beth-Shemesh was seeking to get rid of the antitypical Ark?

(46) What did the Lord not then permit? What proves this? How is this typed? By whom are these typed? Who first of all were among these? How are they typed? What were the abilities of some of these? For what did all of these in their churches stand? On what did they insist? What were they called in Germany? In Italy? In France? In Britain? Describe Arndt, Spener and Franke, as German representatives of these faithful Christians, Molinos, as a Spanish representative of these in Italy, Madame Guyon, Archbishop Fenelon, the two Arnaulds, Racine, De Sacy, Pascal, Quesnel and Tillemont, as French representatives of these, Fox and Bunyan, as English representatives of these. How may they be described in comparison with their co-operating brethren? Of whom were they the antitype? Who were the antitype of Abinadab?

(47) How did such differ in their places in life? What did they receive? What was George Fox used by God to do? In this connection, what are we not to understand of all of them? What are we to understand of them in this connection? What at least did all of them receive? What was the character and accompaniment of their ministry? Who especially persecuted these? Whose condemnation and imprisonment did they secure? The suppression of what did they secure? The scattering of whom? How long was the period of the activities of these? How does the type prove this? What mistaken sense does the A. V. give to the length of the ark's stay at Kirjath-jearim? How does Dr. Young correctly translate this passage, giving its right sense? About how long was the ark at Kirjath-jearim? What facts prove this? What is the time thought

of v. 2? How is this typed? When was this lamentation and the end of the 20 years antitypically fulfilled?

(48) What was the effect of Deism on the British people in the second half of the 17th and in the first half of the 18th century? On what did Deism speak much? Despite this, what did it effect? What did it at first affect? What did its ridicule and disregard of the Bible effect? In what did this result? Who were the leading Deists of the old ethical school? Into what did they develop increasingly one from the other? At approximately what time was the period of their activity? What characterized the second class of Deists? Who were the main representatives of the school of Deists? Approximately what was the period of their activity? What was the character of their influence? What was the general character of the third class of Deists? Who was its leading British representative? What was his position? Who were its leading French representatives? What was the position of each of these? In final analysis, what was the effect of all of these Deists?

(49) What did Deism's evil effects cause? How is this typed? What occurred at this juncture? Of what does P '29, 86 (5) - 89 (17) treat? What in a summary does Samuel's speech (v. 3) type? When and with what did Wesley's star-membership begin? What did he henceforth preach? What was the sphere of his ministry, as described by him? How typed? What four things did his preaching and writing stress? How typed? What did these four things generally and specifically imply? How typed? What things did he strongly emphasize? How typed? To what three ways of carrying out consecration did he exhort? How typed? What effects of God's working did he show would come therefrom? How typed? Whom does 1 Sam. 7 show to have become the antitypical Philistines? What are the antitypical Philistines always, generally and specifically? What are they usually?

(50) What effect did Wesley's ministry have? How typed? What is the movement called that he led? What is it often called? How did George III speak of it and its leaders? What did Deism's effects meet from the Great Revival? What heart effect on the multitude did this movement's preachings and writings have? To what were great numbers led? To what were generous numbers

led? What three things in all their forms were set aside? How typed? Even what kind of sinners, unbelievers and opponents were favorably affected? What characterized the converts? What did the true "Wesleyans" become? What kind of a people did they become? How typed? What were the themes that were preached to the public? In the various meetings of the believers? On what was the chief stress laid? What was thus preached and lived?

(51) What were the main other themes stressed before the brethren? In what respects was the watchfulness of conscience directed? How typed? What was shown of carelessness therein? What were all to do to one another? How typed? As to prayer, how was Wesley, as many examples show? What did he do and promise as to prayer? How typed? What effect did this have on the brethren? How typed? Where did they practice watchfulness and prayer? How did Wesley help therein? Why? What did they do as to the Bible? How typed? What did they do as to such teachings? How did they do this? In whose pertinency and interest? How typed? Through what kinds of service did they do this? How typed? What did they add to this? How typed? What were specially arranged for such confessions? Who was their leader in all this? In what manner? How typed?

(52) What did this great revival soon attract? How typed? Despite the Deists' wicked effects, wherein did they not prevail? Why not? What class of Deists became now active? In what ways? How is this typed? How did this Deistical activity affect the Faithful? How typed? What did their fears prompt them to do? How typed? For what did they request his prayers? How typed? What did he thereupon do? Of what two classes did his preachers consist? What was the character of this ministry? Particularly of its lay part? Who spurred them on? How typed? How did God regard their service? How typed? What was its purpose? How typed? In what two ways did Wesley personally share in this ministry? How typed? During these works what did the Deists do? How typed? How did the Lord respond to the situation? How typed? What similarity existed between the means of conflict?

(53) For what will a brief mention of the pertinent writings and writers serve? What writings and writers will first be mentioned? Who were they? Approximately

when did they live? What are the titles of their chief works? Why were these past writings used in this controversy? Who helped in producing them? Which of these writings was the most convincing? Give a brief description of its history. What other of these past works was also especially helpful? What writers and writings appearing during the controversy deserve special mention? Which work additional to the Analogy was the most able and effective of all of these? Briefly describe its history. Whom did God use to end this controversy? What was the character of the controversy with the Deists?

(54) How did God answer Wesley's prayer? Who were defeated in this controversy? By what lines of thought? What was the position of antitypical Israel therein? How typed? What is implied in being at antitypical Mizpeh? What did they do with the positions of the Deists? Who was not an idle spectator of this controversy? How did he participate in it? How typed? How did he set forth the Bible in relation to the Christian conscience and the sanctified reason? How typed? In his defense of the Bible to what did he often appeal? How did he set it forth? How typed? In what ways did he from these standpoints prove it true? What especially did he prove thereby? How typed?

(55) In this controversy what happened to the Deists? How typed? Who no longer defend their positions? To what has sectarian unbelief turned from Deism? What did Deism not do in Wesley's later years? How typed? What did God do to them then? Through whom and what? What is the character of their efforts since Wesley's days? What teachings had Deists taken from Christians? How typed? What did the Deists do with such teachings while in their possession? What was done with these teachings as a result of the above-described controversy? How typed? How extensive was the reconquest? What happened with Deistical teachings touching on Christian thought? How typed? What was done to sinners by the Wesleyan movement? How typed? What did Wesley do to the end of his life? How typed? How old did he become? How long was he a star-member? What activity did he continue unto old age? To what three classes did he minister? How typed in each case? What was his relation to these three classes? How typed? What was his habitual spiritual abode? How typed? What

were his official positions there? Whom did he gather to the Lord? Who were his more prominent faithful fellow-laborers? In fact all of whom? How typed?

(56) What does 1 Sam. 8 do as to the antitype? Whom does Samuel represent for the Jewish Harvest? In most of the Gospel Age until about 1850? For what did they arrange? What is the Biblical proof for this arrangement? How typed? Of what two kinds have the elders in each of the pertinent movements been? Upon what was this distinction not based? Rather, upon what was it based? How did they compare officially? How did they differ individually? By the Lord's will what did the abler ones become? To what did this doubtless lead? How do matters now stand in this respect? In our Pastor's day? Why is this so? How did matters in this respect stand during the Apostolic days? Despite Apostolic disapproval, what evils existed among some elders, *i.e.*, bishops? How do the cited Scriptures prove this point? What did this not imply? What did it imply? What did all do?

(57) Shortly after John's death how was the leading elder designated? How was this term first used? Under whose lead did a change set in, about 115 A.D.? What was the change? Into what did this misdevelopment increase? How was this deterioration typed? Whom did Joel, Samuel's first-born, type? Abiah, his second-born? What did they first type? Later on? Like whom were two kinds of elders in the twelve Little Flock movements before their perversion into sects? How were they after such perversion? What kind of a typical character have 1 Sam. 8 and much of the events connected with Saul? At first what did these two kinds of elders teach? How typed? What three classes of things did the falling and fallen leaders seek? How is each typed? According to Church history, where did these two classes of leaders in general and particular do such acts? In whose ways did they thus not follow? How typed?

(58) What did the better leaders in each of the twelve denominations do as to this situation? How typed? To whom did they submit the situation? How typed? In what character condition did they find them? How typed? What did those better leaders tell them? How typed? What did they then request? How typed? What examples were cited in corroboration in type and antitype? How

did this request strike the Little Flock, especially its leaders? How typed? What did these properly do? How typed? Why did God give the answer, type and antitype? How was the answer given, type and antitype? What was His answer, type and antitype? What typical and antitypical correction did God give these? What procedure do both the type and the antitype prove that God at times follows? What comfort did God give, type and antitype?

(59) What did God give antitypical Samuel to understand? Amid what events? How typed? Before giving his consent, what was antitypical Samuel charged to do to the people? How was the charge given? How typed? Why and how was antitypical Samuel to protest? How typed? How did antitypical Samuel act toward the charge? How typed? What did he show them? How typed? What seven things did antitypical Samuel tell the people the crown-lost leaders would do to their stronger ones? How is each of these seven things typed? What three things did antitypical Samuel say they would do to the people's weaker ones? How is each of these three things typed? What three things of theirs did antitypical Samuel say they would give to their servants? How is each of these three things typed? What tithes, type and antitype, would be levied for their servants? What would they do with the Little Flock and Great Company brethren, their best students and warriors and their teachings? How typed? What would they do with the Lord's people? How typed? What would they do to those who desired to make them their leaders? How typed? How would these oppressions affect the people? How typed? From whom would they seek deliverance from their oppressors? How typed? What would God do to their cries? How typed?

(60) What was the effect of the star-members', *etc.*, protests? How typed? In what did the people persist? How typed? When in each of the twelve Little Flock movements did this course set in? What is meant, type and antitype, by the words, "like all the nations"? Why did they so desire, type and antitype? What did the star-members, *etc.*, do to the people? How typed? What did they do before the Lord? How typed? How and what did God answer? How typed? What was then done, type and antitype?

(61) In what did the antitype of 1 Sam. 8 occur? What, apart from illustrations, was given above? With what movement will the antitype be illustrated? Give the types of 1 Sam. 8 and their antitypes in their various parts as illustrated in the Wesleyan movement. How did this matter stand in the other eleven Little Flock movements later perverted into eleven denominations? What will here be unnecessary?

CHAPTER III

SAMUEL AND SAUL.

1 Sam. 9—15.

SAUL MADE KING. HIS VICTORY OVER NAHASH. SAMUEL'S VINDICATION AND EXHORTATIONS. SAUL'S FIRST WAR WITH THE PHILISTINES. HIS DISOBEDIENCE.

THE FIRST eight chapters of 1 Samuel center about Samuel; and the following seven (1 Sam. 9—15) center about Samuel and Saul. For these reasons our studies of these first eight chapters were entitled Samuel, and our studies of 1 Sam. 9—15 are being given the title, Samuel and Saul. We trust that the readers have had enjoyment of, and edification by the study of 1 Sam. 1—8, and we pray the Lord to bless to them the study of 1 Sam. 9—15. In 1 Sam. 9—15 Samuel continues to type the Little Flock as a whole, especially in its more prominent members, and more especially in the star-members and their special helpers during the Interim. In these chapters Saul types the crown-lost leaders, more especially the most prominent of these, in crucial times, in each of Christendom's twelve denominations. There is, therefore, a twelve-fold antitype to the types of 1 Sam. 9—15, *i.e.*, these chapters have had their fulfillment in the history of each of the twelve denominations, in so far as it concerns the crown-lost leaders of each of them. Time and space will not here permit a detailed description of each antitype as it was fulfilled in each of the twelve denominations, but an illustration of the fulfillment as an example of their fulfillments in the other denominations will be offered for each episode in a different denomination; and thus a fair idea of the involved principles applicable to all will be given. In our studies of the Gospel-Age Princes, based on Num. 7, we have given many details on the crown-lost princes in their capacity of perverting the twelve Little Flock movements

into the twelve denominations of Christendom, as well as on the refutations, corrections and ethics that they offered on the twelve stewardship doctrines of these twelve denominations.

(2) Crown-losers (man of Benjamin [*son of the right hand*], 1) as a class were a figurative bow (Kish [*bow*]) that shot out figurative arrows against their opponents, powerfully, (Abiel [*my father is mighty*]), as they held together (Zeror [*bundle*]) as a company of new creatures (Bechorath [*firstborn*]) refreshed (Aphiah [*refreshed*]) by the Little Flock brethren, whose chief favorites (Benjamite) they were, as they were able warriors (mighty man of power). The chief of these crown-losers were the crown-lost princes, or leaders (a son ... Saul [*desired, asked*], 2). But as our Pastor indicated, Saul primarily types in general the Jewish Age Israelites and in particular Israel's main political leaders of the Jewish Age, just as in contrast he showed that David represents the Gospel Age Little Flock, particularly its leaders, and Solomon, the Millennial Age Christ, Head and Body. But as more timely we have been giving the Gospel Age antitype of Saul, the Parousia antitype of David and hope to give sometime the Epiphany antitype of Solomon. Accordingly, in the present chapter the crown-lost leaders are presented as the Gospel Age antitype of Saul. These were very gifted (choice) and in the beginning of their careers were of fine character (goodly). Among Christians as a whole (children of Israel) none were better in character than these; and in mental talents they were far above their brethren (from his shoulder ... higher ... people). The mere mention of names such as Origen, Augustine, Chemnitz, Calvin, Simon Menno, (Faustus) Socinus, Barrows, Barclay, Coke, Campbell and Himes, as the chief crown-lost leaders of their respective denominations, proves this of them. In fact, Origen, Augustine, Chemnitz and Calvin are generally considered as having intellects that rank among the ablest of the race. The various sets of

crown-losers (Kish, 3), as embracing in their number the crown-lost leaders (Saul) before the rise of each of the twelve denominations, had lost hold of various of their doctrines (asses ... were lost), *e.g.*, before the Greek Catholic Church arose, due to various errors on the relation of the Father and the Son arising during the second and early third centuries, crown-losers lost the Truth on the three natures of Christ and various features of Christ's office; again, due to various controversies arising among Lutherans, crown-losers lost considerable truths that Luther had presented. The crown-losers (Kish) sent out their ablest representatives (said to Saul ... go seek the asses) to seek to find these lost truths. They sent along with them in this search the doctricians among the faith-justified, Uzzielite Levites (Take ... servants with thee), which fact we construe, first, from the fitness of sending just such ones along for the search, and, second, from the fact that the Uzzielites, as the fourth group of the Kohathite Levites, had a fourth part of the Kohathite Truth teachings (a fourth part of a shekel of silver, 8).

(3) Up to his anointing Saul represents the *prospective* crown-lost leaders, who as such were undergoing preparatory work to fit them later to become crown-lost *leaders*. These in their turn made (1) searching investigations for the lost truths throughout Christendom (passed through mount Ephraim, 4); (2) they did the same as to the lectures and publications of the third (land of Shalisha [*third part*]) main group of the Gospel-Age faith-justified, *i.e.*, the Kohathites, in their linguistic, exegetical, historical and doctrinal lectures and works; (3) they specialized in this search on the subtile theologians' teachings of past times (land of Shalim [*foxes*]); (4) they examined the labors of the crown-losers (land of Benjamites), but all was in vain (they found them not). So many, varied and contradictory were the pertinent teachings that none satisfied them so far. Finally, in

their search, as they came (5) to the teachings of Little Flock writers (land of Zuph [*honeycomb*], 5), the prospective crown-lost princes suggested to their faith-justified doctrinal companions that the search be given up, as in vain (Saul ... servant ... let us return), fearing that their crown-lost brethren would give up anxiety about the lost teachings, would think of them as gone astray into error and would thus be distressed about them (father ... asses and take thought for us). These faith-justified doctricians (he, 6) in their study of doctrine and its history, recognizing that Little Flock brethren (man of God), especially their leaders, more especially their star-member ones, had brought forth lost truths, called (said) the attention of the prospective crown-lost princes to the writings and persons of such Little Flock leaders, as active in Little Flock movements from time to time in various denominations of the nominal church (in this city). They spoke highly of their characters (honorable man) and of the truthfulness of their teachings (all ... cometh surely to pass); therefore they suggested that they consult them (let us go thither), in the hope that they might show them the way to the lost truths that they sought (peradventure he can shew ... we should go); for we are to remember that the Little Flock brethren who began the movements later perverted into denominations started them in previously existing denominations and always worked in the denominations until 1846. The prospective crown-lost princes objected that they had no truths to present to these, as the reason for requesting an interview (what shall we bring the man? for the bread is spent ... no present to bring, 7). In humility they deprecated their condition (what have we?). To this the faith-justified dogmaticians answered that they had doctrinal features to offer (I have ... fourth part ... silver, 8), which would show the Little Flock brethren their Christian faith, offered them for their use to influence them to help (I give ... to tell us our way).

(4) Here a linguistic remark is parenthetically made by the authors of 1 Sam. (Samuel, Gad and Nathan seem to have been the authors of 1 and 2 Sam., 1 Chro. 29:29), to enable their readers to see that the seer of former times was the prophet of their times; for in vs. 11, 18, 19, the obsolete word *seer* (not *prophet*, the current word) is used, to prepare the readers, for whose use the linguistic explanation (9) was made. The prospective crown-lost leaders recognized the propriety of the dogmaticians' remark (said Saul ... Well said, 10), and agreed to his proposal (let us go); and both went to these Little Flock brethren in the denomination where their movement was active at the twelve pertinent times respectively (they went ... where the man of God was). They surmounted the difficulties (hill [literally, ascent], 11) in the way of gaining access to the pertinent denomination (city). Amid such difficult experiences they met providentially some newly consecrated brethren (young maidens) who were seeking Truth in the Scriptures (draw water). They asked these the position of the Little Flock leaders (Is the seer here?) as, *e.g.*, Calvin at various places in France and in Geneva inquired of newly consecrated brethren concerning the views of Zwingli and Oecolampadius, the Swiss reformers and starters of the Little Flock movement that Calvin later perverted into the Presbyterian Church. Such consecrated ones offered them not only what they asked (answered ... He is, 12), but volubly and detailedly gave them information not asked for, but calculated to help them. It is just like the newly consecrated to give more than they are asked for! They told that the Little Flock leaders had preceded them (before you); they urged haste (haste), for they had during that period (today) come to that denomination (city) to serve their truths (sacrifice) on behalf of the people (of [literally, for] the people) throughout the denomination (in the high place). They assured them that they would find them in the denomination's most public

place (as soon as [literally, at your entering, *i.e.*, at the gate] ... the city ... find him, 13). They urged that they see them before they became engaged with others, which would preclude a speedy interview, for their engagements made it hard to gain such an interview (before ... eat). Otherwise, like the rest of the people, they would have to wait to see them until after they had performed their service and all had partaken thereof (people will not eat until ... he doth bless the sacrifice ... they eat that be bidden). Hence they urged haste (get you up ... shall find him). These typical maidens were as observant as they were newsy, for they observed Samuel's habits very well, and were not at all secretive as to telling them, which is just as true of the pertinent newly consecrated ones!

(5) These brethren overcame the difficulty of approach to the pertinent denomination (went up into the city, 14). Hence (into the city) they came into contact with the Little Flock brethren, who approached them (Samuel came out against them) on their way of ministering their Truth in the pertinent denomination (to go up to the high place). Providentially the Lord made known ahead of time (a day before Saul came, 15) to the Samuel class the coming of the prospective crown-lost princes (Tomorrow ... I will send thee a man ... of Benjamin, 16), *e.g.*, as we saw that He had done to William Miller as to Elders Buckley, Himes, White, *etc.* (EC, 35-38). The Lord providentially made these Little Flock leaders recognize that they should train (anoint) such crown-lost leaders to become a class of leaders in the Little Flock movements (captain over my people Israel). These God chose to deliver His people from sectarian attackers of those who accepted the teachings of the Little Flock leaders (save my people ... hand of the Philistines), *e.g.*, (Faustus) Socinus' attacks on the trinity delivered Unitarians from the sectarian attacks of Trinitarians. God assured antitypical Samuel that He was so arranging, out of pity for His people's

oppression at the hand of sectarians (looked ... their cry). The Little Flock leaders' need of such assistance and the coming of such able men unto them was doubtless the way the Lord indicated to antitypical Samuel that they whom he was meeting were the promised helpers and leaders (Samuel saw Saul, the Lord said ... the man whom I spake to thee of ... reign over my people, 17). The crown-lost leaders approached antitypical Samuel (Saul drew near to Samuel, 18) in a public way (in the gate), asking in what teachings of doctrine and practice the Little Flock leaders dwelt (Tell me ... the seer's house). These by their teachings made their identity known (I am the seer, 19). They bade them attend in the pertinent denominations, which the Samuel class did not yet leave, their public ministry (go up before me unto the high place). They likewise invited them to partake of a feast of Truth that day (eat with me today); and when they would be sufficiently fed on the Truth (tomorrow) they would send them on the way of their future service (let thee go). They likewise promised to explain whatever questions were pressing on their hearts (tell thee all that is in thine heart).

(6) They assured them that the teachings that had been lost from the Apostolic days until the Parousia (lost three days ago, 20) were no longer to be worried about, since they were discovered in one or another of the twelve denominations (set not thy mind on them; for they are found). Then, noting the great learning, exceptional talents, deep humility and devoted spirit of service in these, antitypical Samuel assured them that they and their fellow crown-losers were both the hope and the desire of God's people (all the desire of Israel ... on thee ... father's house). By their acts the prospective crown-lost leaders indicated that they were crown-losers (a Benjamite, 21). By their acts they also indicated their humility in recognizing their unworthiness to be in the Little Flock (smallest of the tribes of Israel, 15:17) and the least part of

this class (my family the least of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin). Hence they earnestly demurred at antitypical Samuel's so speaking to them. Such a spirit of humility shines out in all the crown-lost leaders at their outstart, especially in Origen, Augustine, Simon Menno, Barclay, Campbell and Himes, as their biographies testify. *E.g.*, The Confessions of Augustine show this spirit in a most praiseworthy way. Thereupon antitypical Samuel took antitypical Saul and the faith-justified dogmaticians into the banqueting room of Truth (took Saul and his servant ... into the parlour, 22) and gave them the honor place, thereby bestowing chief attention on them (sit in the chiefest place), though not neglecting other guests at the feast (them that were bidden). The guests were all of natures lower than the Little Flock (30 persons [30 is a multiple of 10]). The Little Flock leaders charged themselves, in their capacities as preparers of the spiritual food (cook, 23), with the work of giving the special stewardship truths to antitypical Saul, as the thing especially set aside for the purpose (Bring the portion ... Set it by thee). As charged, so was it done to Saul with the pertinent twelve stewardship truths and their related detailed matters (cook ... shoulder ... upon it ... before Saul, 24). Antitypical Samuel heartily commended to antitypical Saul for his appropriation some detailed features not given to others (which is left [literally, reserved] ... eat), encouraging them to put it into a condition for partaking (set it before thee) and assuring him that it was reserved until then for them from the outstart of their inviting others to the feast (this time ... kept ... invited the people). The prospective crown-lost leaders in the twelve pertinent periods partook of the twelve stewardship doctrines and of certain related details from and with antitypical Samuel, *e.g.*, Chemnitz received the pertinent Truth from and with Melanchthon, Alexander Campbell from and with Thomas Campbell, *etc.*

(7) Thereupon antitypical Samuel and Saul drew back somewhat from the respective denominations' activities in which they had been engaged (come down from the high place into [literally, of] the city, 25). Following this they set the Truth forth before antitypical Saul with a restful result in the latter (communed [additional reading, he spread a couch—Ginsburg's notes; see Rotherham]) in a public way before the Little Flock movements (top of the house). On this Truth antitypical Saul rested himself (he lay down, Ginsburg's notes; see Rotherham. These words are not in the A. V., but instead a variant and incorrect reading has been rendered in the A. V. of v. 26, "and they arose early"). Very early in the next stage of affairs, publicly before the Little Flock movements, antitypical Samuel hastened antitypical Saul to go to their proper denominations (about the spring of the day, that Samuel called Saul to [literally, on] the top ... up ... away, v. 26). Aroused from their rest in the Truth (Saul arose), antitypical Samuel and Saul proceeded in association to activities in the pertinent denominations, *e.g.*, after Thomas Campbell had measurably indoctrinated Alexander Campbell in the teaching that the Bible is the Christian's sole creed and center of union, both of them in unison (both of them, he and Samuel) taught this feature of Truth in the Presbyterian Church, of which both were members. The same thing in principle was done in the other eleven denominations. This course brought them farther and farther away from harmony with the pertinent denominations (going down to the end of the city, 27). At this juncture, as they were falling out more and more with the respective denominations, antitypical Samuel, desiring privacy for their qualifying antitypical Saul for leadership, indicated their desire that the faith-justified dogmaticians be sent away, asked antitypical Saul to remove these from them (Samuel said to Saul ... pass on before us), which was done (passed on). Then antitypical Samuel asked

for antitypical Saul's undivided attention (stand thou still a while), in order that they might further instruct them in the Lord's Word pertinent to the circumstances in which they were (shew thee the word of God).

(8) 1 Sam. 10 treats of Saul's being made king of all Israel, and as such types the crown-lost leaders' being made the leaders of the twelve denominations of Christendom. Up to this point in the antitype the teachings that antitypical Samuel, the Little Flock leaders, had been giving antitypical Saul, the prospective crown-lost leaders, apart from a few details that their superior gifts enabled them to understand better than the rest of the consecrated, were given in no more detail to antitypical Saul than antitypical Samuel had given them to other brethren, but from here on full qualifications for the pertinent leadership in the way of enlightenment and encouragement were given by antitypical Samuel to antitypical Saul (Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured it upon his head, 1), explaining that they were so doing to them, because the Lord had chosen and qualified them unto leadership over His people (Lord hath anointed thee ... over his inheritance). Antitypical Samuel assured them that in the period of their leaving the Little Flock as mouthpieces of the Lord (departed from me today, 2) crown-retainers and crown-losers (two men), in connection with the help and the remembrance of the two Gospel-Age spiritual covenants (by Rachel's [*ewe*] sepulchre), near the border of crown-losers' sphere (in the border of Benjamin), in protection against too hard trial (Zelzah [*heat-shade*]), would assure them that the lost teachings had been found (asses ... are found), and that their long quest therefore was worrying crown-losers (sorroweth for you), who instead of worrying for the lost teachings (left the care of the asses), feared that they had gone astray (What shall I do for my son). This could be told them, since the wide-awake crown-retainers and crown-losers had from

antitypical Samuel learned these truths. Again, antitypical Samuel assured antitypical Saul that, as they would turn from the subjects of the two Gospel-Age spiritual covenants (go ... thence, 3) and would advance to the strength of high character (come to the plain [literally, oak] of Tabor [*height*]), they would be met by consecrated ones of the Little Flock who would present themselves to them in three aspects (three men). In the first of these aspects they would appear as believing in the sin-offering of Jesus, the burnt offering of Jesus and the sin-offering of the Church (one carrying three kids); in the second they would appear as believers in the deeper teachings of these three matters (another carrying three loaves of bread); and in the third they would appear as explainers of the easier matters of sacrifice (another carrying a bottle of wine). It would be natural for the crown-lost leaders to meet Little Flock members so engaged when crown-lost leaders had just left their leaders, though we are not to conclude from this that, the philosophy of the Church's share in the Sin-offering was then clearly understood; rather the simple fact that the Church is privileged to suffer with the Lord for righteousness was doubtless the thing then being taught and lived out. Hence the things that they imparted to antitypical Saul were not the deeper teachings on all three of these matters, but the deeper teachings of Jesus' suffering as atoning for sin—sin-offering, and receiving the manifestation of God's acceptance—burnt offering (salute thee, and give thee two loaves of bread, 4). Antitypical Samuel, who knew that the ransom sacrifice was the all-important Truth for the consecrated, charged antitypical Saul to receive the two antitypical loaves (which thou shalt receive of their hands).

(9) Antitypical Samuel told antitypical Saul that he would have a third experience, which would be in the twelve denominations of the nominal church (hill of God, v. 5), in which the pertinent twelve Little

Flock movements would be working. They assured them that in each of these, where there would be a body of sectarian fighters (garrison of the Philistines), there would come to them companies of preachers (company of prophets), after ending certain features of their services for their respective denominations (coming down from the high place). These would be working in favor of their conceptions of their written creeds (psaltery), books of devotion (tabret [cymbals]), books of hymns or sermons (pipe) and the Bible (harp) and preaching (prophesy) as they proceeded on their course of work. Furthermore, antitypical Samuel told antitypical Saul that the Lord's Spirit would so prevail over them (come upon thee [literally, prosper over thee], 6) that it would move them to preach among such preachers (shalt prophesy with them), and the effect of this upon them would be to alter them entirely, *i.e.*, make them opponents to the respective sects in which the Little Flock movements began (turned into another man), *e.g.*, Dr. Coke would be changed into an enemy of the Church of England, in which the Wesleyan Little Flock movement began; Alexander Campbell would be changed into an enemy of the Presbyterian Church, in which the Barton W. Stone and Thomas Campbell Little Flock movement began. After these three experiences would be fulfilled (when these signs are come, v. 7), antitypical Samuel charged antitypical Saul to do whatever the circumstances would point out for them to do (do as occasion serve thee), because they would be the Lord's indications for their activities (God is with thee).

(10) Antitypical Samuel assured antitypical Saul that the latter would come into various turning points of crucial events before the former would come to their assistance (shall go down before me to Gilgal [*circuit, rolling away*], 8). Then they would come to their succor by fruitful services, expressing God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice (I will come ... offer

burnt offerings), in fulfillment of their consecration vows (peace offerings), impressing upon them the thought that they should await antitypical Samuel's full time of coming (seven days shalt thou tarry) and not take things into their own hand without his presence (till I come). These things done, antitypical Samuel would tell them what they should do (shew thee what thou shalt do). After antitypical Samuel's instructions had been delivered to antitypical Saul, the latter pursued their mental journey away from the former (turned ... from Samuel, 9). God gave them the heart of organizers and servants and defenders of their stewardship truths and their related doctrines (God gave him another heart). And the three forecast sets of experiences of vs. 2-6 occurred to and in them in the respective periods (those signs came to pass). Particulars connected with the first two are not given at their fulfillment, but on the third they are given in vs. 10-13. V. 10 simply states the fact of the third's fulfillment just as stated prophetically in vs. 5, 6; and vs. 11-13 relate certain accompanying experiences. Antitypical Saul's acquaintances from times gone by (all that knew him before time, 11) looked upon them (saw) and behold, they witnessed them moving themselves to preach among preachers (behold, he prophesied among the prophets). They questioned one another incredulously (people said one to another [literally, every man to his friend]) as to the meaning of this unusual happening (What is this ... the son of Kish?), and questioned wonderingly whether these controversialists (Kish [*bow*]) were also preachers (Is Saul also among the prophets?).

(11) But a class in the same denomination (one of the same place, 12) answered their question by another question, to the effect that no one could tell how prophets came into being, *i.e.*, that they became such, not by human birth or training, but by God's appointment, and that as ones that others would not expect to be made such. The lives of every one of the twelve

chief crown-lost leaders exemplify this unexpected thing (who is their father?), *e.g.*, Augustine's, Calvin's and Campbell's previous lives gave no hint of such an office coming to them later on. Secondary crown-lost leaders, like deacon Athanasius, in the Greek; lawyer Cyprian, in the Roman; lawyer Beza, in the Presbyterian; and superintendent Andreae, in the Lutheran Church, *etc.*, are examples of the same. This fact is so frequent an one that it has become recognized generally as a matter of ordinary providential dealings, yea, even a Scriptural teaching (therefore it became a proverb, Is Saul also [literally, even Saul] among the prophets?) Such prophesyings were in favor of the respective stewardship truths, and the result was that it brought antitypical Saul into oppositional prominence in their respective denominations (end of prophesying, he came to the high place, 13), *e.g.*, Chemnitz to Rome, Augustine to the Manichaeans and Donatists, Calvin to Rome, Coke to the Church of England, Campbell to the Presbyterian Church, Simon Menno to Rome, *etc.* This course of theirs led the theological professors as a class, who were the doctrinal, *etc.*, leaders in their respective denominations (uncle [Ner, who, as well as Kish, was a son of Abiel, 9:1; 14:51, which facts prove Saul and Abner, the future captain of Saul's army, to have been first cousins], 14), to speak to antitypical Saul and their associated faith-justified doctricians (Saul's uncle said unto him and to his servant), asking on what theological subjects they had been making mental journeys (Whither went ye?). They answered that they had been searching for the theological teachings of Truth that had been lost out of their respective denominational beliefs (said, To seek the asses). They further said that, failing in their search (they were no where), they sought interviews with Little Flock leaders (came to Samuel). The theologians, long suspicious of, and hostile to antitypical Samuel, eagerly inquired as to their teachings (Saul's uncle said, Tell

me, I pray thee, what Samuel said, 15). Antitypical Saul told the theologians (said unto his uncle, v. 16) that antitypical Samuel said clearly (plainly) that these lost and sought truths had been re-discovered (asses were found), and explained them to the theologians, but told nothing of their choice and training by antitypical Samuel for crown-lost princeliness (kingdom ... he told him not).

(12) Antitypical Samuel made it known that those interested in Little Flock movements in the respective denominations should enter before the Lord into the condition of watchfulness and prayer, in view of critical times among them (Samuel called the people ... unto the Lord to Mizpeh [*watch-tower*], 17). There they reminded the Lord's people (the children of Israel, 18) of God's past favors in delivering them (1) from Satan's evil order of affairs (I brought up Israel out of Egypt), (2) from his servants (out of the hand of the Egyptians), (3) from the domains of sin and error (of all kingdoms) and (4) from sin, error, selfishness and worldliness (of them that oppressed you). They added that, despite these delivering acts of God (saved you ... adversities and tribulations, 19), the Lord's people had rejected their God (ye ... rejected your God), refusing to accept Him as their King, by clamoring for leaders to be their symbolic king (set a king over us). Therefore, acceding to their clamors, they told them to come in their denominations (tribes) and in their sects or leaders (thousands [or princes]) before the Lord, that He might choose them a set of leaders as a symbolic king. Under Divine testings on all Spiritual Israel administered through antitypical Samuel (Samuel caused all the tribes of Israel to come near, 20), the crown-losers were brought forward as having among them the ones qualified as such figurative king (the tribe of Benjamin was taken). Under Divine trial effected through antitypical Samuel upon the crown-losers (he caused the tribe of Benjamin to come

near, 21), the choice simmered down to its specially Truth-studious and Bible-spreading leaders (family of Matri [rainy] was taken); and from these the choice narrowed down to the most capable, faithful and humble of these (Saul the son of Kish was taken). These were looked for among those who were conspicuous, but in vain (sought him, he could not be found).

(13) Such leaders not coming to the fore, the antitypical Israelites again looked into the principles of the Lord's Word and into His Spirit and providence for information respecting their whereabouts (enquired of the Lord further, 22), asking if such leaders would yet come to the fore (man should yet come). The Lord, through the principles of His Word and through His Spirit and providences, gave answer that they were to be found concealed in humility, occupied among lowly ministries and things (answered ... hid himself among the stuff [literally, vessels, teachings]), *e.g.*, Augustine, when so desired, sought in humility to hide himself in studies and lowly occupations among the brethren. This is true also of Calvin, Chemnitz, Coke, *etc.* But the antitypical Israelites brought these reticent ones out of their student privacy and lowly occupations (ran and fetched him, 23). Under these conditions antitypical Saul presented themselves before the people (when he stood [literally, had presented himself] among the people). Here their great talents and fine spirit were found to be very much superior to those of their fellows and brethren (higher than any of the people from his shoulders and upward). Generously antitypical Samuel introduced the crown-lost leaders to antitypical Israel (Samuel said to all the people, 24) as the Lord's chosen for them (the Lord hath chosen), ornamented with incomparable talents and good spirit (none like him among all the people), *e.g.*, Farel so introduced Calvin; Melanchthon, Chemnitz; Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, *etc.*, to the antitypical Israelites. Antitypical Saul was heartily

received and acclaimed by the people as their special leaders (people shouted ... save the king). Antitypical Samuel laid before antitypical Israel the reciprocal duties and privileges of antitypical Saul and Israel, not only orally, but also in writing, as matters pertinent to the Lord (Samuel told ... wrote ... before the Lord, 25), and sent the people on their way to their respective denominations (Samuel sent ... every man to his house). Antitypical Saul went to his position in the nominal church, accompanied by devoted colaborers (Saul ... to Gibeah ... with him a band ... God had touched, 26). But in each denomination there were opponents who belittled, despised, rejected them, showing no devotion (children of Belial [worthlessness] said ... this man save us? ... despised ... no presents, 27). But they acted as though they did not hear their opponents (held his peace [literally, he was as deaf]).

(14) 1 Sam. 11 treats of Saul's first war in deliverance of Israel from their enemies. It types how in each of the twelve denominations the crown-lost leaders had to wage controversy in defense of its stewardship and related truths. This matter, for clearness' sake, as an illustration of all twelve experiences, will be shown as to how especially Martin Chemnitz and John Gerhard, others cooperating, delivered antitypical Israel in the Lutheran Church from the attacks that the ablest Jesuits and other Romanist theologians as clericalists (Nahash [*serpent*] the Ammonite [*from the people*, clericalists], 1), as the special standard-bearers of Rome, waged against it. The Council of Trent (intermittently held between 1545 and 1563), largely dominated by Jesuits, issued its decrees and canons as the modern creed of Romanism; and papacy, through the Jesuits, in harmony with the Council's views, sought to win back (encamped) to Romanism the Lutherans, who, like all other denominationists shortly after the respective Little Flock movements were perverted into sects, became dried up and hardened as to

the spirit of their respective Little Flock movements (Jabesh-gilead [dry rocky land]). Prior to the Council of Trent the religious controversies in Germany, the emperor siding with Rome, made the Lutherans desire to come to an understanding with the Romanists (all the men of Jabesh said ... covenant with us ... serve thee) and thus end the prolonged political and religious disorders in Germany. The Council of Trent was convoked, among other reasons, to end these disorders in favor of Rome; and the emperor, as the Romanist ally, and the hierarchy (Nahash, 2) sought to make as a condition of this understanding (condition ... covenant) the rejection of the Reformation Truth and the acceptance of the decrees and canons of Trent as the papacy's creed, which would have blinded the main one of the eyes of understanding of the Lutherans (thrust out all your right eyes) by propaganda efforts to refute Lutheranism and prove Romanism. In the furtherance of the scheme to produce this spiritual blindness Jesuit propagandists in large numbers were sent into Germany, and made subtle attacks on Lutheranism. The proposed apostasy was intended as a reproach to all Protestants (a reproach upon all Israel). The Lutherans in Germany were hard pressed, especially by the emperor's political measures in favor of Rome and against them, and by the keen, but sophisticated arguments of the Romanist theologians, especially of the Jesuits (encamped against Jabesh-gilead). As a result many, yielding to the political and theological pressure, fell away to Rome from the Lutherans. The leaders (elders, 3) asked for a truce (Give us seven days' respite), which was given them in various treaties, the object of the Lutherans being to gain a sufficiency (seven) of time to gain succor from their allies (send ... man to save us). If such succor should not come in a reasonable time they would give up to the Empire and Papacy (we will come out to you).

(15) It was especially to the Lutheran Church as the sphere of crown-lost leaders (to Gibeah [*height*])

of Saul, 4) that the word of this threatening disaster came (messengers ... told ... the people). This caused the deepest concern and distress among the Lutherans, high and low, civil and ecclesiastical (all the people ... wept). Before this the crown-lost leaders were occupied with their studies along other lines and with pastoral work (Saul came after the herd out of the field, 5). The grief of the people coming to their notice, they inquired for the reason (What ... that they weep?). Then they were apprised of the threatening situation (told him ... of Jabesh). In the earlier stages of this sorrow, *i.e.*, about 1560, the Jesuits, under the leadership of the Portuguese Jesuit, Payva d'Andrada, a member of the Council of Trent, made a strong attack on the Lutheran catechism. Its object of deception and its distressing effect on the Lutherans becoming known to Martin Chemnitz (1522-1586), a representative of antitypical Saul among Lutherans, he became greatly aroused (Spirit of God came upon Saul ... those tidings, 6); and the more and more deeply he meditated on d'Andrada's sophistries, the more and more sharply angry he became (anger was kindled greatly). He sent word and evidence (messengers, 7) of his sacrificing his humanity (yoke of oxen, and hewed them in pieces), everywhere in Germany, through his book in defense of the catechism against d'Andrada, issued in 1562, entitled, *The Main Points of the Jesuits' Theology* (sent ... coasts of Israel). He assured all his fellow Lutherans that if they would not come to the support of himself and his co-workers (Saul) and Luther and Melancthon (Samuel), their human rights would be destroyed (by their Romanist captors). Everywhere the Lutherans were aroused, in their reverence for God and Truth, as though they were one man, to fight for their faith under the lead of these servants of God (fear of the Lord ... come out with one consent). But this was after a considerable number had fallen away to Rome. Antitypical Saul defined, described, limited and explained these

supporters by the Truth (Bezek [*lightning*], 8); both the common run of their supporters (Israel) and the leading ones of them (Judah) were such as indicated a lower standing than that of the Divine class (300,000 ... 30,000 [multiples of ten]).

(16) The first controversial messages of Chemnitz, Gerhard, *etc.*, were the messengers (messengers, 9) to the besieged Lutherans (men of Jabesh-gilead) that in due time (tomorrow), when the full needed Truth would come (sun be hot), they would bring help (help). Chemnitz's first message was the above-mentioned book of his; that of Gerhard (1582-1637) was his incidental refutations of Romanism found in his great dogmatic work entitled, *Theological Topics*, which in the Lutheran Church is considered the greatest work on dogmatics ever written. Other Lutheran anti-Romanist writers produced similar works of secondary importance, contrasted with the prime importance of the first anti-Romanist books of these two Lutheran standard-bearers. All of these came as messengers of help to the antitypical Jabesh-gileadites and rejoiced their hearts (messengers came ... to the men of Jabesh ... glad). The course of the Lutherans in Germany gave the Romanists the impression that they would shortly surrender and accept the blinding effects of Romanist doctrines and practice (said, Tomorrow ... ye shall do ... seemeth good unto you). D'Andrada in 1564 published two answers to Chemnitz's reply to his criticism of the Lutheran catechism. The first of these answers, together with the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent, came into Chemnitz's hands; and as a result of his study of them he decided to issue a thorough refutation of Romanism and defense of Lutheranism. This he did in his work, in four large parts or four large volumes, in Latin, entitled, *The Examination of the Tridentine Council*, issued 1565-1573. This work and Gerhard's *Catholic Confession* are undoubtedly by far the greatest anti-Romanist works ever produced. Chemnitz's large

quarto did Rome more damage than any other book of that period. D'Andrada repented many a time for provoking the controversy. This book stopped the Romeward movement in the Lutheran Church, and put the Romanists very much on the defensive. In consequence of its effects the Lutherans invented the proverb, "If Martin [Chemnitz] had not come, Martin [Luther] would not have stood." The book went through many editions. A copy of the fourth edition, published in 1578, five years after the first edition was completed, is in the writer's library. It was translated into German and French, and in 1861 a Latin edition appeared.

(17) So mighty an attack on Romanism and able a defense of Lutheranism the Romanists could not leave unanswered. Many replies to it were issued. The ablest of these was by the Jesuit, Cardinal Bellarmine (1542-1629), who is by far the greatest controversialist of Rome against Protestantism. Bellarmine aimed to answer every objection ever urged against Romanism in four huge quarto volumes entitled, *Disputations*, issued 1581-1593. The importance and weight that he attached to Chemnitz's work can be seen from the fact that he devoted $\frac{5}{6}$ of this huge work to his answers to Chemnitz's *Examination*. Unlike most Romanist controversialists, who set up straw men and kick them over, Bellarmine stated truthfully and clearly, with its proofs, each Protestant argument, and then attempted to refute it. Its fairness offended the pope, who, fearing that it would injure more than help Romanism, at first put it on the Index, but later removed it therefrom. Bellarmine was undoubtedly mentally a very gifted man, a great scholar and an exceedingly able debater, but his difficulty was that he had a poor cause to defend. Yet he did as capable a job as probably highest human ability backed by Satan's special help could have done with the bad cause that he had to advocate. He was answered more or less tersely by many, especially by Gerhard in his *Theological*

Topics; and the latter answered him detailedly and most destructively in his large four-volumed-quarto work entitled, *The Catholic Confession*, issued 1634-1637. Of all of Bellarmine's and other Romanist controversialists' antagonists, Gerhard is the most dreaded by them. He pulverized the Romanist positions. No two Romanist controversialists can agree on answers to him. The writer is the happy possessor of the chief pertinent works of Chemnitz, Bellarmine and Gerhard, which stand side by side, now in perfect peace, on one of the shelves of his main Romano-Protestant bookcase! Between Chemnitz and Gerhard lesser Lutheran anti-Romanist controversialists wrote. These gave the Romanists added misery in the fight, but Gerhard practically ended the battle, though later anti-Romanist Lutheran controversialists, *e.g.*, Calov, the fourth greatest Lutheran theologian, in his *Papistical Mataeology* (*Vaindoctrine*), issued 1647, wrote against Rome, as a pursuit of a defeated and fleeing enemy. The result of the fight to Romanist warriors was, as v. 11 puts it: "They which remained were scattered, so that two of them were not left together." The fight was well planned by antitypical Saul, who, as planned, waged it along (1) doctrinal, (2) historical and (3) exegetical lines (put the people in three companies, 11), and attacked the Romanists early (morning watch) and continued the fight for over three-quarters of a century (heat of the day [mid-afternoon, the full day here standing for a century]). In similar ways the other eleven crown-lost-leader groups overthrew the antitypical Nahash that attacked their respective denominational views. But the example of how the Lutheran part of antitypical Saul's battle was fought will suffice to illustrate the other eleven forms of the battle, as well as to clarify the entire type, since our space will not permit the presentation of the involved details of the other eleven parts of the antitypical Jabesh-gileadites' and Saul's pertinent parts therein.

(18) After antitypical Saul's great victory in each of the twelve denominations, their adherents desired

of antitypical Samuel (people said unto Samuel, 12) that they be permitted to disfellowship the sons of Belial who said that antitypical Saul should not be their leaders (Who ... said, Shall Saul reign over us? [Ginsburg's notes read: Saul shall not reign over us; thus not a question, but an affirmation] bring the men ... to death). This the crown-lost princes forbade, saying that no one should be disfellowshipped at that time, since God had then wrought deliverance for His people (not a man ... death this day; for today ... salvation in Israel, 13). Antitypical Samuel counseled the people to meet the turning points of their crises by giving renewed energy to the leadership of antitypical Saul (said Samuel ... go to Gilgal [*turning, circuit*], and renew the kingdom, 14). Accordingly, the people at the turning points of their crises renewed the energy of antitypical Saul's leadership as a matter pertaining to the Lord (made Saul king before the Lord in Gilgal, 15). At the turn in their affairs they fulfilled their covenant vows in matters pertaining to the Lord (sacrifices of peace offerings before the Lord), and the crown-lost leaders and their supporters were very glad indeed for their victory and the resultant strengthening of the crown-lost princes' leadership. This occurred in the pertinent turning points of the twelve denominations' controversies with their enemies, *e.g.*, Origen's victory over Beryllus of Arabia on the Father's and Son's being the same person in different forms (Modalism); Augustine's victory over the Donatists on rooting out the unsaintly (tares); Calvin's and Beza's victory over the Romanists on transubstantiation and over the Lutherans on instrumentalization and on the alleged communication of the Divine attributes to Christ's humanity, *e.g.*, omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, *etc.*; Simon Menno's victory over Lutherans and Calvinists on Anabaptism; Faustus Socinus' victory over Romanism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, Anglicanism, Anabaptism and other so-called orthodoxies on trinitarianism;

Barrowe's and Greenwood's victory over Papacy, Episcopacy and Presbyterianism on ecclesiaism; Coke's victory over Calvinism on predestination, irresistible grace, *etc.*; Campbell's victory over Romanism on the Bible as the true creed and center of Christian unity; and Hime's victory over post-Millennialists on the chronology.

(19) Next 1 Sam. 12 will engage our attention. It treats of Samuel's defense of his ministry, of his reproof of the people for their various apostacies, among others, in desiring leaders other than Little Flock leaders, of his exhorting them to obey, of his giving a sign from God as a proof of this sin, of their asking for mercy through Samuel's intercession, after being convinced of their wrong by the sign, of Samuel's continued exhortation to them to walk before the Lord in uprightness, of his promise to pray for them, of his repeated exhortations and of warnings against the effects of sin. At each turning point of antitypical Israel's crises, antitypical Samuel took occasion to inculcate some needed lessons, as well as to defend himself against the charges of the sons of Belial, which he here proceeds to do (Samuel said unto all Israel, 1), in connection with their evil desire which expressed itself in their clamoring for another set of leaders than those of the Little Flock as direct representatives of the Lord, and which under protest was granted them by the Lord and His Little Flock representatives (I have harkened ... and have made a king over you). They pointed out these leaders in each case, after the turning points of their crises came (behold, the king walketh before you, 2); but at the same time the Little Flock leaders were well worn out (old and gray-headed). We see this, *e.g.*, in Wm. Miller's words in 1846, when he declared himself as too old and worn out to bear the burdens of the service much longer, and that he must let the younger men take it up (EC, 35 (32)). Others of the Little Flock leaders at the involved turning points of antitypical Israel's history did the same thing. They called attention to the fact

that the more prominent and less prominent clergy were also ministering to God's people (my sons are with you). They further declared at each of such periods that they as a class had made themselves serve God's people from early in the Gospel Age (have walked [literally, have made myself walk, *i.e.*, conducted myself properly] before you from my childhood [literally, youth] unto this day). Thereupon they challenged anyone to step forward in their presence (Behold, here I am, 3) with the proof, not a groundless surmise, of their ever having wronged anyone in their ministry, and to do it before God and antitypical Saul (witness against me before the Lord, and before His anointed).

(20) Then they threw out the challenge on particulars: Had they taken away from anyone his privileges as to our Lord's sacrificed humanity or as to the services of the Truth (whose ox have I taken)? Had they taken away from anyone his privileges as to the Truth or the Truth literature (whose ass have I taken)? Had they unjustly taken anyone's rights from him (whom have I defrauded [literally, oppressed])? Had they crushed anyone in heart and right hopes or in any other particular (whom have I oppressed [literally, crushed])? Have they received from anyone a bribe that would move them to close their eyes to the briber's wrong-doing (received any bribe to blind [literally, cover] mine eyes therewith)? They asserted that if such things could be proven against them, they would make restitution (I will restore it [rather, them; there is no corresponding word in the Hebrew, so the word *it* or *them* should be italicized] you). No such things having been done by the Little Flock leaders, who, instead, gave up their all on behalf of the brethren, and the brethren all knowing this, they with one voice answered negatively (not defrauded [oppressed] us, nor oppressed [crushed] us, neither hast thou taken ought of any, 4). Thereupon antitypical Samuel called the Lord and antitypical Saul to witness as between them

and the people on this subject (the Lord is witness ... and his anointed ... this day ... not found ought in my hand, 5). To this all agreed (they answered, He is witness). It is a fact of history that in proportion to the prominence of the Divine uses and faithfulness of the Little Flock leaders, in that proportion have the sons of Belial [*worthlessness*] surmised and charged evil against them, which fact has compelled them more or less elaborately to defend themselves against such charges, in order that the ministry be not blamed and injured, *e.g.*, our Lord, Paul, John, Arius, Claudius of Turin, Berengar, Abelard, Marsiglio, Wyclif, Hus, Wessel, Savonarola, Luther, Zwingli, Hubmaier, Servetus, Cranmer, Wesley, T. Campbell, Miller, Russell, *etc.* This should not surprise us, since they are the special targets at whom Satan shoots his arrows, even bitter words. But they have all had these satisfactions, that they have been innocent of the charges, that the brethren knew that none of them were true, and had no real charge against them, as vs. 4 and 5 typically prove and as Matt. 5:10-12 literally proves to them. Amid such experiences of slander they have been comforted with the Lord's promise that in due time He will bring forth their righteousness [purity of character] as the light and their judgment [teachings] as the noonday (Ps. 37:6).

(21) Thereupon antitypical Samuel brought to the people's attention (Samuel said unto the people, 6) some of the main acts of God on behalf of His people during the Gospel Age and their frequent apostasies, as admonitions against a repetition of the wrongs. They called their attention to His raising up of our Lord (Moses) and the Church (Aaron) and His bringing them out of the kingdom of darkness (brought your fathers out of the land of Egypt) into the Kingdom of His dear Son (Col. 1:13), which made them His people. In view of this fact antitypical Samuel requested their special attention (therefore stand still [literally, set yourselves, *i.e.*, to listen], 7), in order that they

might teach (not reason) them in matters pertaining to the Lord (reason ... before the Lord), all the glorious attributes of God (all the righteous acts [literally, righteousnesses of the Lord]), which He exercised toward them lately and earlier (which He did to you and your fathers). He showed that after the Lord's people had come to symbolic Egypt (Jacob was come into Egypt, 8) and were oppressed by Satan, sin, error and death and cried for deliverance (your fathers cried unto the Lord), God sent Christ (Moses) and the Church (Aaron), who by the preaching of repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus brought them out of Satan's kingdom into God's reckoned Kingdom in justification, and caused them later to come into the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (made them dwell in this place). Further, they taught the Lord's people that when in various of their generations they forgot the Lord (forgot the Lord, 9), He gave them up (he sold them) to the power of the leaders of the armies of the nominal church (Sisera [*binder in chains*], captain of the host of Hazor [*enclosed place*]), to the power of the sectarians in the various denominations (hand of the Philistines) and to the power of the papacy as the most autocratic of all rulers (hand of the king of Moab [*from father*]). These waged long warfare against the Lord's captive people (fought against them). Yet when they repented and cried for deliverance, confessing their sins (cried ... said, We have sinned ... forsaken the Lord, 10), and acknowledged that they had served Satan in his power-grasping and lording representatives (Baalim [*lords*]) and the adulterous union of church and state ([literally, the] Ashtaroth [*the beauty, i.e., the goddess of love, Venus of the Romans, Astarte of the Greeks; Ashtaroth was the Phoenician name for this goddess, whose rites were accompanied with licentiousness and prostitution*]). They prayed for deliverance from these enemies (deliver us ... enemies),

promising to serve the Lord, if delivered (we will serve thee).

(22) God raised up for their deliverance our Lord (Jerubbaal [*striver with Baal, lord, i.e., Satan as power-grasper and tyrant*], 11), the star-members beginning with those of the Thyatira Church and ending with those of the Laodicean Church (Bedan [*son of Dan; Hebrew, Bendan, contracted into Bedan, i.e., Samson*]), the anti-Romanist star-members of the Philadelphia Church (Jephthah [*He—God—opens*]) and the Little Flock leaders (Samuel [*name—character—of God*]). By these God delivered His people from all their enemies and oppressors mentioned above (delivered ... enemies on every side) and made them dwell in safety from such (dwelled safely). They declared that when antitypical Israel was threatened by the clericalists (Nahash [*serpent*], king ... Ammon [*from people*], 12), they clamored for the very ablest as their leaders to be appointed by antitypical Samuel (me ... king shall reign over us), despite the fact that God was their Leader (God was your king). Then antitypical Samuel pointed to their desired leaders as Divinely given them (13). They then told antitypical Israel the things that, if done by them, would make them put God before them and their leaders (shall both ye ... king ... continue following the Lord [literally, ye ... king shall be after the Lord, *i.e., shall put God before them—God first—Ps. 16:8; the A. V. does not give the thought of the original*], 14). They told them what these things are that, if done, will set God before them and their leaders: (1) reverence for God (fear the Lord); (2) carrying out their consecration of sacrifice (serve Him); (3) practicing His Word (obey His voice); (4) submissiveness as against revolutionism (not rebel). They further told antitypical Israel that disobedience to the Lord's Word (not obey the voice of the Lord, 15) and rebellion against His precepts, *i.e., arrangements* (rebel against the commandment

of the Lord), would turn God against them, as it did before (against you, as ... your fathers).

(23) They then called their special attention to a great work that God was about to perform in their sight (16). As it was unexpected for rain and thunder in Palestine to come during wheat harvest (wheat harvest today, 17), so during the times that great numbers were won by the sectarianizing and stewardship-truths-perverting work of the crown-lost leaders, it would be unexpected that at the prayer of the Little Flock leaders (I will call unto the Lord), the Lord would raise up Little Flock controversies (thunder) against such works and give new Truth (rain) through them. This unexpected thing would give antitypical Israel clear evidence of God's disapproval of their great wickedness in asking for the gifted sectarian and perverting leaders for whom they clamored (perceive and see that your wickedness is great ... asking you a king). At antitypical Samuel's prayer (Samuel called, 18) the Lord raised up a controversy (thunder) against the sectarianizing work and the perverting work on the respective stewardship doctrines, and sent truths (rain) to set this matter right through the Little Flock leaders, *e.g.*, Little Flock leaders praying for the Lord's help were by Him enabled to controvert, and give new truths against, the perversions of Athanasius on Christ's person, of Augustine on the one Church, of Calvin on the Lord's Supper, *etc.*, *etc.* This had the effect of arousing great fear toward God and antitypical Samuel in the people (greatly feared the Lord and Samuel). Recognizing from these controversies and truths their great wrong in choosing such leaders (added ... sins this evil, 19), they besought antitypical Samuel's prayers that they might not be cut off from being God's people (pray ... that we die not). Noting the people's repentance, antitypical Samuel comforted them with the thought that, though they had done the great evil involved in seeking leaders after their own preference (done all

this wickedness, 20), yet they should no longer fear (Fear not), for there was yet hope for God's favor, if they would not turn in apostasy from Him (turn not aside from following the Lord), but serve Him heartily (serve ... heart). They exhorted them to avoid apostatizing (turn ye not aside, 21), which, if done, would lead to their going after things of emptiness, unprofitableness, unsalutariness and disaster, such as sin, error, selfishness and worldliness in their varied forms (after vain things, which cannot profit nor deliver); for promise whatever they might, they are but unavailing (vain [literally, emptiness]).

(24) The reasons why they should take comfort were: (1) that the Lord's oath to His people would keep Him in honor-bound faithfulness to them (for His great name's sake, 22); and thus He would not forsake them; and (2) His pleasure in choosing them as His people was also a guarantee of this (pleased the Lord to make you his people). Moreover, as for antitypical Samuel, they felt it a sin and an abomination against God, from which they prayed the Lord to deliver them (as for me, God forbid that I should sin against the Lord, 23), that they should give up praying for the brethren (in ceasing to pray [literally, making myself pray] for you). Not only this, but they promised to continue instructing as to the good and right teachings of the Lord (teach you the good and the right way). They stressed again the thoughts that the people should surely reverence God and serve Him most heartily in harmony with the Truth (fear ... serve him in truth ... heart, 24), which to help them do, they exhorted them to study God's magnifying works toward them (consider how great things he hath done for you [literally, see that which he is magnifying for you]). But if, despite God's continued goodness, mercy and longsuffering, the people would persist in wilful wrong-doing (still do wickedly [literally, sinning you sin], 25), the Lord would see to it that they and their chosen leaders would come to ruin and

extinction, and thus come to an end as God's people (consumed [literally, come to an end], both ye and your king). Thus in this entire chapter by word and act antitypical Samuel sought to bring the people to repentance for past wrongs, to the determination to serve God with their whole heart in the Truth, to the exercise of hope for good and fear of sin in its nature and consequence, and so to safeguard them as God's flock; and, so doing, they proved themselves the faithful friends, brethren and shepherds of God's people.

(25) 1 Sam. 13 types the conflict between believing Christian teachers and what is called vulgar rationalism, as well as the aftermaths of that conflict. It was a struggle that occurred mainly in Germany in the last third of the 18th and the first third of the 19th centuries. Rationalism was sown in Germany (1) by the deists of England and (2) by the infidelistic naturalists of France, who themselves were an outgrowth of English deism, and who through the religious indifferentism of Frederick the Great found an entrance into Germany; for he welcomed at his court some of the great French infidelistic naturalists, *e.g.*, Voltaire, d'Argens, la Mettre, *etc.* Vulgar rationalism was in Germany fathered by John S. Semler, theological professor at the Halle University, a very gifted man who used his great talents in a way that, contrary to his purpose and expectation, undermined faith in the orthodox views of the Bible and current dogmas. Thus as to the Bible he sowed to the wind and reaped the whirlwind. When he came to see the evil effects of his teachings, he sought to stem them, but, failing therein, died of a broken heart. A close second to him in this mischievous work was Reimarus, professor at Hamburg, who forged the so-called Wolfenbuettler Fragments, as allegedly very ancient documents. These taught that Christianity was originated by frauds and deceptions. Lessing, one of the three greatest lights of German literature, took up a defense of these Wolfenbuettler Fragments in a controversy

with Goeze, chief pastor of Hamburg. Semler supported Goeze, but Lessing's literary standing and great ability gained much favor for the fraudulent Fragments among many, resulting in the discrediting, not only of the current orthodoxy, but also of the Bible and the idea of a Divine revelation, the virgin birth, atoning death and resurrection of Jesus, as well as everything supernatural, like miracles, prophecies, providence, *etc.* From Semler's school went forth the heroes of vulgar rationalism, *e.g.*, Teller, Leffler, Gabler, *etc.* An infidelistic philosophy gave impetus to this theory; and ere long almost all theological professors, church counselors, pastors, teachers, *etc.*, of Germany rejected the Bible as a Divine revelation and proclaimed only three doctrines as their theology: the existence of a God, the practice of righteousness and a belief in the soul's immortality ("God, virtue, immortality," as they put it), with an acceptance of reason as the source and rule of faith and practice.

(26) As they used the word, reason, it could mean anything from the most depraved to the most exact intellects and the most true and the most erroneous understandings of the most ignorant to those of the most intelligent. According to their idea of reason, it was an exceedingly ambiguous term; for no matter how mistaken one's knowledge and understanding were, they were reason to vulgar rationalists. Accordingly, reason to them meant as many different things as there were individuals in the world. Hence it is the most unstable and variable source and rule of faith and practice imaginable, and therefore utterly unreliable as such a source and rule. We understand reason to mean the normal thinking faculties and their true contents. To normal true thinking faculties belong proper perceptive, reproductive, imagining and analytical powers, as well as the powers of rational intuition, *i.e.*, those faculties that take in thought, that remember thought, that invent thought, and that ratiocinate on thought, as well as the powers that take in and think

self-evident truths (rational intuitions), like $2 + 2 = 4$; $3 \times 1 = 3$, things equal to the same thing are equal to each other, the shortest distance between a point on earth and a point in the sky is a straight line between them, a thing cannot be in two places at the same time, a father is older than his son, *etc., etc.* The great mistake of vulgar rationalists was their failure to allow for the depravity, yea, varying depravity, of man's perceptive, reproductive, imagining, ratiocinating and rational intuitive faculties and for the resultant erroneous and imperfect contents of these faculties. This varied depravity in itself and in its erroneous contents disqualifies reason from being the source and rule of faith and practice. At best it can be a vessel into which can be poured the contents of the true source of faith and main rule of practice, and which can hold such contents and reject contradicting contents, as well as pour the former out to others. The only true source of faith and main rule of practice is the Divine revelation, the Bible; while the sole source of faith and main rule of practice is the Bible, the secondary rule of faith and practice is the Spirit of God in His people. The latter is not such a source, but is such a rule, because in the intellect it holds the Truth already gotten from the Bible, and requires that all subsequent things offered to it as Truth be in harmony with the already received Truth, and rejects everything contrary to it, and because in the heart it requires that all things offered to it as matters of conduct be in harmony with the graces of the Spirit already developed in God's people, and rejects every thing contrary to them. Thus the Spirit as a rule of faith and practice in the intellect is sanctified reason, and in the heart holy affections and a holy will responsive to righteousness and holiness and rejective of unrighteousness and unholiness; and because truth is harmony with reality, Biblical and related facts are included in the Spirit as intellect, *i.e.*, sanctified reason accepts Biblical and related facts as belonging to it as a rule of faith and practice. Accordingly, there is but

one source of faith and one main source of practice, *i.e.*, the Bible, and two rules of faith and practice: the Bible, and the Spirit of God in His people, while vulgar rationalism takes man's depraved intellect and its erroneous and imperfect contents as the sole source and rule of faith and practice. We have made these preliminary remarks on reason, the Bible and the Spirit of God in God's people the better to pave the way to an understanding of 1 Sam. 13 and parts of 1 Sam. 14.

(27) The literal rendering of v. 1 alluded to in the margin means, according to the Hebrew idiom, that Saul was one year old at the commencement of his reign. The A. V. text is not a correct rendering of the Hebrew, whose text as it now stands has evidently suffered the loss of a numerical adjective, perhaps *forty*; for in the second year of his reign (2) Saul had a son, Jonathan, old enough to be the second in command of his army; hence perhaps the word *forty* dropped out of the text. Saul's reign being one of trialsomeness, additional to his son Jonathan's age at Saul's second year of reigning, makes us think that his age likely was 40 (40 representing trialsomeness) when he began to reign. If it is the missing word, v. 1 should be rendered: Saul was forty years old at his [beginning to] reign. At any rate the Hebrew idiom of the pertinent words proves that some numeral adjective has fallen out of the text of v. 1, but none of the ancient Hebrew MSS. contains here a variant reading, which proves that the omission is a very ancient one. V. 1 and a part of v. 2 should be rendered as follows: Saul was [40] years old when he [began to] reign. And he had reigned two years over Israel [the words so far quoted are not found in some of the best recensions of the Septuagint, which likely means that they were not in the Septuagint translators' Hebrew text three centuries before Christ. If that is the case, of course, there is no difficulty, as to the point treated above], when Saul chose for himself 3,000 men from Israel, *etc.* So far our exegetical remarks on certain difficulties

in vs. 1, 2. Now for the explanation of the antitype: Maturity for trial marked each member of the crown-lost leaders when he became such (*forty* years, 1), and shortly after becoming such each of them surrounded himself with the ablest controversialists in antitypical Israel (chose 3,000 ... Israel) The majority of these were especially attached to the crown-lost princes (2,000 with Saul) in the field of treasured knowledge (Michmash, *treasure*) and in the administrative part of the Church (Mount Bethel, *house of God*), and a minority (1,000) of them were attached to the most faithful of the crown-losers (Jonathan) in the humbler positions of character development in the Church (Gibeah, *height*, of Benjamin, *son of the right hand*). The rest of the matured antitypical Israelites worked at ordinary pursuits (the rest ... tent).

(28) This was the condition at the time that the most faithful crown-losers (Jonathan, 3) aghast at the teachings and doings of the vulgar rationalists, gave them a thorough refutation. As indicated above, not only did the latter reject the errors of the orthodox, but with these their truths, particularly that the Bible was the Divine revelation, and, of course, that it was inerrant, they sought to bring everything of teaching and practice down to the low plane of the rabble. So greatly did their religious tastes degenerate that at Christmas the highest thoughts that the manger scene could arouse in them were the kinds of fodder to supply the beasts of the stall; and the best lessons that they could draw from the Easter scene were the benefit of early rising and (because they taught that Jesus did not die, but merely swooned) the symptoms of seeming death, *i.e.*, *swooning*. Flatness and superficiality developed to the *nth* degree characterized their thoughts, lectures, sermons, teaching and conversations. The noble hymnology of the Reformation and its following century they watered to the grossest flabbiness and tastelessness. If able men had deliberately set out to make religion dull, flat and repulsive, they could not

more completely have succeeded in their purpose than the vulgar rationalists did to rob religion of its strength and clearness of thought, depth and fulness of feeling and vigor and activity of will, *e.g.*, Abraham Teller, the president of the Berlin University, openly declared that "the Jews because of their faith in God, virtue and immortality, should be recognized as genuine Christians"; and K. F. Bahrddt, who was one of the leading vulgar rationalists, who was dismissed from the ministry and his professorship in the Halle University's theological faculty for loose living, and who finally died of a venereal disease, thought, while acting as a bartender in a saloon, that it was a good place from which to dispense his theological knowledge to the people. The notorious so-called "German Library," published by the book-seller Nicolai, of Berlin, made itself the judge of literature and a veritable Inquisitorial tribunal, condemning every literary effort that attempted to set forth anything of deeper and sounder import than the mob- and rabble-appealing vulgar rationalists in their shallowness and unsoundness gave forth from the professor's and consistorial counselor's chair, the pastor's pulpit and the teacher's desk. Yet these heroes of superficiality, shouting out their watchword, "reason," as their forte, and "unreason," as their pet aversion, were the leaders in university, consistory, church and school in those unhappy 60 to 70 years, denying everything supernatural, like the virgin birth, miracles, prophecy, atonement, Christ's resurrection, *etc., etc.* They led the religious mob and rabble of those days with the most superficial platitudes as expressions of the acme of wisdom.

(29) But the Lord left not Himself without His 7000 witnesses in this evil time, when he was considered a full Christian who believed there is a god, that virtue is to be practiced and that the soul is immortal. The believing and able dogmaticians, Reinhard, the chief court preacher, of Dresden, and Storr of Tuebingen; the most thorough of all church historians,

Schroech; the brilliant apologists, Lilienthal, Klenker and Koepen; the famous mathematician, Euler; the great physiologist, Haller; and the courageous pastor, Claus Harms, of Kiel, stood for a positive Christianity and smote the vulgar sectarian rationalists, hip and thigh (Jonathan smote the garrison of the Philistines, 3), regardless of their high positions in consistory, university, church or school (Geba, *hill*). The courage of these, the most faithful of the crown-losers, aroused F. D. E. Schleiermacher, who was one of the greatest and most influential theologians of Germany during the 19th century, to great activity in preaching, lecturing and writing, among other things, against vulgar rationalists (Saul blew the trumpet ... Let the Hebrews hear). In his first activities he was only a step ahead of them in belief but miles ahead of them in depth of thought, fulness of feeling and energy of will. As time went on he grew more and more in positive views of Christianity. Though he never succeeded in reaching correct views on the canon, integrity and authority of the Bible, yet by sheer force of intellect, warmth of feeling and energy of will he drew after him a number of the ablest intellects and most pious hearts of Germany. Though a deep thinker and writer, he was a very popular preacher who knew how to make himself understood and appreciated in his sermons by the common people. Additionally, he was a very able leader and executive, and was privileged to be the antitype of Saul at the juncture of affairs typed by Saul in 1 Sam. 13. He was the leading professor at the Berlin University, as well as the first preacher and theologian of Germany, and after a powerful ministry he died in 1834, leaving E. W. Hengstenberg, also of the Berlin University, as his successor in the Saul antitype as set forth in 1 Sam 14. But he and the faithful members of antitypical Jonathan were in a small minority; and the vulgar rationalists, who possessed almost all the theological chairs in the universities, the executive posts in the consistories (the church government

committees in the various states of Germany), the pulpits in the churches and the desks in the schools, took note of antitypical Jonathan's pertinent activities (the Philistines heard of it). Believers everywhere heard of their refuting the vulgar rationalists (all Israel heard say that Saul [through Jonathan] had smitten the garrison of the Philistines, 4). The proud vulgar rationalists from their heights of alleged reason looked down upon, and despised the true believers as alleged hypocrites, superstition's devotees and unreasonable fanatics (Israel ... abomination with the Philistines). Heartened by the refutation of the vulgar rationalists by antitypical Jonathan, the true believers, practicing an energetic piety in consecration, were reached by Schleiermacher's appeals to follow after his standard against the antitypical Philistines (people were called together after Saul), but it led them into an ever-increasing crisis (Gilgal, *circuit*).

(30) This smiting of the vulgar rationalists had the effect of arousing those rationalists who were not of the vulgar kind, but who were of the higher critical sort, many of them being very scholarly men of large knowledge and acute intellects, to gather themselves together to fight the Bible-believers; for they instinctively felt that the principles of these Bible-believers were opposed to their principles, and that the time had come for a clash to set in between these two groups of opposing principles (the Philistines gathered themselves together to fight with Israel, 5). They consisted of comparatively numerous organizations (30,000 chariots) and numerous teaching leaders (6,000 horsemen); and their supporters were innumerable (people as the sand ... sea shore in multitude). They took up their position in the treasure store of vast knowledge (Michmash), but their position was an erroneous one (eastward from Beth-aven, *house of idols* [erroneous theories]). The true believers, seeing these enemies encamped against them, in their distress realized that they were in a difficult position (men of Israel ... in a

strait ... distressed, 6). Thereupon they sought to dodge the pertinent conflict, looking for protection: some in church secret societies, *i.e.*, in local congregations (caves), some in general alliances of great ones, like the Evangelical Alliance (thickets), some in the strong fortresses of society, like the Evangelical Union (rocks), some in high places (societies, like the Gustav-Adolph Society), some in home missionary societies (pits) and some in foreign missionary societies (Hebrews went over Jordan [Christendom] to the land of Gad [*fortunate, company*] and Gilead [*heap, or rock witness*], 7).

(31) At this time Schleiermacher was in a crisis (Saul was yet in Gilgal); and his supporters clung to him with much fear and many forebodings (followed him trembling). After waiting for what seemed to him the full time (tarried seven days, 8) to receive from the Lord's special mouthpiece (Samuel), here the Philadelphia star-members in their writings, the message and service of the Truth that the latter had to give him, and after these did not come to him at the time expected in his crisis (Gilgal), and when his supporters in large numbers left him (the people were scattered from him), Schleiermacher, very unclear on many a truth held properly by believing nominal-church theologians, and failing to wait for clarification thereon, called for his supporters' co-operation (Saul said, Bring hither a burnt offering to me, and peace offerings, 9) in his presentation of his (unclear) views. Accordingly, he began to present his quite immature and erroneous views—a case of less palpable error fighting more palpable error (he offered the burnt offering). Just after each of Schleiermacher's presentations of his more or less erroneous views and service to the Lord, antitypical Samuel appeared in the Philadelphia star-members' writings (as soon as he had made an end of offering ... Samuel came, 10). Schleiermacher made many mental journeys to reach clearness on their views of things, just as his presenting

his partially erroneous views and services was a long-drawn-out affair involving as it did the presentation of various unclear views at different times, antitypical Samuel coming to him after each of such times (Saul went out to meet him) and at each of such times antitypical Samuel came to minister some good to him (salute [literally, bless] him [the grammatical structure of the Hebrew sentence shows that it was Samuel who came to bless Saul]). At each of these times antitypical Samuel in his writings expostulated with him as to his immature teachings and services (Samuel said, What hast thou done? 11). At each of such expostulations Schleiermacher made excuse that his supporters were mentally scattered from him (scattered from me), that he could not get the help from the Philadelphia star-members, T. Campbell and Wm. Miller being their only living representatives during his lifetime, the dead ones coming to him and expostulating with him in their writings, which, indeed, was the way that Campbell and Miller expostulated with him, and all of them offering such written helps each time only after he had done the pertinent presenting of a mixed message and service (thou camest not). He further made excuse that they failed him in his need when he expected help from them (within the days appointed).

(32) Furthermore, he excused himself on the ground that the historico-higher-critical allies of the defeated vulgar rationalists were assembling themselves in the field of special treasures of knowledge, whereby they became especially threatening (Philistines gathered ... at Michmash). Therefore, fearing an attack upon him, he concluded that the historico-higher critics would pounce upon him while he was in a crucial situation (said I, The Philistines ... upon me to Gilgal, 12). For such a thing to happen to him before he had by teachings and services against the historico-higher critics sought to gain God's favor (not made supplication; literally, entreated the face) was to his mind an

unseemly thing; hence he claimed that he forced himself to present such teachings and services as he had contrary to the historico-higher critics (forced myself ... offered a burnt offering), which was not a Divinely pleasing service. Servants of God should not enter into any teaching and ministry before the Lord has made the teaching clear to them, and has indicated what the service should be, otherwise they would be running ahead of the Lord. How much Schleiermacher, a large Gospel-Age crown-lost leader, was in this matter like a certain little Gospel-Age crown-lost leader, who said in his heart, My Lord delayeth, *i.e.*, does not do things fast enough to suit me! Hence he took them out of His hands and hurried them along as seemed good to him. The Philadelphia star-members in their writings, as well as by their example of waiting quietly on the Lord, until His due time would come, rebuked his course as a foolish one (Samuel said to Saul, Thou has done foolishly, 13), telling him that thereby he had violated the command that God gave him, *i.e.*, to wait upon the Lord, and to let Him direct his teachings and services (not kept the commandment of the Lord). Had he obeyed the Lord in this matter, the Lord would have given him the privilege of leading the Lord's people in the fight against the historico-higher critics to a completion (now would the Lord have established thy kingdom upon Israel for ever). But the repeated failure of Schleiermacher unto a completion to wait on the Lord to reveal His message and service as due moved the Lord to reject his leadership over antitypical Israel's warriors (thy kingdom shall not continue, 14). The Philadelphia star-members assured him in their writings that the Lord had selected a crown-lost leader whom He could heartily approve for the pertinent work. So far as Schleiermacher the individual is concerned, God had selected a successor, Hengstenberg, under whose supervision as leader the Lord would entrust His warriors against the historico-higher critics, but in so far as all through the Age

the crown-lost leaders did in principle the same thing as Schleiermacher did in this matter, not wait on the Lord, the successor of these crown-lost leaders as a class was to be Bro. Russell as that Servant (commanded him to be captain over his people), the reasons for the Lord's course being repeated for emphasis.

(33) After each of such failures of Schleiermacher to wait upon the Lord, the Philadelphia star-members withdrew from him in the sense that their pertinent teachings failed to influence him to betterment, until such leavings came to a completion, despite his thereby being left in a crucial condition (Samuel arose and gat him up from Gilgal, 15). And at each of such leavings they in their teachings went to the most faithful of the crown-lost servants of the Lord, antitypical Jonathan, who were in that height of the humbler character of the Church attainable by crown-losers (unto Gibeah of Benjamin). Schleiermacher after each of these experiences examined and analyzed his supporters and found them quite few and faultful humans and new creatures (Saul numbered the people ... 600 men). After each expostulation from antitypical Samuel Schleiermacher took up a position in the height of the humbler character of the Church for crown-losers, attainable by amendment of his course, with the most faithful of the crown-losers and their supporters (Saul and Jonathan and the people abode in Gibeah of Benjamin, 16), while the historico-higher-critical (not vulgar) rationalists took up their position in the treasury of their scientific theological knowledge (Philistines encamped in Michmash). The father of the rationalistic historico-higher critics was De Witte, an encyclopedia scholar, a sharp thinker, a thorough linguist and a great writer. The historico-higher-critical rationalists engaged in three lines of destructive anti-Christian work (the spoilers ... in three companies, v. 17). The first of these was philosophy. At first by making the basis of their theology the pantheistic natural philosophy of Schelling, and a little later by

making the basis of their theology the pantheistic idealistic philosophy of Hegel, the historico-higher-critical rationalists worked destructively and anti-Christianly against the idea of the Bible as a Divine revelation and against its contents as inspired, unto subverting the faith of most theological professors and pastors (one company turned ... to Ophrah [*gazelle*, in allusion to the doctrine of philosophy] ... Shual [*fox*, in allusion to the subtlety of Schelling and Hegel and their colaborers]). The second of these was that of philology, embracing especially the dead languages, Hebrew and its cognate tongues and Greek, whereby they sought to undermine Biblical teachings. The leaders in this line of misuse of philology were Gesenius in Hebrew lexicography and Ewald in its grammar, and Wahl in the lexicography and Winer in the grammar of Biblical Greek. While the former two did some very useful lexical and grammatical work in the elucidations of the Hebrew of the Old Testament, and the latter two did the same for the Greek of the New Testament, their and their colaborers' efforts were in the interests and spirit of rationalistic historico-higher criticism; hence their work was in many ways anti-Biblical (another ... to Beth [*house*]-horon [*grave-like*, in allusion to the dead languages], v. 18).

(34) The third of these was Biblico-historical criticism, *i.e.*, higher criticism proper. Baur of Tuebingen, thoroughly imbued with Hegel's philosophy, and a talented scholar, was the main leader of this company or school of thought, and Strauss and Vatke were its chief lieutenants. The first claimed that there were two antagonistic schools of thought among the Apostles: Peter leading the particularistic—Jewish—point of view, and Paul leading the universalistic—Jewish-Gentile—point of view, and that in the battle the universalistic overthrew the particularistic point of view, and thus became the surviving view of the Christian Church. He denied the genuineness of all the New Testament, except Romans, 1, 2 Corinthians and

Galatians. The origin of all its other books he assigned either to the last quarter of the second or to the third century. Strauss's main destructive work was done by his *Life of Jesus*, the Gospel accounts of which he claimed to be myths, assigning the Gospels' writing to the third quarter of the second century. Vatke treated the Old Testament destructively and anti-believingly with the same spirit and methods as Baur and Strauss treated the New Testament. This third school was by far the worst of the three as to destructiveness and anti-Christianity (another turned to ... border that looketh ... Zeboim [*serpents*, or *hyenas*, in allusion to its Satanic destructiveness] toward the wilderness [in allusion to their disregard of organized churchianity]). They all started their destructive attacks in 1835, the year that we have elsewhere shown that the darkening of the symbolic sun and moon began, as it was indeed their work that began this darkening. From Semler's opening the attacks that led up to vulgar rationalism in his four-volumed work on the Canon (1771-1776) to about 15 years before the attacks of Vatke, Baur and Strauss (1835), increasingly the literary molders of public religious opinion ceased in Germany to be Bible-believers among theological professors, consistorial counselors, pastors and teachers, until, with but the exception of antitypical Saul and Jonathan, there were none of such there (no smith found throughout ... Israel, 19). For the authorities, to prevent such becoming Bible-believers, filled with rationalists of both classes the theological professorships, which resulted in prospective theological professors, consistorial counselors, pastors and teachers becoming either vulgar or historico-higher-critical rationalists, and which resulted in Bible-believers' being made unfit to prepare controversial discourses and lectures or to write controversial books (Philistines said, Lest the Hebrews make them swords or spears). This had the effect that all Bible-believing exponents had to go to the rationalistic professors, *etc.* (all

Israelites went down to the Philistines, 20), to fit for use (sharpen) their correctional (share), ethical (coulter), controversial (axe) and doctrinal (mattock) discourses and books. However, they had the writings (file, 21) of the star-members and their assistants for their doctrinal (mattocks), ethical (coulter), correctional (forks), controversial (axes) and hortatory (goads) helps, to fit for use (sharpen) their discourses, lectures and books. Excepting in the case of antitypical Saul and Jonathan, this resulted by 1835 (day of battle, 22) in no Bible believer's being able to prepare up-to-date controversial discourses, lectures and books (there was neither sword nor spear found ... but with Saul and Jonathan). When 1835 came the historico-higher-critical rationalists went forth to battle, as described above, on the difference between their fund of knowledge and that of Bible-believers (garrison ... went out to the passage of Michmash, 23).

(35) Immediately following the appearance of Baur's and Strauss's books in 1835, antitypical Jonathan, catching their drift, began to consult with his chief scholarly supporters on answering them (upon a day Jonathan ... said ... bare his armour ... let us go ... garrison ... other side, 14:1). The chief members of antitypical Jonathan at that time on the New Testament phase of the controversy were Neander, a converted Hebrew, the father of modern New Testament and church history, Ullmann and Tholuck; and the chief members of the antitypical armour bearer on New Testament apologetics were Nitzsch, Mueller, Dörner, Rothe and Lange. The chief members of antitypical Jonathan taking part in defense of the Old Testament were Bleek, Umbreit and Keil; and the chief members of his armour bearer were Delitzsch and Lange, also mentioned above as working in defense of the New Testament. But above all Hengstenberg, the antitypical Saul of this time, did the earlier best work on the Old Testament against the historico-higher-critical rationalists. Indeed, his disproofs of some of their Old Testament

positions are among the strongest ever written, and to this day have not been refuted. This is particularly true of his Genuineness of the Pentateuch and Daniel, His Christology of the Old Testament and his Egypt and the Books of Moses, which are classics on these subjects. But, owing to his too controversial attitude, the then members of antitypical Jonathan held aloof from him, and let him know nothing of their plans; for they were head and heart theologians compared with him, who seemed to be mainly a head theologian (he told not his father). Hengstenberg took an ever-increasingly radical conservative position which made him in character far inferior to men like Neander, Tholuck, *etc.* (Saul tarried [literally, dwelt] in the uttermost part of Gibeah, 2), fighting every manifestation of rationalism in his magazine, *The Evangelical Church Newspaper* (under a pomegranate tree), which more or less continuously fought every kind of religious error advanced by the higher critics (in Migron, *overthrow*). But his supporters were a very small, imperfect and faultful set of humans and crown-losers (about 600 men). The Priesthood (wearing an ephod, 3) at that time stressed the God-man theory of Christ (Ahiah, *Jehovah's brother*) as a good brother of the race (the son of Ahitub, *my brother is good*) and as a supporter of freedom (Ichabod, *where is the glory?*) in Protestantism (Phinehas), where for centuries the crown-lost princes were to be found (Eli, *high one*). But none of these knew the mental journeys of antitypical Jonathan as against the historico-higher critics.

(36) Antitypical Jonathan occupied a strong believing position (sharp rock ... Bozez, *shiny*, 4) on the matters at issue between the believing theologians and the historico-higher critics, and the latter a strong unbelieving position thereon (a sharp rock ... Seneh, *peak*, or *point*); and between the two positions there was a very deep and steep passage way of thought down one and up the other, so that it was easy to miss one's mental footstep passing from one to the other

(between the passages); and for coming to an understanding of both positions there was a necessity of sharp thought (sharp rock); and many a traveler from one to the other lost his mental footing. Down and up these mental paths the members of antitypical Jonathan and their special supporters had laboriously to travel. Antitypical Jonathan's position opposed that of the rationalistic historico-higher critics (the forefront [edge] ... northward over against Michmash, 5); and the position of the rationalistic historico-higher critics opposed that of antitypical Jonathan (the other southward over against Gibeah). The proposal of antitypical Jonathan was that they and their special supporters (Jonathan said ... let us, 6) study with the purpose of opposing the views of the rationalistic historico-higher critics (go over unto ... these uncircumcised), but do it in the faith that the Lord cannot be limited in His help, regardless of whether His servants are many or few (Lord will work for us ... no restraint ... by many or by few). To this plan their special supporters with encouraging words agreed (do all ... heart ... I am with thee, 7). Antitypical Jonathan then said that they would do the necessary involved study (we will pass over, 8) and show themselves as opposed to them (discover ourselves unto them). Furthermore, they said that if their opponents would by their course suggest that they were going to attack them, they would wait for them to attack and would defend the position of the believers (Tarry until we come to you; then we will stand ... not go up unto them, 9); but that if by their course their opponents would indicate that they would act defensively, if attacked, the believers would take the aggressive against their errors (Come up unto us; then we will go up, 10), believing that the Lord had decided victory for them (the Lord hath delivered them into our hand). To antitypical Jonathan's suggestion both agreed (this ... sign to us). Accordingly, these servants of God by word of mouth and in their writings

made it known that they were opposed to the theories of the rationalistic historico-higher critics (both of them discovered themselves unto ... the Philistines, 11), who in their pride ridiculed these servants of God as cowards venturing out of their shelters (come out of their holes where they had hid themselves). After ridiculing these servants of God, they challenged them to attack their positions (Come up to us, and we will shew you a thing, 12).

(37) Antitypical Jonathan took his cue from their proud challenge that they and their chief supporters were to take the aggressive, and, therefore, encouraged the latter to follow them into the fray (Come up after me), assured that the Lord had delivered the rationalistic historico-higher critics into the power of God's people (the Lord hath delivered them into the hands of Israel). Thereupon antitypical Jonathan as leader and their special supporters as followers did the necessary very difficult mental work to put them into the position to attack (climbed up upon his hands and feet ... armour bearer after him, 13) and by their lectures and publications attacked Strauss's and Baur's positions, thoroughly refuting them (they fell before Jonathan; and his armour bearer slew after him). Neander was the first member of antitypical Jonathan to attack Baur's and Strauss's challenges and books of 1835. Against Strauss's *Life of Jesus* Neander in 1837 published his *Life of Christ*, which is the ablest and most complete refutation of Strauss's mythical theory as applied to the Gospel narratives ever made. In 1832, before this controversy broke out, he had published, as an introduction of his great *Church History*, a history of the Apostolic Age, entitled, *The Planting and Training of the Christian Church*. After Baur's attacks on the Acts and Epistles appeared, Neander revised this book, making it, among other things, a thorough refutation of Baur's entire theory of the Apostolic Age. Undoubtedly Neander was under God the chief agent in restoring a living faith in the

Bible to Christian theologians the world over as against the unbelief of the rationalistic historico-higher critics, for these books were translated into many languages and therein widely circulated. In 1838 Ullmann, another very able member of antitypical Jonathan, published an able refutation of Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, entitled, *Historical or Mythical*; and against the rejection of Jesus' virgin birth and sinlessness he published his very fine *Sinlessness of Jesus* (1842). His *Essence of Christianity* likewise was a hard blow against the rationalistic historico-higher critics. Other members of antitypical Jonathan, mentioned above, also joined in the battle successfully. Not only so, but the members of their chief supporters joined in it very fruitfully, especially Mueller, in his book, *The Doctrine of Sin*, and Lange, in his able and detailed *Life of Christ*. Thus in defense of the New Testament the above-named brethren and others waged a very successful fight. Umbreit, Bleek, and especially Keil, supported by Delitzsch and Lange, as their special helpers, waged a noble fight in refuting some attacks of the rationalistic historico-higher critics on the Old Testament, as that higher criticism was known in the documentary theory and in the late origin of the Old Testament before its later manifestations, by which through Wellhausen, Graf and Kuenen it left the partly refuted positions of the rationalistic historico-higher critics and took on the form of evolutionary higher criticism, with which believing scholars battled during the Harvest. But, as shown above, Hengstenberg gave the rationalistic historico-higher critics on the Old Testament the strongest of their partial refutations. Nevertheless antitypical Jonathan and their special supporters started the defeat of the rationalistic historico-higher critics (first slaughter, which Jonathan and his armour bearer made, 14), who were in many cases very exceptionally able apostate new creatures of highest human culture (about twenty men); especially did they refute them in the domain of the New Testament (an half acre of

land [half of God's revelation]) as written by God's inspired Apostles (a yoke of oxen, 1 Cor. 9:9; 1 Tim. 5:18).

(38) These staunch defenders of the veracity of the Bible, especially of the New Testament, started a revolution in Christian society against the rationalistic historico-higher critics, who were up to that time almost omnipotent in influence in German Christian society (the earth quaked, 15). Their refutations were so powerful and the revulsion of German Christian society at, and its revolution against the rationalistic historico-higher critics were so great, that a paralyzing fear overtook the latter's whole host (host) in their world of activity (field) and among their supporters, their camp followers (all the people). The leaders among the rationalistic historico-higher critics (garrison), yea, all three groups of destructive companies, *i.e.*, philosophers, linguists and historico-Biblical critics, trembled (the spoilers, they also trembled); there was indeed a paralyzing fear that overtook these (a very great trembling). Hengstenberg's guards (watchmen of Saul, 16), ever on the alert to note the goings on among the rationalistic historico-higher critics, from their vantage ground of the believing positions in the humble height of Christian character (in Gibeah of Benjamin), gave close heed (looked) to the commotion among the rationalistic historico-higher critics, and saw that the latter were diminishing in numbers (multitude melted away) and were fighting one another in their confusion (went on beating down one another). Hengstenberg asked that his supporters be investigated (said Saul unto the people that were with him, Number, 17), that they might learn who had left them to fight with the rationalistic historico-higher critics (see who is gone from us). Then, from the investigation, it was learned that antitypical Jonathan and their chief supporters were not among them; for these had withdrawn from co-operation with Hengstenberg because of the violence of his controversial spirit and expressions

(Jonathan and his armour bearer were not there). Thereupon Hengstenberg asked that the consecrated brethren bring to him all the truths of God's plan then due, that from them they might select ones fitted for use in that condition, according as God through the consecrated should indicate His will (Saul said unto Ahiah, bring hither the ark of God, 18); for at that time the believing theologians brought together and held all of the truths previously and then due (the ark of God ... with the children of Israel).

(39) While Hengstenberg was consulting with the consecrated brethren over what the Truth required them to do at this juncture of affairs (while Saul talked unto the priest, 19), the debate, the confusion and the flight of the rationalistic historico-higher critics became very tumultuous (noise ... of the Philistines ... increased). Then Hengstenberg charged the consecrated brethren to cease their efforts to get a response from the Truth, as it now was by the providential situation shown what course to take (withdraw thine hand). Thereupon Hengstenberg with all his warriors by Divine providence was called out to battle (Saul and all the people that were with him assembled themselves; literally, Saul was called and all the people that were with him, 20). Accordingly, they joined the controversy (they came to the battle). Here they noted that the rationalistic historico-higher critics, in their efforts to answer the arguments that antitypical Jonathan and his chief supporters used against them, fell to contradicting and fighting one another (every man's sword was against his fellow), resulting in their utter defeat on the involved New Testament matters (a very great discomfiture). Some of the Lord's real people under deception had joined in with the rationalistic historico-higher critics as fellow warriors (Hebrews that were with the Philistines before ... went up with them into the camp, 21). These received the opening of their eyes through the arguments of antitypical Jonathan and their chief supporters and joined

their real brethren who were with antitypical Saul and Jonathan (turned to be with ... Saul and Jonathan). And those real believers who, dodging the issues, hid themselves in various protective organizations of Christendom (men ... hid themselves in mount Ephraim, 22), seeing that the rationalistic historico-higher critics were being refuted and put to flight (heard that the Philistines fled), joined in the controversy, to the further undoing of the foe (followed hard after them in the battle). Thus at that time, from 1837 to from about 1860 to 1865, God delivered His people from the rationalistic historico-higher critics (The Lord saved Israel that day, 23); and the controversy entered the phase of the creed idols (the battle passed over unto Beth-aven).

(40) Hengstenberg was so conservative a man, made all the more so by his very many controversies with unbelievers, that anything claimed to be a new truth, advancing light, was looked upon by him with gravest suspicion; and he put his followers under a strict charge to eschew anything not taught previously (Saul had adjured ... saying, Cursed be the man that eateth ... until evening, 24). This resulted in the people famishing for positive Truth (men of Israel were distressed that day), since in the controversy they were refuting error, and not getting advancing Truth. Hengstenberg gave this solemn charge, because he desired to vindicate himself against his foes, and because he feared that the new views accepted would compromise the victory that he desired to win for God's cause and for himself (that I may be avenged on mine enemies). Accordingly, his supporters kept the charge, and eschewed accepting any new views during that controversy (none of the people tasted any food). Just at that period the Lord's people came to certain great ones of the Lord, like Bros. Miller, Storrs, Stetson, *etc.*, who taught the sweet hopes of the message of Christ's Millennial reign of blessing in the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (all ... came to a [literally,

the] wood [trees represent great ones either among the Lord's people or among the world] ... honey upon the ground, 25). Hengstenberg's supporters coming in contact with these sweet hopes of the messages in their writings (when the people were come into the wood, behold, the honey dropped, 26), heeding their leader's charge, would not accept the sweet hopes of the Millennial message (no man put his hand to his mouth: for the people feared the oath). But, as shown above, antitypical Jonathan, offended at the too severe polemics of Hengstenberg, left the sphere of his activities. Hence they did not know of his solemn charge to the people (Jonathan heard not when his father charged the people with the oath, 27). They, in various of their members, accepted with their official sanction some of the sweet hopes of the Biblical teachings on the Millennium (put forth the end of the rod ... and dipped it in an honeycomb, and put his hand to his mouth). This gave them great enlightenment, not only on this, but on many other doctrines, *etc.* (his eyes were enlightened).

(41) Certain of Hengstenberg's heresy-hunting followers (one of the people, v. 28) disapproved of their accepting and giving their official sanction to the doctrine of the Millennium, stating that Hengstenberg had solemnly forbidden such a course (Thy father straitly charged the people with an oath, saying, Cursed be the man that eateth any food this day), even though the people should be hungry for advancing Truth (the people were faint). Antitypical Jonathan replied that Hengstenberg by such a prohibition had wrought evil results for the Lord's people, giving them both head and heart difficulties (hath troubled the land [container for thing contained], 29). They politely called (I pray you) the attention of the people to how the Millennial doctrine clarified the mental vision of them as parts of God's people on Biblical subjects otherwise unclear (see ... how mine eyes have been enlightened), emphasizing the fact that this was because they had accepted

the Biblical doctrine of the Millennium (because I tasted a little of this honey). These brethren were certainly right, for that doctrine is sweetness itself to God's true people; for its blessed prospects give them hope and joy amid their conflicts, trials and suffering; for this doctrine was some of the spoil taken out from under the rubbish with which the rationalistic historico-higher critics had covered it. Accordingly, antitypical Jonathan stated that if all the opponents of rationalistic historico-higher critics had accepted this doctrine as part of the spoil that they had taken from the latter, they would have had much more enlightenment on God's ways (How much more ... had eaten ... spoil ... they found, 30), and would consequently have refuted their foes with greater thoroughness (much greater slaughter). As it was, instead of making the slaughter complete on both New and Old Testament matters, it was complete only on the treasures of knowledge on the historico-higher criticism of New Testament matters (they smote ... that day from Michmash, 31). While there were defenses of the Old Testament against higher criticism made by antitypical Saul and Jonathan, these were incomplete (to Aijalon, place of gazelles [Josh. 10:12, "moon in the valley of Aijalon," i.e., *Old Testament* in the sphere of *Historico-Higher criticism's doctrines*]). The comparative weakness of antitypical Saul and his supporters against the Old Testament historico-higher criticism was due to their lack of the riches of knowledge in the Old Testament on prophecies and types as to the Millennium (people were very faint).

(42) As all erroneous systems have some Truth mixed with their error, so rationalistic historico-higher criticism had some Truth mixed in with its error; in fact, in some cases the error was quite well hidden and the amount of connected Truth was so large that the error was not apparent without considerable thought and knowledge; for Satan knows that without some Truth he cannot deceive many. This pertinent

Truth is in v. 32 represented by the flesh, and the hidden error by the blood left in the flesh. Hengstenberg's followers (the people, 32) with zeal mentally accepted the truths that they took away from the rationalists (flew upon the spoil). Some of these truths pertained to the justified (sheep), some to the humanity of Jesus (oxen) and some to the humanity of the consecrated (calves); and without proper examination of them and without the full elimination of the hidden error from them, which would be complete figurative bleeding of the figurative flesh (slew them on the ground [did not hang them up so that all the blood would flow out of them]), and with the pertinent truths, they imbibed the connected and hidden error (the people did eat them with the blood). Many brought the knowledge of the fact to Hengstenberg (told Saul ... sin ... eat with blood, 33), who in his characteristic hatred of, and opposition to error, even in its most attenuated form, denounced the wrong-doers as traitors and their wrong as treason (Ye have transgressed; literally, Ye have dealt treacherously). Thereupon he charged that the doctrine that the Bible is God's inspired and inerrant revelation be analyzed, proved and upheld as a tester for him of all religious thought for that period of time (roll a great stone unto me this day). Furthermore, he charged his main supporters to mingle everywhere among his ordinary supporters (Saul said, Disperse yourselves among the people, 34) and teach them to submit, in a work done as in his presence, to his test doctrine all teachings that they had taken as booty from the rationalistic historico-higher critics (Bring me hither every man his ox ... sheep) and study them in submission to his test doctrine (slay them here [on the rock]), and if they by that test doctrine have all the error emptied from them, then they should accept them (eat); but he cautioned them not to sin against the Lord by partaking of the bootied truths containing error, be it ever so little (sin not ... eating with the blood). All his supporters with their full power did as

he charged (every man his ox with him; literally, by his hand), and did this before the Parousia day dawned (that night), and thus properly studied them, purging out of them whatever was erroneous (slew them there).

(43) Hengstenberg developed his followers as a compact consecrated body for sacrificial purposes on behalf of the Lord (Saul built an altar unto the Lord, 35). While previous crown-lost princes built sects in which consecrated, justified and unjustified ones were members, and thus were not the real Church, Hengstenberg would have none in this special company who not only professed, but practiced consecration, which was possible, because the so-called Pietists at that time, who to a man were consecrated, stood with him and recognized him as their leader (the same was the first altar that he built unto the Lord). Hengstenberg desired and, therefore, exhorted his supporters to join him in pursuing and devastating the rationalistic historico-higher critics on their Old Testament theories, and that immediately (Saul said, Let us go down after the Philistines by night, 36) and thus make a complete job of the conquest (spoil them until the morning light ... not leave a man of them). To this plan all acceded (Do whatsoever seemeth good unto thee). But the consecrated brethren asked that they should first approach God and learn His will on the subject (draw near ... unto God), and that in connection with the doctrine of the Bible as God's inspired and inerrant revelation (hither). Thereupon Hengstenberg sought to find out the Lord's will from His Spirit, Word and providence (asked counsel of God, 37) on whether the battle against the rationalistic historico-higher critics on their Old Testament theories (Shall I go down after the Philistines?) should be pushed unto the limits of a complete victory thereon (wilt thou deliver them into the hand of Israel?). By not giving them the necessary refutative arguments thereto, and by not giving favoring providences, God withheld a reply at that period, from about 1850 to about 1865 (answered him not that

day). This lack of God's manifesting His will on the subjects under consideration convinced Hengstenberg that there was something wrong done by some of the leaders among his supporters. Hence he asked that these should undergo a Divinely indicated examination on the subject of the alleged sin that hindered the completion of the victory (Saul said, Draw ye near, all ye chief ... know and see wherein this sin hath been this day, 38). He solemnly affirmed that if the fault was even in antitypical Jonathan, his chief new-creaturely supporters, they would have to be disfellowshipped (though it be in Jonathan ... surely die, 39).

(44) This struck all his supporters as too harsh; for it was generally known that antitypical Jonathan accepted the Millennium, which Hengstenberg, as an adherent of the (Lutheran) Augsburg Confession, rejected. Hence none of his supporters gave him any encouragement on his rash determination (not a man among all the people that answered him). It struck him that the blame should lie either in the main leaders or in the rest of the warriors (all Israel ... one side, and I and Jonathan ... other side, v. 40). To this his supporters assented (people said ... what seemeth good unto thee). Then Hengstenberg prayed that the Lord might properly direct the discussion and vote to the discovery of those allegedly at fault (Lord ... Give a perfect lot, 41). Thereupon the discussion and vote eliminated all except him and antitypical Jonathan (Saul and Jonathan were taken; but the people escaped; literally, went out). Thereupon Hengstenberg declared that the discussion and voting should be as between him and antitypical Jonathan (Cast lots between me and Jonathan, 42). The discussion and voting revealed the fact that antitypical Jonathan had by his acceptance and commendation of the Millennial doctrine introduced a condition among Hengstenberg's supporters that in their opinion diverted attention from the fight against the rationalistic historico-higher critics, and brought a new controversy among the former,

which influenced the Lord to decide against the prosecution of the anti-infidelistic battle in the interests of a subject more edifying for this people (Jonathan was taken). Thereupon Hengstenberg demanded an explanation of antitypical Jonathan's pertinent course (Tell me what thou hast done, 43). These then very frankly confessed their faith in the Millennial doctrine (I did but taste a little honey) and their sanctioning it with the office that was in their power (with the end of the rod that was in mine hand). They also recognized that the unbending conservatism of Hengstenberg would cut them off from the fellowship of their fellow sympathizing antitypical Israelites (lo, I must die).

(45) Thereupon the unbendingly conservative Hengstenberg by word and act most solemnly pronounced the sentence of disfellowshipment upon these, under pain that he would receive it or worse yet, if he refrained from acting it out on these (God do so [to me] and more also [if I do not see to it that] thou shalt surely die, 44). But Hengstenberg had miscalculated the attitude of his supporters as to antitypical Jonathan, for they loved the latter more than him, because they had nobler and more lovable heart qualities than he. Reminding him of their more effective part in the conflict with the rationalistic historico-higher critics than his (who hath wrought this great salvation in Israel, 45), they in no uncertain, and with unanimous voice questioned his decision (Shall Jonathan die?). Then most solemnly they declared against his decision (God forbid; as the Lord liveth) and most determinedly insisted, not only that these be not disfellowshipped, but that no other evil, not even the least one, come to them for their course (there shall not one hair of his head fall to the ground); for they argued that these had cooperated with God throughout the period of the involved controversy (for he hath wrought with God this day). Hengstenberg, as strong-willed as he was, had to bend to the storm of indignant protests that his severity had aroused in all his supporters, with the

result that his own supporters rescued these from the disfellowshipment that he had determined against them (so the people rescued Jonathan, that he died not). The dissension in the ranks of his supporters on the Millennial question and their unanimously standing by antitypical Jonathan as against him made him give up that phase of the controversy that was implied in attacking in detail the positions of the rationalistic historico-higher critics on Old Testament matters (Saul went up from following the Philistines, 46); and these critics went on with their theories (the Philistines went to their own place), which were developed by the Wellhausen-Graf-Kuenen schools into the theories of the evolutionary higher critics of the Harvest time. These latter views have been refuted by the antitypical Levites, who rallied to antitypical Moses' call (Ex. 32:26-28). Among these antitypical Levites the outstanding ones were Koenig, Moeller and Ruprecht, of Germany; Robertson, Orr, Sayce, Rawlinson, Finn and Urquhart, of Britain, and Bartlett, Bissell and, with Koenig, Green, of America.

(46) Thus by defending the twelve stewardship and other doctrines throughout the period of denominational mouthpieceship against their attackers, the crown-lost leaders took the leadership of antitypical Israel (So Saul took the kingdom over Israel, 47); and they had no easy time; for they had to meet opponents on every phase of truth due in their times (fought against all his enemies on every side), particularly against the autocrats, like the hierarchies in the Church (Moab), the clericalists (children of Ammon), the secular rulers who sought to control the Church (Edom), the radical religious leaders (kings of Zobah, *encampment*) and the sectarians (Philistines). Their great abilities enabled them to be very troublesome to whatever opponent they met, it making no difference who those opponents were (whithersoever he turned himself, he vexed them). Yea, they wrought

mightily, as can be seen by the properly informed at the mere mention of names like Origen, Augustine, Gerhard, Calvin, Menno, (Faustus) Socinus, Jewel, Barrowe, Barclay, Watson, Campbell and Himes, besides many other very able members of antitypical Saul in each of the twelve denominations, of whose crown-lost leaders only one for each is mentioned in this sentence. These able new creatures were certainly calculated to "vex" opponents in error. Not only so, but they saw to the gathering and training of able controversialists as their assistants (he gathered an host, 48), as they also waged for a time a successful war against sin in themselves and others (smote the Amalekites) and by their controversies delivered antitypical Israel from all who corrupted for them their Truth teachings (delivered Israel out of the hands of them that spoiled them).

(47) They had, especially, three groups of helpers (the sons of Saul, 49): (1) the ablest and most faithful of the crown-losers (Jonathan), (2) the less able consecrated crown-losers and the faith-justified ones, who in both classes were linguistic, interpretational, historical and systematic scholars (Ishui, *level, just*), and (3) the least able consecrated ones and the faith-justified ones, who acted as evangelists, missionaries and pastors (Melchi-shua, *my king is saved*, in allusion to antitypical Saul's being delivered as their leader from their attackers' arguments). They had especially two powers (two daughters): (1) that of writing, preaching and lecturing before immense public audiences (the name of the firstborn Merab, *increase, abundance*) and (2) that of addressing church gatherings (the name of the younger Michal, *brook*). Their office was that of being winsome chief leaders of God's nominal people (the name of Saul's wife was Ahinoam, *my brother is pleasant*, 50); and those whom they made leaders of their warriors were the theological professors (name of the captain of his host was Abner, *father of light*), who were very closely associated with

the crown-lost leaders (Saul's uncle); and they were indeed depositaries of knowledge (son of Ner, *light*). Controversialists by their controversial knowledge (Kish, *bow*, 51) were their developers (father of Saul); and the light, knowledge (Ner) that developed the theological professors, and that developed antitypical Saul was powerful (Abiel, *mighty father* [who was the father of Kish also, 9:1]). But throughout the period of denominational mouthpieceship for God (all the days of Saul, 52) the crown-lost princes in each denomination had severe controversies with the sectarians in the other denominations (sore war against the Philistines). And they were on the lookout for able scholars and controversialists, and on finding them enlisted them among their warriors (when Saul saw any strong man, or any valiant man, he took him unto him).

(48) From chapters 9 to 14 antitypical Samuel's and Saul's conflicts with error receive almost exclusive typical descriptions, but in chapter 15 their conflicts with sin in and about them are typically set forth. Here antitypical Samuel appears as more than a conqueror, while antitypical Saul falls short thereof. And chapter 15 closes with the statement that typifies antitypical Samuel's sorrowfully keeping himself aloof from antitypical Saul. The types of chapters 9-12 have had twelve progressive fulfillments, one in each of the twelve denominations. The types of chapters 13 and 14 have had but a single fulfillment, members of various denominations having part therein. But like the types of chapters 9 to 12, the types of chapter 15 have had a twelve-fold fulfillment, one progressively in connection with each denomination. So much prefaced, we will with the Lord's help proceed to the explanation of chapter 15's antitype, and with it will end the discussion of Samuel and Saul.

(49) Antitypical Samuel in each denomination first, in order of time, aroused antitypical Saul to wage controversies against errorists who were injuring God's true people. Later, in point of time, they exhorted

these to amendment of life and development of an overcoming character, and with such exhortations they (Samuel, 1) reminded these (said unto Saul) that they were by God commissioned to qualify them for leadership in antitypical Israel (The Lord sent me to anoint thee king ... over Israel), and made this fact the reason of their exhorting these to obedience to them as the mouthpiece of the Lord's Word (therefore hearken thou unto the voice [mouthpiece] of the words of the Lord), the sequel proving that in this exhortation amendment of life and development of an overcoming character were the things charged. Then antitypical Samuel points out the reason why this exhortation coming from God should be fulfilled. The treacherous efforts of *sin* to impede and prevent God's people from developing character unto fitness to reach heavenly Canaan in their journey thereto from the present evil world (saith the Lord, I remember that which Amalek, *laborious*, did to Israel, *prince or warrior of God*, ... when he came up from Egypt, *fortress*, 2). Therefore the Lord charged antitypical Saul utterly to destroy sin in themselves and to help other antitypical Israelites to do the same in themselves (smite Amalek, 3), and not only so, but utterly to destroy every form that sin has (utterly destroy all that they have), not sparing it or any of its forms and expressions (spare them not), killing all of them (slay), regardless of whether they were strong (man) or weak (woman) or partly developed (infant) or just begun to be developed (suckling) or were in the humanity of the consecrated (ox) or justified (sheep) or in an organization (camel) or in a teaching (ass). To carry out this charge antitypical Saul assembled antitypical Israel (gathered the people, 4) and described them in their sin-oppressed condition (numbered them in Telaim, *oppression*), detailing the nature of sin, their fallen dispositions and their sinful expressions, showing that the majority of them were very depraved (200,000 footmen) and that a minority of them were

less depraved (10,000 men of *Judah*, praised). The first effort was made against sin as an organized empire, *i.e.*, the natural depravity of their dispositions (Saul came to a [the] city of Amalek, 5) and they fought in the advantageous position of the Truth and its Spirit (laid wait [literally, strove] in the valley).

(50) Since this antitype concerns the overthrow of sin, certain human talents inherited and acquired (Kenites, *acquisitions*, 6) and usable in the Lord's service were not included in the order of extirpation. Hence antitypical Saul by his course separated these (Go, depart, get you down), which often are used as servants of sin (among the Amalekites), from such sinful uses, that they might not be destroyed as inseparable from sin, when it would be destroyed (lest I destroy you with them), the reason being that these natural and acquired talents have been helpful for the Lord's people in carrying out their consecration (showed kindness to ... Israel, when they came up) during their journey from this present evil world (out of Egypt). Accordingly, antitypical Saul and Israel severed their natural and acquired talents from sinful uses (Kenites departed from among the Amalekites). Antitypical Saul and earnest antitypical Israelites bravely attacked all of their actual and verbal sins and all of the wilfulness that formerly lodged in them (Saul smote the Amalekites, 7). This they did in the sphere of their isolated condition away from the world (Havilah, *sandy* [Israel's 40 years' journeys were in the sandy wilderness]) to the fortifications of sin (Shur, *fortress*) guarding the present evil world (over against Egypt). They even did more: they made a captive of sinfulness itself (Agag, *giant*, 8), which as the depraved condition of a fallen disposition is the king sin (king of the Amalekites), and overthrew its expressions in word and deed (utterly destroyed all the people) with the Sword of the Spirit, the Word of God (with the edge of the sword). But they made the great mistake of cutting off the branches of the tree of sin and leaving

its trunk unfelled and its roots unuprooted (Saul and the people spared Agag, 9); not only so, but they spared, some the besetting sins of their justified humanity (best of the sheep), some the besetting sins of their consecrated humanity (best ... of the oxen), some even other than besetting sins (and of the fatlings; literally, even seconds), some their recently developing sins (lambs), and in general what of sin that was dear to their depraved dispositions (and all that was good), refusing to make a full end of these (would not utterly destroy); but all of sin that was distasteful and unappealing, hence rejectable, they destroyed (but every thing [literally, every work] ... vile and refuse ... destroyed utterly).

(51) The Lord's Word condemning such a course, opening up to antitypical Samuel (then came the word of the Lord unto Samuel, 10), impressed them with the thought that God had decided to change His procedure in having antitypical Saul continue to be God's leader for Israel (repented me that I have set up Saul to be king, 11), God giving as His reasons therefore that antitypical Saul had turned away from the Lord (he is turned back from following me), and that they had failed to fulfill the charge of God as to fully overcoming sin (not performed my commandments). Naturally antitypical Samuel was greatly saddened by the two things: antitypical Saul's disobedience and the Lord's purpose to uncrown him (it grieved Samuel). These two things moved him with much supplication to entreat the Lord not to uncrown them, but to give them another chance to reform (cried unto the Lord all night). Assured that God would not change His decision, antitypical Samuel quickly (rose early, 12) betook themselves on a mental journey to meet antitypical Saul as soon as possible (to meet Saul in the morning). Antitypical Saul was on all hands being praised to antitypical Samuel as being very fruitful in their undertakings (told Samuel, saying, Saul came to Carmel, *fruitful garden*), as having made a great reputation

for themselves as a reminder of their fame (set him up a place; literally, a monument), as exhibiting, *i.e.*, showing off, themselves in many places (gone about, and passed on) and as descending into a crucial condition (gone down to Gilgal). Thus they who had begun so humbly were now developing pride, unholy ambition, arrogance and hunger for honor and applause, thus proving that few of God's people can stand greatness and popularity. If we look at men like Origen, Athanasius, Cyprian, Gregory the Great, Illiricus, Whitgift, Calvin, (Faustus) Socinus, Calov, Coke, Campbell and Rutherford, we see this principle illustrated in antitypical Saul. How necessary in the prominent servants of God that they be filled both with deep humility and loving zeal; otherwise they will come to their Gilgals and therein come to a fall!

(52) Of course, in antitypical Samuel's coming into contact with antitypical Saul (Samuel came to Saul, 13), the latter were sure to speak graciously to the Lord's faithful (Blessed be thou of the Lord), and yet to boast in hypocrisy (I have performed the commandment of the Lord). But antitypical Samuel's sharp eyes and keen ears were quick to perceive and understand the evidences of unovercome sins in the justified (Samuel said, What meaneth then this bleating of the sheep in mine ears, 14) and in the humanity of the consecrated (the lowing of the oxen which I hear?). Then to save their face and to make an appearance of piety (for hypocrisy does love to palm off its evil doings as a service of God), they asserted that the qualities *e.g.*, compromises with the world and its ways to win more followers, exercising worldly and selfish qualities against consecration to influence otherwise unwinnable persons to accept a compromise of Christianity as the genuine article, were proper things to offer to God in sacrifice, though connected with some sin (Saul said, They have brought them from the Amalekites ... to sacrifice unto the Lord, 15). They claimed that these were the best of fallen humanity's qualities (best of the

sheep and of the oxen) and were really useful to exercise with certain kinds of people, to win them for the Lord. And the dispositions not useful in this way they claimed were all overcome (the rest we have utterly destroyed). This untruthful and deceitful answer prompted antitypical Samuel to ask antitypical Saul to give attention to the pertinent message that the Lord had just recently given them (Stay, and I will tell thee what the Lord hath said to me this night, 16). Antitypical Saul asked them to tell it (Say on). Antitypical Samuel then asked antitypical Saul whether it was not true that in the days when they were full of deep humility they were made the leaders of the denominations of Christendom (When ... little in thine own sight ... made the head of the tribes of Israel, 17) and whether it was not then that the Lord qualified them to be such leaders (the Lord anointed thee king over Israel?). Furthermore, they reminded them that God had commissioned them utterly to overcome sin in itself and in all its forms (the Lord sent ... and said ... utterly destroy the sinners, the Amalekites, v. 18) and to continue perseveringly in this spiritual warfare, until they would fully conquer them (fight against them until they be consumed). Then antitypical Samuel asked antitypical Saul why they had not obeyed the Lord's charge (Wherefore ... not obey the voice of the Lord, v. 19), but instead yielded to sin's sway for advantage (fly upon the spoil), and had done evil in God's sight (didst evil in the sight of the Lord?).

(53) Self-righteousness and self-justification characterized antitypical Saul to so great a degree that he presumed in his pride positively to contradict the rebuking star-members (*Yea*, I have obeyed the voice of the Lord, 20). They insisted that they had gone the full length of their mission (gone the way which the Lord sent me). Then they boasted that they had gotten sin under their control (have brought Agag, the king of Amalek) and had fully overcome the words and acts of their fallen flesh (have utterly destroyed the Amalekites).

Selfishly they sought to shift upon their supporters (the people took of the spoil, 21) the burden of sparing such allegedly allowable features of sinfulness in the justified and in the humanity of the consecrated (sheep and oxen) as could be used fruitfully in an alleged service of God, instances of which were cited above (the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto ... thy God in Gilgal). To this deceitful answer antitypical Samuel gave, partly in question form, a classic answer (Samuel said, 22; in the type the answer is put in poetic form): Does the Lord delight in services allegedly acceptable to Him and in sacrifices made contrary to obedience as much as He does in obedience, even if unaccompanied by sacrifice? Does He in any sense delight in such service and sacrifice contrary to obedience? (Hath the Lord ... delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as [He delights] in obeying the voice of the Lord?). Then antitypical Samuel read them a lesson very essential for all of God's people to learn, especially those of them in high places in His service, to the effect that to practice justice is better than to practice love contrary to justice, and to obey is better than alleged acceptable services rendered contrary to obedience. If, therefore, such cannot in harmony with obedience sacrifice, let them omit sacrifice, but obey; for justice must precede love. If both can be done together, that is best (Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams). Then, because antitypical Samuel were dealing with a crown-losing class, and therefore in God's sight with Levites, they used language appropriate to the situation, to the effect that revolutionism—the sin of antitypical Levites—is the sin of especially deceiving false teaching (rebellion is [the word for *as* is not in the Hebrew, as its being in italics shows] the sin of witchcraft, v. 23), and wilfulness—a special characteristic of revolutionistic leaders—is disharmonious with justice and is self-worship (stubbornness is [again the word for *as* is

not in the Hebrew, as the italics show] iniquity and idolatry).

(54) Thereupon antitypical Samuel, with a sad, but obedient heart, announced the Lord's decision, telling antitypical Saul, with words doubtless choked with deep emotion, and in some of their representatives with tear-filled eyes, that since they had refused obedience to the Lord's Word, the Lord had rejected them from being the leaders of His true people (rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king). Then, pricked to the heart and facing the situation honestly, antitypical Saul, their natural and acquired humility returning, acknowledge to antitypical Samuel that they had sinned (I have sinned, 24). Then they confessed the weakness that prompted to the sin—fear of opposing the wishes of the people by a resolute insistence on their overcoming sin (I feared the voice of the people and obeyed their voice), for which they were willing to disobey God and the star-members (transgressed the commandment of the Lord, and thy words). Here is brought out a danger to leaders: fear of losing the popular favor leading them to compromise Truth and righteousness. Let those who are leaders be on their guard against this snare. If they give God their supreme devotion and trust, they will be delivered from "the fear of man that bringeth a snare," a snare that in a more attenuated way is a danger to all of God's people. Surely our hearts bleed for typical Saul, and more so for antitypical Saul, for having been caught in this snare unto their undoing as leaders of God's people! Antitypical Saul earnestly and humbly entreated antitypical Samuel for forgiveness (I pray thee, pardon my sin, 25); moreover they made the same kind of a request that antitypical Samuel withdraw not their cooperation with them in their service of the Lord, which they greatly desired to further (turn again with me, that I may worship the Lord). This antitypical Samuel refused to do, for they knew that the rejected ones' service henceforth would not be acceptable

(I will not return with thee, 26). They gave as their reason a repetition of the pronounced sentence, that their rejecting God's Word resulted in God's rejecting them from leadership in antitypical Israel. This made it inadvisable to act in a way contradictory to the resultant situation (rejected the word of the Lord ... rejected thee ... king over Israel).

(55) So saying, antitypical Samuel turned to leave antitypical Saul, so far as acting as though they were sanctioning their administrative acts any more (turned about to go away, 27). Thereupon in remonstrance antitypical Saul forcibly took away from antitypical Samuel some of their power, and thus did violence to it; for these crown-lost princes resented antitypical Samuel's refusal to recognize their leadership, but they did it in the hope of changing their minds and course (laid hold on the skirt of his mantle, and it rent). The remonstrance of antitypical Samuel at Calvin's burning Servetus is a good illustration of the antitype of 1727; others abound. This unseemly course of antitypical Saul prompted antitypical Samuel to point out how by that violence antitypical Saul had figured forth God's taking the leadership in antitypical Israel from them (the Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee, 28) at that time (this day), which occurred with the various individuals on their rejection in each denomination and, finally, with all of them through God's choice of Bro. Russell to be put in their place. They said that God would give it to a brother in Christ worthier than they (give it to a neighbour ... better than thou). They further asserted that God, who is the Strength of His people, would not make His decision become a falsehood (the Strength of Israel will not lie, 29); nor would He, as men usually do, change His mind (nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent). Heartbroken, poor antitypical Saul again acknowledged their sin (I have sinned, 30). Despite this, they pleaded that antitypical Samuel do them the respect, that the other leaders, as well as

the people, seeing, would still continue to support them as their chief leaders (honour me ... before the elders ... and before Israel). Antitypical Saul pleaded this that they might serve the Lord (turn again ... worship ... thy God). Deeply touched through their love and pity for antitypical Saul, antitypical Samuel relented and showed fellowship while antitypical Saul continued to serve the Lord (Samuel turned again ... Saul worshiped the Lord, 31).

(56) But antitypical Samuel did not use the occasion to compromise with, but to destroy sin in themselves. Before the whole assembly they required sin as a subject to be brought to the fore (Bring hither to me Agag, the king of the Amalekites, 32). In its possessors this seemed to be thought to mean that they would very tenderly be spared overcoming it (Agag ... delicately ... said, Surely the bitterness of death is past). But they miscalculated the character and purpose of antitypical Samuel, who declared that as sin by its mortal power had caused the death of all men, as the children of human nature and of God's covenant with Adam and the race in him (Hos. 6:7; as thy sword hath made women childless, 33), so should lust in its various forms, the mother of sin (Jas. 1:15), become childless, through antitypical Samuel's overcoming it (so shall thy mother be childless among women). Thereupon antitypical Samuel overcame sin in the presence of antitypical Saul and Israel, by making no compromises with it, but overcoming all inducements that it offered them to compromise with it, which to accomplish they had to sever themselves from antitypical Saul and all who had their spirit (hewed Agag in pieces), and that publicly in the Lord's service amid crucial experiences (before the Lord in Gilgal). Thereupon antitypical Samuel returned to the heights of developing and maintaining a more than overcoming character (Then Samuel went to Ramah, *height*, 34). And antitypical Saul ascended to office powers in the heights of a crown-loser's character (Saul went up to

his house to Gibeah [*height*] of Saul). But these experiences ended antitypical Samuel's fellowship with antitypical Saul (Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death, 35); for after the Adventist crown-lost leaders went to the bad, the last of the twelve fellowship removals occurred, which fellowship removals were kept up until their careers ended, early in the Harvest, when Bros. Storr and Stetson, some of the last representatives of antitypical Samuel, died. Despite antitypical Samuel's disappointment in antitypical Saul, they still continued to love these, which occasioned them to grieve deeply over the fall of these (Samuel mourned for Saul), which, however, did not alter God's determination to change His procedure whereby He had made antitypical Saul the leader of antitypical Israel (the Lord repented [changed not His mind, but His procedure] that he had made Saul king over Israel). Let us learn the lessons chiefly inculcated by Samuel and Saul, *i.e.*, that by God's grace we stand, as we abide faithful, taught us by antitypical Samuel's life, and that, despite God's grace, we fall, as we prove unfaithful, taught us by antitypical Saul's life.

(1) About whom does 1 Sam. 1-8 center? 1 Sam 9-15? What title did these two facts suggest as to the subjects of these two sections? What have the brethren indicated as to their study of 1 Sam. 1-8? What prayer is thereby suggested? What does Samuel continue to type in 1 Sam. 9-15, generally, particularly and most particularly? Whom does Saul therein type, generally and particularly? How many fulfillments does 1 Sam. 9-15 have? What does this mean? What will time and space not allow here? In lieu of this, what will be presented? What has been given as to the crown-lost leaders? In what study?

(2) What do Saul, David and Solomon primarily type? Saul and David secondarily? When will the secondary antitype of Solomon be given? By what are crown-lost leaders typed? As a class what were they? How typed? How did they shoot out their teachings? How typed? What did they do with one another? How typed? As

what did they hold together? How typed? As such what was their condition? How typed? By whom were they refreshed? How typed? Who were the chief of the crown-losers? By whom typed? How are these described? How typed? How did they compare in this respect with other crown-losers and unconsecrated ones? How typed? Name one of such in each denomination. What does the mere mention of their names prove? Who were the four ablest of the twelve? How do they rank in intellectual ability with the ablest of men? What had crown-losers before the rise of each of the twelve denominations lost? How typed? How is this exemplified before the rise of the Greek Catholic Church? The Lutheran Church? What did the crown-losers, therefore, do? How typed? Whom did they send along? How typed? In what two ways is this construed?

(3) Up to his anointing whom does Saul type? As what? What did they do in search of the lost truths? First where? How typed? Second where? How typed? Wherein? Third where? How typed? With what results? Why? Finally, where did they come in search? How typed? What did the prospective crown-lost leaders here suggest? How typed? Why did they make the suggestion? How typed? What did the doctricians suggest? How typed? Why? How did they speak of the Little Flock leaders' characters and teachings? How typed? What moved them to advise going to antitypical Samuel? How typed? What are we to remember as to antitypical Samuel's activities up to 1846? How did antitypical Saul react to the suggestion? How typed? Why? How did he deprecate the situation? How typed? How did the dogmaticians answer? How typed? What reason did they give? How typed?

(4) What remark is made in v. 9? Why is it made? How did antitypical Saul react to the dogmaticians' second remark? How typed? What, accordingly, was done? When? How typed? What did they first do? How typed? Whom did they providentially meet? How typed? On' what errand were these engaged? How typed? What were they asked? How typed? Give an example of one of the twelve fulfillments. What did the consecrated ones offer them? How typed? How? How typed? Like what is this? What did they say? How typed? What did

they urge? How typed? Why? How typed? Why did they say they had come? How typed? Where, according to the assurance, would they find them? How typed? What further did they urge? How typed? Why? How typed? Otherwise what would happen? How typed? Why did they urge haste? How typed? In what were the typical and antitypical maidens alike?

(5) What did antitypical Saul and his associates overcome? How typed? How did they meet antitypical Samuel? How typed? What had the Lord made known to antitypical Samuel beforehand? How typed? What example illustrates this? With what did He charge antitypical Samuel? How typed? For what had God chosen antitypical Saul? How typed? What example illustrates this? Why, according to God's assurance, was God so arranging? How typed? How did God indicate this to the Little Flock leaders? How typed? What did antitypical Saul do? How typed? What did they ask? How typed? How did antitypical Samuel introduce himself to antitypical Saul? How typed? What did antitypical Samuel bid them? How typed? To what did they invite them? How typed? What did they promise to do later? How typed? What else? How typed?

(6) What assurance did they give? How typed? Noting what moved antitypical Samuel to give what assurance? How typed? By what did the crown-lost ones betray themselves as such? How typed? What else by act did they indicate of themselves as a class and their relations? How typed? What did these qualities move them to do? How typed? In what examples do we see this? Who shows this and in what? What did antitypical Samuel then do? How typed? What did they then give them? How typed? What did they not thereby neglect? How typed? Of what natures were the guests? How typed? With what and in what capacity did the Little Flock leaders charge themselves? How typed? What was done with the charge? How typed? What did antitypical Samuel heartily commend to antitypical Saul? To what did they encourage them? How typed? What assurance did they give them? How typed? What did antitypical Saul then do? Where? How typed? Give two examples of this.

(7) Thereupon what did both classes do? How typed? In what way did antitypical Samuel put the Truth before antitypical Saul? How typed? How do we get this thought? In what way? How typed? What did antitypical Saul then do? How typed? How do we get this thought? What in the next stage of affairs did antitypical Samuel do? How typed? After this rest what did antitypical Samuel do? How typed? What did both classes in association do? How typed? Give an example of this. What in principle was done in the other eleven denominations? Into what did this activity bring both classes? At this juncture what did antitypical Samuel desire? How typed? What resulted? How typed? Why did they desire this privacy? How typed?

(8) Of what does 1 Sam. 10 treat? Up to this point, with certain exceptions, what had antitypical Samuel not given antitypical Saul? What from then on did they give them? How typed? For what did this qualify them? How typed? What assurance did they give them on their leaving the Lord's mouthpieces? How typed? In what sphere? How typed? What would the two classes of the consecrated tell them? How typed? How could they have told this? What second assurance did antitypical Samuel give antitypical Saul? How typed? What are the three aspects of the type and antitype? What were, and what were not, the teachings that they would impart? What charge was given as to two loaves? How typed?

(9) Where was the third of antitypical Saul's experiences to take place? How typed? Who would be there? How typed? With whom would it be? How typed? How would these be occupied? How typed? In favor of what would these be working? How typed? What would these be doing as they thus proceeded? How typed? What would antitypical Saul's third forecast experience be? How typed? In what would such prophesying result? How typed? Into what would this third experience change them? Give two examples of this thought. What was antitypical Saul to do after these three signs were fulfilled in them? How typed? Why do these things? How typed?

(10) What did antitypical Samuel then tell antitypical Saul? How typed? How would the former come to the latter's succor? How typed? What thought did the

former impress upon the latter? How typed? What were the latter not to do? How typed? After these things, what would antitypical Samuel show antitypical Saul? How typed? What occurred after antitypical Samuel had finished his instructions to antitypical Saul? How typed? What kind of a heart did God give the latter? How typed? What happened as to the three forecasts of vs. 2-6? How typed? Of which two as events are no fulfilled details given? How typed? Of which one are the details given? In what verses are they typed? What does v. 10 simply state? How? What do vs. 11-13 relate? What did antitypical Saul's oldtime acquaintances witness? How typed? What did they do to one another? How typed? What did they question? How typed?

(11) How did another class in the same denomination answer them? How typed? What was their question? How typed? What did their question mean? How typed? What facts prove this principle to be true? What examples of primary crown-lost leaders illustrate this principle? Of secondary crown-lost leaders? What did the frequency of this fact result in? How typed? In favor of what truths was such prophesying? How typed? In what did it result? How typed? Give six examples illustrative of this result. To what further result did this lead? How typed? What was the relationship of the involved types to each other? How proved? What was the antitypical uncle's question put to antitypical Saul and the doctricians? How typed? What twofold thing did they answer? How typed? What question did this twofold answer prompt the antitypical uncle to ask? How typed? What answer was returned? How typed? Of what was no mention made? How typed?

(12) What did antitypical Samuel make known? To whom? In view of what? How typed? Of what did they there first remind God's people? How typed? Second? How typed? Third? How typed? Fourth? How typed? What did they add? How typed? Despite what did they reject the Lord as King? How typed? For what had they clamored? How typed? Acceding to their ill-advised clamors, what did they suggest that they do in their denominations and thousands of leaders? How typed? Why this? What resulted from the first testings through antitypical Samuel's ministry? How typed? From

the second testing? How typed? Under the third testing? How typed? Under the fourth testing? How typed? What was done as to antitypical Saul? How typed? What was the result? How typed?

(13) On such leaders not coming forward what was done? How typed? For what did they inquire? How typed? How and what did the Lord answer? How typed? Who illustrated this course of humility, *etc.*? What did the antitypical Israelites then do? How typed? What did antitypical Saul then do? How typed? In what respects was he superior to all the others? How typed? How did antitypical Samuel introduce them to the people? How typed? Give three examples of such introduction. How was antitypical Saul received? How typed? What did antitypical Samuel then do? How typed? What did they finally do? How typed? What did the crown-lost leaders then do? How typed? By whom accompanied? How typed? What did opponents in each of the twelve denominations do as to this matter? How typed? What reaction was made? How typed?

(14) On what does 1 Sam. 11 treat? What does it type? Who will be presented as an illustration of the controversial work of the involved antitypes in all twelve denominations? Against whom especially did they contend? What was the pertinent work of the Council of Trent? What did the Jesuits and other Romanist controversialists, accordingly, attempt? How typed? What was the condition of the Lutheran Church at that time? How typed? What before the Council of Trent had the Lutherans come to desire? Why? How typed? Why was the Council of Trent convoked? What condition did the emperor and the hierarchy desire to impose for the treaty? How typed? How impose it? In furtherance of this scheme what was done? As what was the proposed apostasy intended? By what two things were the German Lutherans hard pressed? How typed? What resulted? For what did their leaders ask? How typed? What was the object of the Lutherans? How typed? On what condition would they give up? How typed?

(15) To and as what did the message of the threatening disaster come? How typed? What was its effect on the people? How typed? With what were the crown-lost leaders occupied before this? How involvedly typed?

What did they ask as to the people's grief? How typed? What were they told? How typed? What in 1560 was done by Payva d'Andrada and his colaborers? How did its nature and result affect Martin Chemnitz? How typed? How did he progress in this attitude? How typed? What did he then do? How typed? What word did he send to his fellow Lutherans? How typed? What effect did this have on them? How typed? What had previously happened? What did antitypical Saul do to those who flocked to his standard? How typed? Of what two kinds were his supporters? How typed? What as to their standing is typed by the multiples of ten?

(16) What in reality were the first pertinent writings of the Lutheran section of antitypical Saul? How typed? Wherein were Chemnitz's and Gerhard's first pertinent messages contained? Who else cooperated? How, compared to the two? As what did all these come to antitypical Jabesh-gilead? With what effect? How typed? What impression did the course of the German Lutherans make on the Romanists? How typed? What did d'Andrada do in 1564? What came into Chemnitz's hands? What resulted therefrom? Into what did this decision result? What were the character and effect of his work, Examination of the Tridentine Council? In view of its character and effect what proverb was invented? What is a short history of this book?

(17) As to it what could the Romanists not permit? What did many Romanist theologians do as to it? Who was their ablest representative? Give a description of him and his pertinent work, Disputations, *etc.* Of the terse answers, and especially of Gerhard's detailed answer? Where are copies of the three above-mentioned works? What was done by Lutheran anti-Romanist controversialists between Chemnitz and Gerhard? Who practically ended it? By whom, later than Gerhard, was it continued as a pursuit? By whom especially of these? What was the result of the conflict, especially Gerhard's part therein? How typed? How was the conflict planned and executed? How typed? How long did it last? How typed? How did the antitypical battle go on in the other eleven denominations? Why will their details not here be given? What adequately illustrates them?

(18) What did antitypical Saul's and Samuel's adherents desire of the latter? Why did they desire this? How typed? Who forbade this? Why? How typed? What did antitypical Samuel counsel? How typed? What was, accordingly, done? How typed? What did they do at this turn of affairs? How typed? What else was there done? How typed? Give examples.

(19) What are the main lines of thought in 1 Sam. 12? What two things did antitypical Samuel seek to do at each turning point of antitypical Israel's crises? In connection with what did he seek these things? How typed? Whom did they point out? How typed? To what else did they point? How typed? What example illustrates this? Who else did this also? To what third thing did they point? How typed? What fourth thing did they point out? How typed? What general challenge did they throw out? How typed?

(20) What was the first particular challenge that they threw out? How typed? The second? How typed? The third? How typed? The fourth? How typed? The fifth? How typed? What did they assert? How typed? What was the people's answer? Why? How typed? Upon whom did antitypical Samuel call to witness the people's answer? How typed? How did the people respond thereto? How typed? To what does history testify in this connection? How did this affect the faithful servants of the Truth? Who are examples of this? Why does this occur? What say the cited Scriptures thereon? With what should God's servants comfort themselves when slandered?

(21) Thereupon what did antitypical Samuel call to the people's attention? How typed? What was the first of these Divine acts? How typed? In view of this what did antitypical Samuel request? Why? How typed? What did they teach them? How typed? On this subject what did they first teach the people? How typed? Whom did God send to deliver them? By what? How typed? What was done to God's people? How typed? What did they teach the people as to their forgetting God? How typed? To whom did He first give them up? How typed? Second? How typed? Third? How typed? What did these do to God's captive people? How typed? What did God do when they repented and cried to Him? How

typed? What evils were confessed? How typed? What was asked? Promising what? How typed?

(22) What four antitypical deliverers did God raise up? How typed in each case? What did these effect? How typed? What did antitypical Samuel then charge against them? Under what circumstance did they ask this? How typed? To whom did antitypical Samuel then point? How typed? What four things did they then point out as enabling the people to set God first before self? How typed? What did they mention as turning God against them again? How typed?

(23) To what did they then direct special attention? How typed? What, type and antitype, made it unexpected? What would this unexpected thing give antitypical Israel? How typed? What was then done, type and antitype? Give examples of the fulfillment in the Greek, Roman and Calvinistic Churches. What was the first effect of this, type and antitype? The second? The third? What effect did the repentance of the people have on antitypical Samuel? How typed? Why could they give comfort? How typed? Under what conditions? How typed? To what did they exhort? How typed? To what would apostasy lead? How typed? Despite what would such be the result of apostasy? How typed?

(24) What reasons did antitypical Samuel give for the people's taking comfort? How typed? How did antitypical Samuel regard ceasing to pray for the people? How typed? What besides praying for the people did antitypical Samuel promise to do to them? How typed? What did they again stress? How typed? To what did they exhort as helpful thereto? How typed? If they should sin wilfully, what did antitypical Samuel say would occur? How typed? What activities and disposition type and antitype, does 1 Sam. 12 show to be its speaker's?

(25) What will our present study do with our subject? What does 1 Sam. 13 type? Where and when did this conflict mainly occur? By what two error-teaching parties was rationalism sown in Germany? Whence did the French naturalists arise? By what did they find an entrance into Germany? How so? Who were their chief representatives at the court of Frederick the Great? Who was the father of vulgar rationalism? With what effects did he use his great talents? How may his sowing and

reaping be described? What effect on him did his recognition of the effects of his teachings have? Who was a close second to him in this mischievous work? What fraud did he commit? What did they teach? What was Lessing's connection with them? What part did Semler take in this controversy? What were the effects of Lessing's defense of the Wolfenbuettler Fragments? Who were the heroes of vulgar rationalism? What gave impetus to this theory? What resulted ere long? What three doctrines were by them held to be the total of religion? How did they state these three? On what did they rely as the sole source of faith and practice?

(26) What did they include as meant by the word, reason? According to their uses of this word, what characterized it? What even would they understand it to mean? What does this mean for reason? What kind of a source of faith and practice is it? What two things do we understand the word to mean? What four powers belong to normal true thinking? What functions do these four powers have? What are some self-evident truths? What two great mistakes did vulgar rationalists make? What does the depravity of these four intellectual powers disqualify reason from being? At best, what are its offices? What is the only true source of faith and practice? What are the two sole rules of faith and practice? How do they compare as such? How does the Spirit of God in His people exercise its office as the secondary rule of faith and practice? Accordingly, in the intellect what is the Spirit? What is included in sanctified reason as a part of the rule of faith and practice? Accordingly, how many sources of faith and practice are there? How many rules of these are there? In contrast, what does vulgar rationalism take as the sole source and rule of faith and practice? Why have these remarks been made on reason, the Bible and the Spirit in God's people?

(27) What, according to the margin's literal rendering, does the expression, Saul was a son of one year, mean? How does the A. V. render the pertinent expression? What has happened to the original here? What word did it probably originally contain? What two reasons favor this thought? If this emendation be correct, how should the pertinent part of v. 1 be rendered? What does the pertinent Hebrew idiom prove as to this verse? How can

we not prove this? What does this prove of the omission? Accordingly, how should v. 1 and the first part of v. 2 be rendered? What marked each member of the crown-lost leaders when chosen to be such? How typed? What happened shortly thereafter? How typed? With whom were the majority of these especially associated? In what? How typed? The minority? In what? How typed? What did the crown-lost leaders do with the rest of the Lord's people? How typed?

(28) What did the most faithful of the crown-losers do at this time? How typed? What two things did the vulgar rationalists reject? What did they seek to do? What are some examples of their use of the Christmas and Easter festivals? Wherein did their flatness manifest itself? What did they do with the noble German hymns? Had able men deliberately sought to make religion hollow, more than whom would they not have succeeded in so doing? What two examples illustrate this? What did the notorious so-called German Library do in this connection? What was their watchword and their aversion? Where were they placed in office? Whom did they lead? With what?

(29) What was God's pertinent course? Even amid what condition? In what branches of religious learning did some war against vulgar rationalism? In spite of what? How typed? Who was by them aroused to lecture, preach and write against the vulgar rationalists? How typed? What were some of his beliefs, abilities, characteristics and activities? In what did these result? To whom did he appeal? How does he stand related to the Saul of 1 Sam. 13? At his death, who was his successor as antitype of Saul? Especially in what chapter? How did he and antitypical Jonathan stand in numbers, compared with the vulgar rationalists? What officials took note of antitypical Jonathan's refuting the vulgar rationalists? How typed? Who else took note of it? How typed? How did the high-placed rationalists regard the Bible-believers? How typed?

(30) What kind of men were many of the non-vulgar rationalists? What effect did antitypical Jonathan's victory have on the other than vulgar rationalists? What were they in fact? On what did they decide? Why did they do this? How typed? In what groups were they

gathered together? How typed? How were they in numbers, compared with the antitypical Israelites? How typed? Where did they take their stand? How typed? What was the character of their position? How typed? How did the true believers view the situation? How typed? What did it move them to do? In what ways did they seek protection? How is each way typed?

(31) In what condition was Schleiermacher at this time? How typed? How did his supporters cling to him? How typed? For whom and what did he wait and how long? How typed? Whom here does Samuel type? In what did they not give him help? How typed? Who in large numbers left him? How typed? What mistake did he commit? Why? How typed? What did he do? How typed? Thereafter who appeared? How? How typed? How did Schleiermacher react to the situation? How typed? How in point of time did he do the offering and approach the views of the Philadelphia star-members? At each stage of his advancement what did he do? How typed? After each stage of the offering what did antitypical Samuel do? How typed? At each expostulation what did Schleiermacher do? What were the excuses? How typed? Who during his life were the living star-members? How only was there contact made between him and all of the Philadelphia star-members? How was his second excuse made? How typed? What was his third excuse? How typed?

(32) What was his fourth excuse? How typed? His fifth excuse? How typed? The sixth? How typed? As a result of these six excuses what did he do? How typed? Until when should God's servants be inactive as to teaching and serving? Why? Like whom did Schleiermacher in this respect act? How did the latter one speak in his heart? How did the star-members rebuke the former? How typed? Of what did they accuse him? How typed? What would have resulted had he kept the Lord's command? How typed? What would result from his repeated disobedience in this line? How typed? What did the star-members tell him? How? How typed? Who was the selected successor of Schleiermacher? Of all the crown-lost leaders? How typed? Why is a repetition made here? How typed?

(33) What was done after each of Schleiermacher's runnings ahead of the Lord? Unto what? Despite what? How typed? After each one of such leavings what did he do? How typed? After each of such experiences what did he do as to his supporters? After each expostulation of antitypical Samuel what did he do in company with antitypical Jonathan? How typed? What position did his foes take? How typed? Who was their father? In how many lines of destructive work did they engage? How typed? What was the first of these? Who were its two main exponents? How did they differ? From this standpoint what did the rationalistic higher critics do and accomplish? How are their views and activities typed? What was the second of these? What did its cultivators seek to do? Who were the two main leaders in Biblical Hebrew and the two main leaders in Biblical Greek? How did the two in each set differ in their work? Despite certain good fruits of their work, in whose interests and spirit did they work? What was the result? How is all this typed?

(34) What was the third of the three destructive activities? Who was the main leaders of this movement? What was his inspiration and qualifications for this work? Who were his two main lieutenants? What did Baur hold as to the Apostles, especially Peter and Paul? What did he deny and accept of the New Testament? To what periods did he assign the writing of his rejected books? What was Strauss's most destructive book called? What did he claim the Gospels' accounts to be? When did he claim them to have been written? What did Vatke do in this matter? In what spirit? How did the third school compare with the other two? How is it typed? In what year did all three start their attack? What did that year witness? What was the period of vulgar rationalism's ascendancy? How long before Baur's, Strauss's and Vatke's special attacks? What characterized the molders of public religious opinion during this period? How typed? What pertinent course did the authorities pursue? In what did this result? How typed? What resulted from this result? How typed? What only was left to them? How typed? In what did this result? How typed? What did the rationalistic higher critics do in 1835? On what? How typed?

(35) What did antitypical Jonathan do shortly after the appearance of Baur's and Strauss's books in 1835?

How typed? Who were the three chief members of antitypical Jonathan at that time as to New Testament subjects? What is here said of the first of them? Who were their chief supporters? Their chief members on Old Testament matters? Their chief supporters? Who was the antitypical Saul of that time? On what was his chief pertinent work? How did it compare with others thereon of his times? What may be said of it? Of what three works of his is this especially true? Wherein did he go to an extreme? In what did this result as to antitypical Jonathan? Why was this so? How typed? What position did he increasingly take? How typed? What did he fight? In what? How typed? What did he do with rationalistic error? What was the character of his supporters? How typed? What did the Priesthood at that time stress? How typed? How did it characterize Jesus? How typed? As the supporter of what? How typed? In what? How typed? Who were in it for centuries? How typed? Of what were all the other warriors against rationalistic higher criticism ignorant? How typed?

(36) What were the contrasted positions of antitypical Jonathan and the rationalistic higher critics? How typed? What lay between the two positions? What resulted therefrom? How typed? What was necessary to understand both positions? How typed? What was the result to many a mental traveler? Where did antitypical Jonathan and their armour bearer have mentally to travel? How did the two positions stand toward each other? How typed? What did antitypical Jonathan propose? For what purpose? How typed? How was their faith in God as to this proposal expressed? How typed? How did their special supporters react to the plan? How typed? What first thing did antitypical Jonathan then say? How typed? Second thing? How typed? Third thing? How typed? Fourth thing? How typed? What in this connection was their belief? How typed? To what did both antitypes agree? How typed? What did they then do? How typed? How did the rationalistic higher critics at first react to this avowal? How typed? Later? How typed?

(37) From the proud challenge of the rationalistic higher critics, what cue did antitypical Jonathan take? How typed? What did they do? How typed? What did they then do? How typed? What did their lectures and publications do? How typed? Who was the first member

of antitypical Jonathan to attack Baur's and Strauss's challengesome books of 1835? By what pen product did he attack Strauss's mythical theory of the Gospels? What is a correct characterization of Neander's book? When previously did he publish a certain book? What was its title? For what was it intended? What did he do with it after Baur's 1835 book appeared? What did his revision, among other things, do with this book? What was his place as to restoring faith in the Bible among theologians the world over? How did this occur? What did Ullmann as a very able member of antitypical Jonathan do in 1838? What was his book entitled? What did he publish in 1842? Against what? What third book of his gave the rationalistic higher critics a very hard blow? What did other members of antitypical Jonathan also do? Who else joined them in the fray? In what books? What is a summary of the activities of the above-mentioned and other members of antitypical Jonathan and their armour bearer? Who did well and nobly in defense of the Old Testament against the rationalistic higher critics thereon? On what form of Old Testament higher criticism? Who were its chief molders during the Harvest? How do they differ? Who have battled with its later form? Who gave the rationalistic higher critics on the Old Testament the strongest refutation? Who first started the refutation of these on both Testaments? How typed? What kind of persons were these believing critics? How typed? In what part of the Bible did they refute these most completely? How typed? How do the cited Scriptures suggest this?

(38) What did antitypical Jonathan and their special supporters start by their defense of the Bible, especially of the New Testament? How typed? What was the influence of their foes before their attacks on them? Where? What were the effects of these two things on the rationalistic higher critics? How typed? On their world of activity? How typed? On their camp-followers? How typed? On their leaders? How typed? On the three groups of these destructive critics? What were these three groups? How typed? Who observed these happenings? How typed? From what vantage ground? How typed? What as sentinels did they do? What did they first note? How typed? Second? How typed? What did Hengstenberg ask? How typed? Why so? How typed?

What was then learned from the investigation? Why in the antitype were these absent? How typed? What did Hengstenberg ask of all the consecrated? Why? How typed? How was it that the consecrated then had the Truth then and previously due? How typed?

(39) What occurred while he was so consulting? How typed? What did he then charge? How typed? Why? How typed? What did Divine providence then do? How typed? What did they do? How typed? What did they note at this point? How is the noted thing typed? What was the result? Under deception what had some of God's people done? How typed? What did they receive through antitypical Jonathan's arguments, and how did this affect them? How typed? Who else had fled from the danger? Into what? What did they see? How did it affect them? How are all these features typed? During what period had this fight been going on? What did God do for them then? How typed? Into what phase did the controversy thereupon enter? How typed?

(40) What kind of a man was Hengstenberg? What had made him so? To what extreme did this lead him? Accordingly, what charge did he lay upon his follows? How typed? What was the result of his foolish charge? Why? How typed? Why did he give this solemn charge? How typed? To what did this charge lead his supporters? How typed? To whom did the Lord's people at that time come? What sweet message did they teach? How are these two things typed? What did Hengstenberg's followers do as to these messengers and their message? How typed? In obedience to their leader's charge, from what did they abstain? Why? How typed? How did it come that antitypical Jonathan knew not of this charge? How typed? What did they do with the Biblical doctrine of the Millennium? How typed? What resulted? How typed?

(41) What did certain of Hengstenberg's followers do about this? How typed? What did he state? How typed? Despite what? How typed? What was antitypical Jonathan's reply? How typed? What and in what spirit did they do to the people? How typed? What fact did they emphasize? How typed? Why was their reply true? What did they then declare of the usefulness of the Millennial doctrine? How typed? What did they say would have resulted therefrom? How typed? As a result, wherein were they completely victorious? How typed?

Wherein not completely victorious? How typed? How is this point proven by the last clause of Joshua 10:12? To what was the pertinent weakness of Hengstenberg and his supporters due? How typed?

(42) What is characteristic of all erroneous systems of thought? How does this hold as to higher criticism? How is this principle usually worked out? Why is this necessary for Satan? How typed in v. 32? What did Hengstenberg's adherents do on this point? How typed? To whose humanity did this truth pertain? How typed in each case? What two things did they fail to do? How typed? How does the type prove that they did not eliminate the error connected with these truths? What resulted? How typed? What was done as to their course? How typed? What did it prompt him to do? Why? How typed? What as a result did he charge? How typed? What additional two things did he charge? How typed? What were they further to do with these doctrines? How typed? What did he conditionally charge? How typed? Against what did he caution them? How typed? What did his supporters then do? How typed? Before what period did they do this? How typed? What was then done? How typed?

(43) Into what kind of a body did Hengstenberg develop his supporters? Why? How typed? How does this part of his work compare with that of previous crown-lost leaders? Why? How typed? What desire did he express to his followers? How typed? Why did he desire this? How typed? What response to this expressed desire was made? How typed? What counsel did the consecrated offer thereon? How typed? In connection with what doctrine? How typed? Accordingly, what did he do? How typed? On what subject? For what purpose? How typed? By what special ways did the Lord give no answer? During what period? How typed? Of what did God's not answering convince Hengstenberg? For what did he consequently ask? How typed? What solemn affirmation did he make? How typed?

(44) How did his proposal strike his supporters? Why? How typed? What did they not do? How typed? What moved him to make his next proposal? How typed? What was the reply to it? How typed? Thereupon what did he do? How typed? In what did the discussion and vote result? How typed? What did he then say? How typed? What did the pertinent discussion and vote then reveal?

How typed? What did he demand? How typed? What did antitypical Jonathan then do? How typed? With what did they sanction it? How typed? What did he recognize? How typed?

(45) What did Hengstenberg then demand? How? With what expressed emphasis, if he did not see to it? How typed? What had he miscalculated? Why? Why this? Of what did they remind him? How typed? What did they, therefore, do? How typed? What did they then solemnly do? How typed? On what two things did they firmly insist? How typed? What reason did they give for their decision? How typed? What did he have to do? With what result? How typed? What was the effect of the pertinent controversy and their support of antitypical Jonathan? How typed? What did the critics do as a result? How typed? Into what were their theories developed? By what schools? By what class were these refuted during the Harvest? Especially what three men in Germany did this? Six in Britain? Three in America? Which two were the greatest of these twelve men?

(46) How did antitypical Saul obtain the leadership in antitypical Israel? How typed? Why did they not have in it an easy time? Particularly against what five sets of enemies did they have to contend? How in each case typed? What did their great abilities enable them to do to all their enemies? How typed? What can be inferred by the properly informed by the mention of the names of their chief representative in each of the twelve denominations? Who were these twelve? What others could be mentioned here as corroborating the great ability of the crown-lost leaders? What were all of them calculated to do? What else did they do? How typed? What other kind of a successful war did they for awhile wage? How typed? What by their controversies did they effect? How typed?

(47) What especial three groups of helpers did they have? How typed in each case? How many special powers did they have? How typed? What was the first of these? How typed? The second of these? How typed? What was their office? How typed? Who were the leaders of their warriors? How typed? How were these associated with them? How typed? How were these related to knowledge? How typed? Who were the developers of antitypical Saul? How typed? What was the quality of the knowledge that

developed both antitypical Saul and Abner? How typed? Throughout the formers' denominational leadership in what hard things were they engaged? How typed? For what were they on the lookout? How typed? Finding these, what did they do with them? How typed?

(48) What is typically described in 1 Sam. 9-14? In 1 Sam. 15? How did antitypical Samuel and Saul emerge from the second kind of the conflicts? With what typical statement does 1 Sam. 15 close? How many fulfillments, and where, have the types of 1 Sam. 9-12 had? The types of 1 Sam. 13 and 14? How are denominational adherents involved in these single antitypes? What will this study bring to an end?

(49) What is the order of antitypical Samuel's two kinds of arousalment? Of what did they remind antitypical Saul? How typed? As what did they use this fact? How typed? What does the sequel prove the exhortation to have been? What reasons did they give that the Divine exhortation should be fulfilled? How typed? Accordingly, what did God charge? How typed? What two particulars are first mentioned? How is each typed? Regardless of what eight conditions? How is each of these typed? To carry out the charge, what was first done? How typed? Secondly? How typed? What did antitypical Saul detail and show from two classes? How typed? Against what was the first effort made? How typed? In what condition did they fight? How typed?

(50) What were not included in the order of extirpation? Why not? How typed? What did antitypical Saul do as to these? Why? How typed? What use is often made of these? How typed? Why did antitypical Saul spare these? How typed? What did antitypical Saul and Israel do with these? How typed? What did they attack? How typed? Where did they do this? How typed? What more did they do? How typed? What is the king sin? How typed? What did they do with sin's expressions? How typed? With what? How typed? What great mistake did they make? How typed? What other evil did they commit? How typed? In what five forms? How is each one typed? What did they refuse to do with these? How typed? What forms of sin only did they destroy? How typed?

(51) What feature of God's Word opened up to antitypical Samuel? How typed? What thought did it impress

upon them? How typed? What did God give as His reason therefore? How typed? In what particular? How typed? How did these two things first affect antitypical Samuel? How typed? Secondly? How typed? On learning that God would not change His purpose, what did they then do? How typed? When? How typed? What was on all hands being done to antitypical Saul in four particulars? How typed in each particular? From initial humility to what was antitypical Saul descending? Of what were they thus giving proof? In what crown-lost leaders do we see this deterioration exemplified? What is necessary for prominent servants of God? If these things are not exercised by them, what will result?

(52) What two things should be expected as a matter of course at a meeting between antitypical Samuel and Saul at this juncture? How typed? What was the former quick to see and understand? In what ways? How typed? What two things did antitypical Saul seek to do? For what reason? What did they assert? How typed? What are some ways in which they compromised principle? How typed? What did they claim for these qualities? How typed? What did they claim for dispositions not useful for the Lord? How typed? What did these deceitful and untruthful answers prompt antitypical Samuel to do? How typed? What did antitypical Saul say thereto? How typed? What two questions did antitypical Samuel ask them? How typed? Of what did they remind them? How typed? Thereupon what three questions did they ask these? How typed?

(53) What characterized antitypical Saul? To what extent? How typed? On what did they insist? How typed? Of what two things did they boast? Upon whom did they seek to shift the blame? How typed? For what? How typed? What reason did they allege as justifying this course? Even how did they describe these? How typed? In what form partly was antitypical Samuel's answer given? In what kind of language was the answer? What was the answer? How typed? What lesson, important for all God's people to learn, did they read these? Especially for which ones of them? How typed? What are the principles underlying this lesson? What is best in these matters? How are these matters typed? With what kind of people was antitypical Samuel dealing? Accordingly, what

kind of language did they use? What was the language? How typed?

(54) What did antitypical Samuel then announce? With what feelings? How typed? How did antitypical Saul react to this announcement? In what spirit? How typed? What weakness prompting to the sin did they confess? How typed? To what did this fear of loss of popularity lead them? How typed? What danger to leaders is here brought out? What lesson should present leaders learn from this? How may they overcome it? Who else are in danger of this snare? For whom in this connection do our hearts bleed? Why? For what did antitypical Saul entreat of antitypical Samuel? How typed? What other request did they make in the same spirit? How typed? How did antitypical Samuel react to the second request? Why? How typed? What did they give as the reason? In what did it result? How typed?

(55) So saying, what did antitypical Samuel do? How typed? What in remonstrance did antitypical Saul do? Why? What was their motive therein? What is a good illustration of antitypical Samuel's remonstrance contained in vs. 17-27? How were these features typed? What did antitypical Saul's unseemly pertinent course prompt antitypical Samuel to point out? How typed? When was that leadership taken away? How typed? To whom would it be given? How did this occur in each individual rejected one and, finally, in all of them as a class succeeded by Bro. Russell? What two things did they further assert? How typed? Why would God not change? How typed? Heart-broken, what did antitypical Saul repeat? How typed? Despite their having sinned, for what did they plead? How typed? Why did they plead for this? How did antitypical Samuel finally react to this plea? What did both sets of leaders then do? How typed?

(56) How did antitypical Samuel not, and how did they, use the occasion? What did they publicly require? How typed? What did this seem to mean to the wrongdoers? How typed? What did they miscalculate? What did they first declare? How typed? Secondly? How typed? What did they thereupon do? How, negatively and positively? What did this require of them? How were these acts typed? Under what circumstances? How typed? What did antitypical Samuel thereupon do? How typed? What

did antitypical Saul then do? How typed? When did the twelfth general withdrawal of such fellowship occur? Through what brethren? Until what occurred? Despite their disappointment, what did antitypical Samuel do as to antitypical Saul? From what motive? How typed? What did it not effect? How typed? What two lessons should we learn from the story of Samuel and Saul?

Jesus, Savior, Son of God,
Bearer of the sinner's load;
I to Thee will look and live,
And, in looking, praises give.
Looking lightens, looking heals,
Looking all the gladness seals;
Looking breaks the binding chain,
Looking sets us free again;
Looking scatters all our might,
Makes our faces shine with light;
Looking quickens, strengthens, brings
Heavenly gladness on its wings!
Jesus, Savior, Son of God,
Bearer of the sinner's load,
I would rise to Thee above,
I would look, and praise, and love;
Ever looking let me be
At the blood-besprinkled tree,
Blessing Thee with lip and soul,
While the endless ages roll.

CHAPTER IV

EARLIER PARALLELS.

1 Kings 12:1–2 Kings 8:29; 2 Chron. 13:1–22:5.

CHRONOLOGICAL HARMONIES. EARLIER PARALLEL PROTESTANT MOVEMENTS. THEIR MANY CONTROVERSIES. ANTITYPICAL ELIJAH AND ELISHA.

FOR CENTURIES chronologians have striven, and, for the most part of the problem, in vain, to harmonize the comparative chronologies of the kings of Judah and Israel. In EC, 144 (97)—145 (99), is shown the harmony in the synchronisms of Jehoshaphat's and Ahab's houses. But that harmonization merely scratches the surface of the problem in comparative chronology presented in the books of Kings and 2 Chronicles; for, viewed from the standpoint of the surface evidence as presented in these books, the comparative chronology seems unharmonizable. Indeed, chronologians up to the last half of the 19th century gave up the problem as insoluble. Since then, at the expense of the Bible's inerrancy, most of them have attempted to adjust the data given in the two Kings and 2 Chronicles to the Assyrian Eponyms for as far back as the latter extend—a dangerous thing, among other reasons, because these Eponyms are admittedly deficient and in error in certain particulars. To clarify the problem, first of all, the seeming discrepancies in the comparative chronologies of Judah's and Israel's kings will be pointed out, and that in two tables: (1) up to the death of Ahaziah of Judah and Jehoram of Israel, who died within a few hours of each other; and (2) from their death until the death of Hoshea, Israel's last king, in the sixth year of Hezekiah's reign; and after each of such presentations the harmonization will be given. The first comparative table will give the years of the respective reigns of Judah's and Israel's kings up to the death of Ahaziah of Judah and Jehoram of Israel.

JUDAH'S KINGS*

	YEARS
Rehoboam (1 Kings 14:21)	17
Abijam (1 Kings 15:2)	3
Asa (1 Kings 15:10)	41
Jehoshaphat (1 Kings 22:42)	25
Jehoram (2 Kings 8:17)	8
Ahaziah (2 Kings 8:26)	1
	—
Total	95

ISRAEL'S KINGS

	YEARS
Jeroboam (1 Kings 14:20)	22
Nadab (1 Kings 15:25)	2
Baasha (1 Kings 15:33)	24
Elah (1 Kings 16:8)	2
Omri (1 Kings 16:23)	12
Ahab (1 Kings 16:29)	22
Ahaziah (1 Kings 22:51)	2
Jehoram (2 Kings 3:1)	12
	—
Total	98

(2) Rehoboam and Jeroboam began to reign a few days apart (1 Kings 12:1-24); and Ahaziah (of Judah) and Jehoram (of Israel) died within a few hours of each other (2 Kings 9:22-27). Nevertheless the sum totals of the years' reigns of the six involved Judahite and the eight involved Israelite kings differ, according to the tables, by three years, whereas, according to the facts given in the preceding sentence, they should be of the same length. Knowing the Scriptures to be inerrant, and there being no differences in the involved years' reigns in the Hebrew MSS., we found ourself face to face with the problem that chronologers hitherto had been unable to solve. But the solution had to be found, otherwise the 2520 years parallels for both sets of kings could not be worked out, a task that this book undertakes to do. Knowing that there must be a solution for this difficulty, where else should we go except to the Lord the Giver of the three involved books (1, 2 Kings and

* All PRESENT TRUTH references in this and the following chapters to the chronological tables of Judah's and Israel's Kings are to be understood as the same as are given here on pages 274 to 277.

2 Chronicles) and the Source of Truth, for the needed enlightenment? And, praised be His holy name! He gave it; for as we meditated and prayed over the problem, the thought struck our mind: Since the chronology, the Parallel Dispensations, the Parallel Seven Times and the Pyramid measurements prove that the chronology as given in 2 Chro. as to the lengths of the reigns of Judah's kings is true, and since 1 and 2 Kings agree with these reign lengths, *why not take the lengths of the reigns of Judah's kings as the basis and calculate the lengths of the reigns of Israel's kings as they are given in terms of the years of Judah's kings and thus see what results would be reached?* Thought and done! And the result was complete harmony between the two chronologies! We treated as cardinal numbers the ordinal numbers in terms of which the years of Judah's kings are given when compared with the beginning and ending years of Israel's kings, because, as was the case with Judah's kings, undoubtedly whatever was lacking in full years in the reigns of Israel's kings was made up by the succeeding kings before the years of their own reigns began to count chronologically. So only could a correct chronology be construed; for various of the kings of Israel and Judah died at other times of the year than April, when the various reigns are made to start chronologically. We will now set forth the chronological harmony of these reigns from the standpoint just given.

YEARS

(3) Jeroboam reigned during Rehoboam's 17 years, during Abijam's 3 years and during Asa's first 2 years (1 Kings 12:1-24; 14:20, 21; 15:1, 2; 15:25)	22
Nadab reigned from year 2 to year 3 of Asa (1 Kings 15:25, 28)	1
Baasha reigned from year 3 to year 26 of Asa (1 Kings 15:33; 16:8)	23
Elah reigned from year 26 to year 27 of Asa (1 Kings 16:8, 10)	1
Omri reigned from year 27 to year 38 of Asa (1 Kings 16:15-27, 29)	11

(A comparison of 1 Kings 16:15, 16, 23, 29 proves that the reading "31st" in v. 23 is a copyist's mistake and should be "27th.")

Ahab reigned from year 38 of Asa to year 18 of Jehoshaphat, <i>i.e.</i> , 3+18 =	21
(1 Kings 16:29; please see EC, 144 (97)—145 (99) for proof that Ahab died in year 18 of Jehoshaphat.)	
Ahaziah's sole reign was from year 18 to year 20 of Jehoshaphat	2
(Please see EC, 144 (97)—145 (99), for proof of this.)	
Jehoram reigned from year 20 of Jehoshaphat through Jehoram's (of Judah) 8 years and during year 1 of Ahaziah (5+8+1)	14
(2 Kings 8:16 17, 26; for proof of this please see EC, 144 (97)—145 (99).)	
Total	<u>95</u>

(4) Thus by giving the lengths of the reigns of Israel's kings in the compared terms of those of Judah's kings, the chronology of the involved six Judahite and the eight Israelite kings is found to be harmonious.

(5) The seeming discrepancy between the lengths of these two sets of kings from the deaths of Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah until the death of Hoshea, Israel's last king, in the year 6 of Hezekiah, which period will next require our study, is much greater when the separately mentioned lengths of each pertinent set are added, but are perfectly harmonized when the lengths of the reigns of Israel's kings are given in the terms of the compared years of Judah's kings, as just shown of the six and eight kings above. First, tables will be given showing the separately mentioned reign years of the two sets of the involved kings:

	YEARS
Athaliah (2 Chro. 22:12; 23:1; 24:1)	7
Jehoash (2 Chro. 24:1)	40
Amaziah (2 Chro. 25:1)	29
Uzziah (2 Chro. 26:3)	52
Jotham (2 Chro. 27:1)	16
Ahaz (2 Chro. 28:1)	16
Hezekiah had reigned 6 years when Hoshea died (2 Kings 18:1, 10)	6
Total	<u>166</u>

	YEARS
Jehu (2 Kings 10:36)	28
Jehoahaz (2 Kings 13:1)	17
Jehoash (2 Kings 13:10)	16
Jeroboam (2 Kings 14:23)	41
Zachariah (2 Kings 15:8)	½
Menahem (2 Kings 15:17)	10
Pekahiah (2 Kings 15:23)	2
Pekah (2 Kings 15:27)	20
Hoshea (2 Kings 17:1)	9
Total	143½

(6) Here is a seeming discrepancy of 22½ years. But it is harmonized by the same method as was used above, *i.e.*, giving the kings of Israel the number of reign years that their reign years are given in terms of the reign years of Judah's kings, as follows, placing after the years the difference plus when more, and minus when less, than the separately given years in the preceding table:

	YEARS
Jehu reigned 7 years before and 23 with Jehoash (2 Kings 12:1; 13:1)	30 + 2
Jehoahaz reigned from year 23 to year 37 of Jehoash (2 Kings 13:1, 8-10)	14 - 3
Jehoash reigned 3 years with Joash and 15 with Amaziah (2 Kings 13:10; 14:23)	18 + 2
Jeroboam reigned 14 years with Amaziah and 38 with Azariah (Uzziah) (2 Kings 14:23; 15:8)	52 + 11
Zachariah reigned one year with Azariah (2 Kings 15:8, 13)	1 + ½
Menahem reigned 11 years with Azariah (2 Kings 15:17, 23)	11 + 1
Pekahiah reigned 2 years with Azariah (2 Kings 15:23, 27)	2
Pekah reigned 16 years with Jotham and 12 years with Ahaz (2 Kings 15:27, 33; 17:1)	28 + 8
Hoshea reigned 4 years with Ahaz and 6 years with Hezekiah (2 Kings 17:1; 18:10)	10 + 1
Total plus years	+25½
Total minus years	- 3
Total years	166, +22½

(7) Since both tables would give Shallum one month and since that is included in the year of Zachariah, we have omitted Shallum's one month from both tables, as neutralizing one another, and as being neutralized, because included in the one year of Zachariah's reign in terms of the reign of Azariah, as for a similar reason we omitted mention of the 7 days' reign of Zimri (1 Kings 16:15) in the first table. It will be seen that one table gives the kings of Israel $22\frac{1}{2}$ years less than the contemporaneous reigns of the kings of Judah, while their years in terms of the kings of Judah are $22\frac{1}{2}$ years more, which harmonizes the seeming discrepancy.

(8) But, one may ask, Why does the Lord in the separately given reigns of the kings of Israel make the latter 3 years longer in the first table and $22\frac{1}{2}$ years shorter in the second table than the harmony shows to be the true datings? We reply that in the datings in terms of the years of Judah's kings the Lord arranged the matter so as to give the dates and events of the large parallel, the one of 2520 years, and in the separately given years of Israel's kings, so as to give the dates and events of the small parallel, which comes out in its second member in terms of days. In this book we will present the large parallel, which to be worked aright required the chronological datings to be made in terms of the years of Judah's kings; hence the foregoing chronological discussion, to clarify the subject. In EJ 333-418 we discussed the small parallel, pausing here, however, to remark that we have given above Athaliah's reign as 7 years, even as the three passages there cited prove it to have been; for, though she died sometime during her seventh year, Jehoash (Joash) filled out the balance of that year before his reign years began to count chronologically, even as every other Judahite and all Israelite succeeding kings did with the balance of their predecessors' last year before their reign years began to count chronologically; otherwise a consistent chronology could not have been formed, since all of them evidently did not die on

Nisan 1. Moreover, as we have elsewhere seen, it is the regular Hebrew way of counting a fraction of a day or year a full day or year. Our Pastor, ignoring the fraction of Zedekiah's last year, counted the period of the kings as 513 years, whereas, according to his data and the fact that Zedekiah reigned $10\frac{1}{2}$ years, he should, if noting the fractions, have given it as $512\frac{1}{2}$, since he counted Athaliah as reigning but 6, instead of 7 years. The exact length of the period of the kings was $513\frac{1}{2}$ years, which, as required by the other features of the chronology, the Parallel Dispensations, the parallels of the two Seven Times and the Pyramid, requires us to reduce the $449\frac{1}{2}$ years of the judges' period to $448\frac{1}{2}$ years. The expression, "about the space of 450 years," in Acts 13:20 is flexible enough to permit this to be done.

(9) The dates and events of the 2520 years' parallels require Athaliah's reign to be 7 years, otherwise their dates and events cannot be harmonized. Accordingly, in Studies, Vol. II, 374-376, 380, please change the figures $512\frac{1}{2}$ and $512\frac{6}{12}$ for the period of the kings to $513\frac{1}{2}$ and $513\frac{6}{12}$, and those of $449\frac{1}{2}$ and $449\frac{6}{12}$ for the period of the judges to $448\frac{1}{2}$ and $448\frac{6}{12}$. This will also require us to understand the expression in 1 Kings 6:1, "*fourth* year of Solomon's reign," to mean year 4, as we saw above to be the regular usage with the ordinal numbers of the reign years of Judah's kings. Please also make the pertinent corrections of the expression, 3 years, to 4 years, and the figures, $129\frac{1}{2}$, to $130\frac{1}{2}$, in Studies, Vol. II, 376, end of par. 1. All these references to Studies, Vol. II, are, of course, to the notes in our edition of that Volume. We are not to think that there is in any sense a contradiction between the length of years expressly assigned to the various Israelite kings' reigns as given in 1, 2 Kings and the number of years in the comparative chronology of their and the various Judahite kings' reigns; for the length of the formers' reigns apart from the comparisons is stated to cover only such years in which they

were active as marked specifically the first and last acts of their reigns required for the working out of the small parallel, *i.e.*, only such years are expressly given as the length of their reigns as were revelatory of God's designs as to the length in days of the second member of the small parallel. Hence in some cases these typical acts as royal acts were performed before they actually ascended the throne and in some cases these typical acts as royal acts were performed as the last ones of their years of life before they really ceased to reign; and in either case the matter was Divinely arranged so as to fit the chronology of the small parallel. Hence there is absolutely no contradiction between the actual lengths of the reigns as the comparison above shows and the years expressly assigned to their reigns in 1, 2 Kings, if we look upon matters as just explained, since the different sets of lengths of the separate reigns are given to mark different sets of acts in the two sets of parallels.

(10) Solomon in the good acts of his reign, as these are given in 1 Kings 1-10 and 2 Chro. 1-9, types in the large picture the Christ in the good acts of the Millennial reign. Certainly, his reign's evil acts of 1 Kings 11, which are entirely omitted in 2 Chro., cannot type anything in the Christ's Millennial reign, which will in every way be good. It will be noted that the evil acts of 1 Kings 11 are represented as bringing resultant evils upon Solomon's reigning descendants. And from this we get a broad hint as to the antitype of Solomon's wicked acts of 1 Kings 11. That the books of Kings are typical prophecies we know from the fact that they are by God put among the books—Joshua, Judges, Ruth and the two Samuels—which God calls, "the earlier Prophets." That Joshua, Judges, Ruth and the first $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 Samuel are prophetic types we are assured by the fact that St. Peter by inspiration tells us that Samuel thereby prophesied (Acts 3:24). In fact, so far as we now know, there are three applications of prophetic types in these two books; and the same is true of their

companion book, 2 Chronicles. The first of these three applications is that of general pictures more or less detached, *e.g.*, Solomon in his good acts typing in the large picture the Millennial Christ and in his bad acts, the papacy before and early in the Reformation; from the reign of Ahab on to the death of Zachariah (Jeroboam II's son), when Elijah and Elisha performed their parts in the history, we have a history of the whole Gospel Age up to nearly the time of Anarchy. Then specialized pictures, especially concerning America, are given by the kings of Judah from Rehoboam on to at least Amaziah's time. These and others are general pictures isolated one from the other. Then the three books that treat of the kings of Judah and Israel have a second set of applications, *i.e.*, the 2520 years' parallels, beginning with the reigns of Rehoboam and Jeroboam, 1,000 B.C., and ending with Jerusalem's and the land's desolation, 607 B.C., in its first member, and in its second member beginning in April, 1521, with the first workings of a division among the two Reform movements and ending about Oct., 1914, with the setting in of trench warfare in the World War. Then there is a third application, a small application of the parallel of Judah's and Israel's kings in its first member and certain Truth leaders, *etc.*, in 1916 and 1917, wherein the years of the first member of the parallel stand for days in the second member of the parallel. The years of the third application in the first and second parallel's members in the Judah and American features are 392½ years and days respectively, while the years and days of the third application in the first and second parallels' members in the Israelite and British features are 241½ years and days respectively. It is of the second application that several chapters of this book will treat.

(11) Describing the wicked acts of Solomon, 1 Kings 11 serves as an introduction to the second and third applications, the large and the small 2520 years' and days' parallels. In order to keep this book within

reasonable bounds, since it will cover the contents of 1 Sam. 1—15, nearly the whole of 1 Kings, the whole of 2 Kings and nearly the whole of 2 Chro., we will have to be exceedingly brief; and the reader will have to have his Bible, better two, one at each of the accounts, constantly before him, to compare type and antitype; for we will merely by parenthetical chapter and verse citation, or occasionally by parenthetical word allusion refer to the type and state the antitype very briefly. Briefly, we would say that Solomon's wicked acts of 1 Kings 11 type the pre-Reformation wicked acts of the papacy which led up to reformatory movements and to God's people in Protestantism dividing into two parties and into sets of movements, which were repeatedly antagonistic to one another, as Judah's kings and Israel's kings were repeatedly antagonistic to one another. And later (after Israel's kings had disappeared from the scene) as Judah's kings alone were on the throne, acting out various good or evil things, so various movements of varying good or evil operated among God's people in American Protestantism until utter apostasy, so far as the parallel is concerned, came to a head from 1893 to 1914. Thus we have given a brief outline of the introduction to, and progress of the 2520 years' parallel in both its members; for we are to remember that there are no parallel dates and events in the first member of this parallel before April, 1,000 B.C., and that these ended Oct., 607 B.C., while the parallel dates and events in the second member began April, 1521, and ended Oct., 1914. We gave in EJ, 333-418 the third application. In THE PRESENT TRUTH we have discussed many of the pictures of the first application, the rest coming, in due time, as the Lord opens the way.

(12) Now a few details on the wicked papal practices of the pre-parallel events and dates, typed by Solomon's wicked acts. The papacy greatly desired many cooperating organizations, like synods, councils, orders of monks, nuns, universities, various orders and kinds of

professors, authors, nobles, as well as kings, canonists, officials, armies, guilds, burghers, servants, *etc.*, some more influential, others less so (1 Kings 11:1, 3), forbidden by God to His real people (2). This was especially true in the Sardis period of the Church (4). It fostered a union of state and church (Ashtoreth, Venus, 5), the doctrine of eternal torment (Milcom, *i.e.*, Molech, *king*, 7) and of purgatory (Chemosh, *subduer*) and other false doctrines which were urged by its various orders, *etc.* (8). This aroused God's displeasure against the papacy (9, 10). Repeatedly through the Sardis star-members God threatened to disrupt it (11), but put it off temporarily (12) and said its disruption would not, for the sake of the true Church, be total (13). Early in the Philadelphia period God raised up three adversaries against the papacy: (1) a reform (v. 14, Hadad, *sharpsighted*) political party demanding the reformation of political Romanism, especially in Germany, when it sent to Rome a set of 100 grievances, demanding redress (14-22). It worked favorably with the reigning political powers for awhile (17-20), then left them to pursue its own policies (21, 22); (2) the reforming humanists, learned scholars, who revived Latin, Greek and Hebrew learning, prominent among whom were the learned Reuchlin, Melanchthon's uncle, and Erasmus; this party (Rezon, *prince*; Eliadah, *God-enlightened*, 23) was a thorn in the flesh of the papacy, and did preparatory work for the religious reformation (24, 25); (3) the Lutheran reform party (Jeroboam, *striver of the people*; Nebat, *aspect*, 26) from 1517 to 1521. The individuals who later formed this party previously to their reform activity worked valiantly for the papacy (27, 28); but when they formed the Lutheran movement, the sharpsighted ones (Ahijah, *Jehovah is my brother*, 29) among these forecast that it would disrupt papacy and also make a division among some of papacy's religious adversaries (30-32), declaring that this was because of papacy's wickedness (33), yet they

said that some would be left with the good part, those who had the Lord's Spirit (34-36), and promised the Lutheran movement much success, if it would be loyal to God (37, 38), while punishing the others measurably who as Protestant people of God would retain some features of God's Spirit (39). Hearing of the action of these forecasters, the papacy persecuted the Lutheran movement, which fled to certain civil rulers of Germany for refuge, from about 1518 to 1521 (40). Details, among other things, on papacy's wicked acts are found in the star-members' writings (history of Nathan, 41; 2 Chro. 9:29), the writings of leading early Lutherans (prophecy of Ahijah) and later Lutheran authors on Lutheranism (vision of Iddo).

(13) From here on our comments will be on Kings and Chronicles; and we will abbreviate these by their initial letters, K. and C., in the first reference to each chapter's number; after that in the chapter we will merely indicate the verse, without repeating the name of the book and the same chapter number, giving first the Kings citation and, second, that of Chronicles, with the semicolon between the verses of the two books; but when only one citation is made the Kings' citation is followed by the semicolon and the Chronicles' citation is preceded by the semicolon, thus: 2; 3 mean verses in both books, 2; means a Kings' verse and ;2 means a Chronicles' verse. As already pointed out, the first parallel dates with parallel events in the 2520 years' parallel are April, 1,000 B.C. and April, 1521 A.D. In giving the parallel date of the parallel's second member we will in parenthesis often give the date 2520 years before. The parallel events were the division of the typical kingdom into the two-tribed kingdom of Judah and the ten-tribed kingdom of Israel, and the division of God's Gospel-Age people in Protestantism into two movements: (1) the Reformed movement, mainly in Switzerland, corresponding to Rehoboam (*who enlarges the people*), and (2) the Lutheran movement, corresponding to Jeroboam. Little Flock

leaders and good crown-lost leaders were leaders in both of these movements. As a rule, but not always, the leaders of the movements that correspond to the succeeding kings of Judah were Little Flock and good crown-loser members; and as a rule, but not always, the leaders of the movements that correspond to the succeeding kings of Israel are crown-lost leaders, good and bad. But in some cases the latter set of movements are almost entirely political, infected with the Divine-right-of-kings doctrine. In the first set of movements they are always religious; however, in some of these cases the religious movement is apostate in character, corresponding to the apostate character of some of Judah's kings. The Lutheran movement began as a purely priestly movement, with Luther's nailing the 95 Theses to the doors of the Wittenberg Castle Church, Oct. 31, 1517, and continued such for about a year, when Luther and his collaborators began to lean on the civil rulers of Saxony, and by April, 1521, under Luther's leadership, his movement was quite strongly leaning on the arm of the civil power.

(14) The Zwinglian movement began in 1519 in very attenuated ways, mainly through Zwingli's efforts; and by April, 1521 (1,000 B.C.) under Zwingli's leadership it was an independent movement characterized by more strictness as to Christian life, and was thus more Little-Flock-like, than was the Lutheran movement. It was on this point that the ever-widening rupture between these two Protestant movements set in. At first this movement approached in friendliness the Lutheran movement, which reciprocated. It expected to have the ascendancy over the latter (1 K. 12:1-3; 2 C. 10:1-3). The Lutheran movement desired to give it such, but requested that it ease its too strict demands on the people and accept the more easy-going demands of the Lutheran movement on the people (4; 4). The matter was taken under advisement (5; 5). Wiser heads advised compliance (6, 7; 6, 7). Less wise, but more intimate heads advised stricter demands to be

made on the people (8-11; 8-11). After a time the Lutheran movement returned for the answer (12; 12). A refusal accompanied with stricter demands was given by the Zwinglian movement to the Lutheran movement (13, 14; 13, 14). Thus was effected the condition leading up to the division forecast by the enlightened ones in the Lutheran movement (15; 15). Thus by a very small beginning set in the division between the Zwinglians and Lutherans (16; 16). As the years went by this division became wider, as the Zwinglians made their practices stricter, and the Lutherans made theirs more lenient. When emissaries from the former sought to win over the latter to their stricter practices, the latter refuted these by stronger arguments (18; 18); however, in some states of Germany, the Zwinglian movement got the upper hand (17; 17). Thus the division set in and continued among the two groups of Protestants (19; 19); the Lutherans, in the great majority, recognized and supported their movement (20). This led the Zwinglian movement to plan war against the Lutheran movement (21; 2 C. 11:1), from which it was dissuaded by the Divinely-raised-up peace party in their midst, convincing them that God so willed matters (22-24; 2-4). The Lutheran party then proceeded to develop the German field as congenial, and from there developed the Scandinavian field (25;).

(15) The Zwinglian movement developed itself in the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, in certain principalities of Germany and provinces of France (;5-10), strengthened its principles, appointed able defenders of these and put in them hard and easy teachings with much of the Spirit (;11). In all of these political units it placed defensive and offensive controversial writings and strengthened them and maintained itself as a movement (;12). Generally speaking, the more consecrated public servants of God left the Lutheran movement and adhered to the Zwinglian movement, since these were cast off by the Lutheran

movement and its representatives as extremists, whom they would not permit to minister among them (;13, 14). The Lutheran movement appointed such clergy as would serve the nominal people, sectarianism and clericalism (;15). Not only so, but the more faithful consecrated laity followed the example of the more consecrated public servants of God by leaving the Lutheran and adhering to the Zwinglian movement (;16). This, of course, gave real spiritual strength to the latter, though the former had the more numerous followers. This continued for three years, 1521 to 1524 (1,000 to 997 B.C.), when the Zwinglian movement began to persecute the Little Flock movement started by Balthasar Hubmaier, which later was sectarianized by crown-lost leaders into the Baptist Church (;17). But the Lutheran movement, to keep its own from going away to the rival movement (26;), sought to hinder their fellowshipping with the latter, in order to prevent their casting it off and turning to the latter (27;). Hence it developed Lutheran sectarianism and clericalism as their deliverers from Satan's empire, to ease matters for its adherents (28, 29;), which became great evils (30;). In every Lutheran dominated country these two evils were served; and in most cases unconsecrated preachers and professors were made servants of these (31;).

(16) This movement counterfeited the class standings of the antitypical feast of tabernacles and served these counterfeit class standings in their Church, particularly by its doctrines of the Lord's Supper, Person of Christ and Romanist sacramental efficacy (32, 33;). Able Zwinglian movement brethren, *e.g.*, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Capito, *etc.*, testified against this spurious Church, its servants and their gross errors as the Lutheran movement served these, and forecast that a pure teaching movement would arise and expose as vile sectarianism the Lutheran Church and ministers with their memories (1 K. 13:1, 2), and gave as an evidence of this a rending of the Lutheran Church and

a rejection of its sacrifices (3;). The Lutheran movement on noting this witness exerted its power against these witnesses controversially to injure them; but that controversial power withered, under the refutative answers that these witnesses gave, and could not be made effective (4;). Great divisions set in in the Lutheran Church and its pertinent sacrifices were rejected, as these witnesses had forecast (5;). The impotence of the Lutheran movement appealed to these witnesses to labor for its pertinent healing, which was granted (6;). Thereupon the Lutheran movement desired their fellowship in doctrine and practice (7;), which, as forbidden by the Word, they refused to give (8, 9;). They were charged to return to their usual service in a somewhat altered way of presenting the teachings, which they did (9, 10;).

(17) Various of the Lutheran leaders, like Luther, Melanchthon, *etc.*, were told the actual effects of these happenings by some of their supporters (11;); and the latter indicated the changed form that the representatives of the Zwinglian movement gave their teachings, particularly on the Lord's Supper. This influenced Luther, Melanchthon, *etc.*, to make certain adjustments to their pertinent teachings, in order to use them for the purpose of re-establishing fellowship with them (12, 13;). They met, and after discussions *pro* and *con* (14-18;) fellowship in doctrine and practice were agreed upon, particularly between Luther and Melanchthon, with their chief colaborers, on the one hand, and Bucer and Capito, with their chief colaborers, on the other, some of the Lutheran representatives, particularly Melanchthon and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, acting more or less uncandidly in the matter (19;). But some of them, particularly Luther and the Elector of Saxony, seeing through the course of Bucer, Capito, *etc.*, as disloyal to their own principles, forecast that they would become non-existent as pertinent messengers of the Lord, and would lose the respect of their fellows (20-22;). Adjusting their

pertinent doctrine, Luther, *etc.*, sent them away as disloyal (23;). By their course, being a surrender of the Truth on the Lord's Supper as taught by Zwingli, Satan destroyed them as God's messengers; and as such Satan and their doctrine remained with them as teachers of error and no longer God's messengers; and they were seen to be such and proclaimed as such in Lutheran sectarianism (24, 25;), especially by the main Lutheran leaders (26;), whose supporters adjusted for them the real Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper (27;), and thereon they went and found the above-described condition, Satan not having done the unfaithful and their pertinent teachings further harm (28;). They gave them as a former Divine mouthpiece suitable respect, as they would have desired for themselves (29, 30;), and desired their supporters to treat them with the same respect as due a real prophet when their role as such was over (31, 32;). But these things effected no reform in the Lutheran movement, which continued in its special wrong teachings and practices (33;). And these evils led to God's casting off the Lutheran movement (34;).

(18) The Reformed movement developed a considerable number of sub-movements in Switzerland, Germany, England and France, through which many groups of supporters were developed (;18-21), the chief of which was the English Cranmer movement (;22). It wisely distributed these supporting groups in the various principalities, cantons, provisions, *etc.*, of these countries as means of strength, giving them teaching support and seeking to give them organizational helps (;23). But as its strength increased, it and all its supporters did evil by becoming persecutors of Hubmaier and his associates, particularly the latter in late 1525 and early 1526 (;2 C. 12:1). Immediately thereafter the papacy (1 K. 14:25; 2) began to make inroads upon it with huge forces (;3), beginning in Switzerland and proceeding in France, through religious, political and military fights, resulting in severe

defeats for the Zwinglian movement in cantons and provinces, endangering the heads of the movement (;4). The more pious of them denounced their wrongdoings as resulting in their defeats, which produced confession and repentance of sin in them and acknowledgment of God's justice (;5, 6). This moved the Lord to send them a message of partial mercy (;7), though forecasting some oppression upon them from the papists in contrast with the mildness of God's rule (;8). The papists took away some of their religious and political privileges and some of their arguments (26; 9), in lieu of which the movement made less costly but stronger arguments for its leaders who guarded it (27; 10), and who used these in their religious and political spheres (28; 11).

(19) These calamities producing repentance, the Lord relieved it of its evils, since good was found in its adherents (;12). Thereafter it strengthened itself until it ceased to be dominant in the Lord's affairs, despite its clericalistic principles (21; 13). The movement and its adherents were not wholeheartedly loyal to God, resulting in their displeasing God above the primitive believers (22; 14); for they formed sects, had evil leaders and united state and church in each principality, canton and province under great leaders (23;) and furthered such by alliances between various states and more or less continued papal practices (24;). Various historians described its doings, particularly its controversies with the Lutheran movement (29, 30; 15). In the year 1538 (paralleling 983 B.C.) this movement ceased to function as the Lord's more favored movement, though it was remembered as such, and the Cranmer movement succeeded it (31; 16). The Cranmer movement, 1538-1541 (983-980 B.C.), did this good, that it furthered Bible distribution, but it was mixed up with Henry VIII's evil policies (1 K. 15:1, 2; 2 C. 13:1, 2), and was guilty of some of the evils of the Zwinglian movement (3;). But for the Little Flock's sake God used it (4, 5;); and as between the

Zwinglian movement and the Lutheran movement, so was there strife between it and the latter (6, 7; 2); because of the evils of the Lutheran movement the Cranmer movement would not sanction an alliance between England and the former, which sought to bring it about by intriguing through the marriage of Anne of Cleves and Henry VIII. This by various arguments the Cranmer movement opposed and annulled, to the discomfiture of the Lutheran movement, after the former had reproached the latter for its iniquities (;3-18), and overthrew its sectarianism, clericalism and creedism (;19), from which defeats it did not recover before the time the Lord cast it off as a less favored movement (;20). On the contrary, the Cranmer movement prospered, gaining many organizations and strong and less strong supporters (;21), and its history is written in the writings of many (7; 22). But the Lord set aside this movement in 1541 as a Little Flock remembered one; and the Unitarian movement became the more favored one (8; 2 C. 14:1).

(20) The Unitarian movement took its place as the Divinely more favored movement for 41 years, *i.e.*, 1541-1582 (980-939 B.C.), *i.e.*, it began while the Lutheran movement was still active (9, 10;). The Unitarian movement was one of the best of all the Divinely more favored movements, acting like the Little Flock (11; 2). It set aside those who favored international alliances and the creedal idols of the Cranmer movement, the false churches, their leaders and union of state and church (12; 3). It even set aside those who nourished it in its weakness, when they set up a creed idol favorable to union of state and church, and overthrew it (13; 2 C. 15:16); yet it did not set aside the sects, though it was loyal almost to the end (14; 17). The good thought of Bible spreading of the Cranmer movement and its own teachings: unity of God, mortality of man, death as the wages of sin, Christ as Son of God, it deposited in the Church (15; 18). It laid great stress on the Lord's people

living aright (;2 C. 14:4), and thrust out among its adherents the sects and Satan's way of service, thus securing prosperity among its adherents (;5); and there were no special controversies for ten years (1541 to 1551 [980-970 B.C.]). During these years Servetus had leisure to study much and wrote his great work, *The Restoration of True Christianity* (;6). By prayer, speech and example he encouraged several coloborers to cooperate in reconstructive work (;7).

(21) There was a movement begun by the Lutheran movement and its supporters that for years labored for a settlement of the religious troubles in Germany by a national council participated in by Romanists and Protestants, intended to bring about peace (1 K. 14:1). The Lutheran movement in its secular leaders sent certain of its supporters, who were instructed by it to disguise their relations to the former and inquire of the most enlightened leaders of it, like Luther, Melanchthon, *etc.* (2;), as to what the prospects of the peace movement's designs as to a German National Council's convening and settling Germany's troubled religious parties might be, and to take along ingratiating gifts for these leaders (3;). These supporters undertook the mission to the unsuspecting leaders (4;). But the Lord opened the latters' minds to discern the identity of these supporters (5;). These leaders, therefore, on being approached by the supporters, told them of their relationship to the secular leaders of the Lutheran movement (6;) and told them to return as answer a denunciation of the evils of the Lutheran movement, both in its religious and its secular aspects (7-9;), and to announce the Lord's rejection of the Lutheran movement, as corrupt, from His favor (10;) and of His cutting off every feature of its various movements, whether restrained or free, by sectarians and rebels (11;). Particularly did these leaders forecast the death of the Lutheran peace movement when they, the supporters, would reach their secular commissioners (12;), which would cause mourning to all

adherents of the Lutheran movement; for this peace movement had commendable features in it (13;). They further forecast that another movement would displace the Lutheran movement as that of the less favored of God's people (14;). They even forecast the overthrow of the autocracy of the Divine-rightist civil powers, because of their state and church union (15;), all because of the evils that the Lutheran movement introduced into Protestantism (16;). This message was carried back by the supporters to the secular leaders of the Lutheran movement; and on their arrival the peace movement died (17;), to the great grief of German Protestantism (18;). Lutheran historians have set forth in detail the acts, controversies and rule of the Lutheran movement (19;). The above phase of the Lutheran movement ceased to be recognized by the Lord in 1543 (978 B.C.), after lasting 22 years, and was succeeded by a sickly Lutheran movement that lasted but one year, from 1543 to 1544 (978 to 977 B.C.), striving through Luther's wilfully beginning a controversy (20;) on the Lord's Supper against the Calvinistic movement, which refuted it as evil, with the other evils of the former movement, while the sickly Lutheran movement was striving against sectarian Romanists (1 K. 15:25-30;). This weak phase of the secondary Lutheran movement is described by Lutheran and other historians (31;).

(22) The Calvinistic movement became in 1544 (977 B.C.) the less favored movement of the people of God, and was active as such until 1567 (954 B.C., 1 K. 15:33); but this movement, like both Lutheran movements, was guilty of sectarianism, clericalism and union of church and state; and additionally it incessantly fought the Unitarian movement (16, 32, 34;), which was the more favored movement of the people of God. The Unitarian movement had a large number of leaders who wrote able expositions of, and able refutations of attacks on, their doctrines, like Servetus, the two Socini, Davidis, *etc.*, and a large number of

lesser lights who by word of mouth, especially by questions, were able to do likewise (;2 C. 14:8). Against them contended the Greek and Roman Catholics, the Lutherans, the Calvinists and the Anglicans (;9); but the former came forth courageously to meet these, especially on the doctrine of the trinity (;10). The Unitarian movement made earnest, humble and trustful prayer to God, as His more favored representative (;11). God enabled them successfully to defend Unitarianism and to overthrow trinitarianism in an utter defeat (;12, 13); and at the same time they overthrew and captured the doctrines related to trinitarianism (;14) and won to their faith many former trinitarians (;15).

(23) This victory moved the Unitarian leaders (;2 C. 15:1) to exhort by the Lord's Spirit their brethren to remain faithful to the Lord, who would, if they did, continue on their side (;2). They reminded them of the apostasies of nominal Spiritual Israel and their consequent unhappy experiences, and of the Lord's mercies returning to them on their repentance (;3-6); and from this they drew the lesson to be faithful and promised blessings to follow thereupon (;7). The Unitarian movement, encouraged by these exhortations, put away more and more errors and renewed the true Church publicly in its sacrificing course (;8). This resulted in numerous converts to the unity of God, especially in Italy and Switzerland, where Laelius Socinus (1555, 963 B.C.) mildly questioned the trinity in favor of the Unity (;9, 10). Consecrations and their carrying out marked their course (;11, 12), as they agreed to disfellowship the unconsecrated, and solemnly made their vows to the Lord amid preachings of the Word (;13, 14), for which reason they rejoiced in their wholehearted consecrations as manifesting the Lord to them in blessing (;15). Then this movement lapsed into silence until in 1566 (952 B.C.; v. 19 should read year 25, not year 35, since Baasha died in year 26 of Asa) Faustus Socinus, nephew and disciple

of Laelius Socinus, held aloft the Unitarian banner (;19). In 1567 (951 B.C.) the conflict between the Calvinistic movement and the Unitarian movement broke out again (1 K. 15:17; 2 C. 16:1), because the former desired to prevent further fallings away to the latter, and therefore developed trinitarianism further. To meet these arguments the Unitarian movement made a combination of arguments from upholders of Scripture and reason to renew a former combination of these (18, 19; 2, 3). Upholders of reason and Scripture agreed to this renewal of their former alliance; and reason attacked and refuted the idea of there being three gods in one God, as well as the pertinent arguments (20; 4). This moved the Calvinistic movement to desist from further elaboration of trinitarianism and to go about its proper business (21; 5). Thereupon the Unitarian movement called upon all its adherents to take away the Calvinistic points based on perverted Scripture and to develop the Unitarian thought on the relationship between the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit (22; 6).

(24) But some of the adherents of the Unitarian movement, speaking the truth, rebuked it for making an alliance with reason's upholders, as unbelief toward God, and said that it would result in Romanist trinitarians evading its arguments (;7), reminding it of its victory over all nominal-church trinitarians in their former controversy, because of trusting in the Lord (;8); for God seeks such believers; and folly was the quality of the other act, which would bring continual warfare (;9). The movement became enraged at these and restrained their influence among its adherents, at the same time in Poland and Transylvania it enacted oppressive church laws (;10). Certain ones of the rebukers of this movement rebuked the Calvinistic movement, which from little was by God made great, for committing the same sins as both Lutheran movements, to the Lord's displeasure (1 K. 16:1, 2, 7); therefore they foretold that the Lord would set aside

the Calvinistic movement from His favor, as He had done with the Lutheran movement (3;), and sectarians and lawless ones would plunder them (4;). Calvinistic historians have given a history of this movement (5;). In 1567 (954 B.C.) the Calvinistic (continental) movement gave way to the Calvinistic Knox Scottish movement as the less favored movement among the Protestant people of God (8;); but after a career of but one year this movement, drunken with its external success, came to grief through an oppositional Scottish politico-religious movement (1568 [953 B.C.], 9, 10;).

(25) At the same time it set aside every vestige of both Calvinistic movements in its leaders as adherents of the less favored movement, even as was forecast (11, 12;), because of the iniquities of both phases of this movement against which God was displeased (13;). Its historians have described this secondary Calvinistic movement (14;). This Scottish politico-religious movement was of very short duration; for the Anglican movement under the lead of Elizabeth, at that time fighting against sectarian Romanism, displaced it as the less favored movement of the people of God, in 1568 (953 B.C.; 15, 16;) by an oppositional movement (17;), for which the Scottish politico-religious movement gave up (18;); for it, too, in its brief life was guilty of the evils of the Lutheran movement (19;). The historians of this movement have accurately described it (20;). From the cases of the houses of Jeroboam and Baasha we construe of all the dynasties (houses) of Israel's kings, that each such house or dynasty in its various ruling members stood for as many variations of the antitypical movement as were ruling members in the pertinent dynasty or house; thus, as there were two ruling members in the Jeroboam house or dynasty, so were there two Lutheran movements in the parallel or antitype, and as there were two ruling members in the Baasha house or dynasty, so were there two Calvinistic movements in the parallel or antitype.

(26) In Britain there were two Protestant parties: those who desired a more Scriptural relation of church and state, Protestants in a purer sense, called Puritans, and those who desired a close union of state and church, the latter being led by Elizabeth (with the idea of royal supremacy) and the Anglican hierarchy, which prevailed (21, 22;). The first phase of the Anglican movement was from 1568 to 1579 (953-942 B.C.; not in the year 31, but 27 of Asa; compare 1 K. 16:15-22 and 29 with 23; hence here in v. 23 is a copyist's error). In its first six years it was mainly a religious movement; and in its last five years it was mainly a political movement (23, 24;), force by law sometimes being used to compel conformity to the rites and worship of the Anglican Church from 1574 (947 B.C.) onward. This persecuting phase of the Anglican movement included not only fines and imprisonments, but the burning at the stake of two Baptists in 1575 and another in 1579, to the disgrace of Elizabeth, the leader of this movement. It proved to be, so far, the most wicked of all the less favored movements of the Protestant people of God, and it was set aside in 1579, doubtless as a result of the third heresy burning bringing to a head its wickedness; for we are to remember that both the civil and religious powers supported this movement's wickedness, committing all the evils of the Lutheran movements and more besides, to the Lord's displeasure (25, 26;). Historians of this movement have described it (27;).

(27) This phase ceased, being buried in politics; but it was succeeded by even a worse phase (28;). This worse, yea worst, phase of the Anglican movement was from 1579 to 1600, (942-921 B.C., 29, 30;). This movement not only continued the evils of the Lutheran movements, but became united with the Anglican Church through Elizabeth, furthered by the Royal Supremacy idea, and became the servant of power-grasping and lording (31;). Riding roughshod over all rivals: the Puritans, Baptists and Congregationalists,

it erected the Church of England as the servant and supporter of power-grasping and tyranny (32;), making the union of state and church firmer, and displeased God more than any other former one of the less favored movements of the people of God (33;). The hierarchy and its literary supporters so developed the Episcopal Church in its Divine-right-of-bishops doctrine and powers and in its promoting to power and influence the supporters of the same as to alienate the Little Flock leader, Robert Browne, and his supporters and the Puritan crown-lost leader, Thomas Cartwright, and his supporters, as the Lord forecast of such cases (34;). In 1582 (939 B.C.), thus during the second phase of the Anglican movement, the Unitarian movement ceased to be the more Divinely favored one of the Protestant people of God. It was respected as more or less in harmony with the Little Flock (1 K. 15:24; 2 C. 16:12-14). Toward its end its practices turned still more to the worse, seeking a cure by encouraging its leaders to sectarianize it more or less, instead of seeking the Lord's help in His spirit, which brought about its rejection by the Lord (23; 12). Its historians adequately described its course (23; 11) with much praise of it (;14).

(28) The Unitarian movement was succeeded by the Congregational movement as the more favored one of God's people (24; 2 C. 17:1), in the year of 1582 (939 B.C.), and prevailed as such until 1607 (914 B.C.); but, though well armed, it was a movement deserted by its Little Flock leader, Robert Browne, and by the English government, so far as protection is concerned (22:41, 42; 20:31). Like the Unitarian movement, it did right, thoroughly avoiding the sins of all the less Divinely favored movements; but the Congregational movement failed to put down false religious service (43; 32, 33), but condemned unholy alliances between various states, even those not condemned by the Unitarian movement (46;). It developed its views on church government very strongly as against the

papistical, the episcopal and the presbyterian forms of church government (;2 C. 17:1), training its adherents thoroughly to use the proofs of the congregational form of church government defensively and offensively against the opposing errors (;2). The Lord blessed it, because it clung to Little Flock ways and opposed power-grasping and lording over God's heritage (;3); and because it acted in harmony with the Word, seeking the Lord and avoiding the evils of the apostate movements (;4). Hence the Lord strengthened it, its adherents gave it good support, and its riches were of truth and the respect of its adherents (;5). It was exalted in character through walking in the Lord's ways, and removed from its midst the false religious services that the Unitarian movement failed to do, as well as all combination of church and state (;6). Moreover, in 1585 (936 B.C.) it raised up deacons, elders and pastors, specially trained, who went about preaching the Truth then due, especially on church government, using the Bible as their sole source of faith and main rule of practice (;7-9). While the Anglican Church through Elizabeth persecuted this movement, her clergy, hierarchy and professors did not specially carry on doctrinal controversies with it, their hands being full with their controversies with the Presbyterian Puritans (;10). Some of the sectarians and politicians, doublefaced as they were, *e.g.*, Cecil (later Lord Burghley), Leicester, *etc.*, especially the civil rulers of Holland, whither persecution drove many of its adherents from England, gave it special favors (;11), under which conditions it waxed stronger and developed its principles in greater detail. It trained its adherents thoroughly in its principles, and made a large proportion of them warriors for them (;12, 13) chiefly in five countries: England, Scotland, Holland, Germany and America (;14-19).

(29) Starting off with Robert Browne, 1582, the new creatures in the Congregational movement faced the second Anglican movement with the statement that

surely no Truth could come apart from their ministry (1 K. 17:1;). The Lord's Word, Spirit and providence prompted them to withdraw from the Anglican Church to the Truth that could be gotten in isolation between that Church and the race under the curse, which they accordingly did (2-5;), where Dutch sectarians gave them some relief (6;). When they could get no more assistance there, they in part returned to England and in part went to America and received nourishment among outcasts of the Anglican Church in England and America (7-10;). These outcasts, consisting of some Baptists and more Puritans, assured them that they had almost no spiritual food; but such as it was they were seeking to prepare it with the thoughts of anti-hierarchy and anti-superstition (11, 12;). They told these outcasts to give them of their spiritual refreshments; and thereafter there would be enough for them and their anti-hierarchical and anti-superstition movement until the Lord would send abundance of truth (13, 14;). Said and done; and the forecast of the new creatures in the Congregational movement was fulfilled (15, 16;). After a time, as the Elizabethan persecution against the non-conformists continued, resulting in the imprisonment and hanging of many non-conformists, including some of the new-creaturely leaders of the Congregational movement, the anti-hierarchical and anti-superstition movement became inactive (17;). The outcasts blamed the new-creaturely members of the Congregational movement for this result (18;); and these by a threefold effort, that led by Browne, that led by Barrowe and that led by Ainsworth, the most learned of all early leaders of Congregationalism, resuscitated it and presented it as such to the outcasts (19-23;), who were thereby fully persuaded of the Divine mouthpieceship of these new-creaturely leaders in the Congregational movement (24;).

(30) The providence of God moved Barrowe and his colaborer, Greenwood, to carry their case before the

civil powers, through which they hoped that the Truth would get a wide circulation; hence they sought to do this (1 K. 18:1, 2;). Their activities brought them to the attention of a more liberal and very prominent section of the Anglican movement (Lord Burghley, Leicester, *etc.*), who favored the leaders of the Congregational movement, and who with the Anglican movement went forth to obtain refreshment for it (3-5;). One class sought by ecclesiastical, the other by secular means to find the needed refreshment (6;). The liberal section came in contact with Barrowe, Greenwood and certain of their colaborers, mainly while these were in prison for their faith's sake, and under questioning (7;), found them to be new-creaturely members of the Congregational movement, and were told to make them known as such to the Anglican movement (8;). The liberal party demurred, thinking it would injure them with the Anglican movement (9;), protesting earnestly against its inimical attitude toward the Congregational movement (10, 11;) and claiming that the Congregational movement, shifting its lines of thought, would expose them to evil from the former movement (12;). These liberals testified of their care for the Congregational movement, as well as for the Baptists, as against the Anglican Church working through Elizabeth's ire, *e.g.*, Burghley's repeatedly securing Browne's release from prison, *etc.* (13;). Nevertheless, by the aid of these the new creatures and the Anglican movements met, especially in the persons of Barrowe, Greenwood and other imprisoned new creatures who insisted on confessing their faith in the pertinent Bible teaching (14-16;).

(31) The Anglican movement at their meeting accused them of disturbing God's people (17;), which charge was thrust back into their teeth with proofs of the truth of the counter charge (18;). The attitude of these new creatures was a challenge to the Anglican movement to bring into debate with them the power-grasping and lording Anglican hierarchy and clergy

and those of them who stood for the union of state and church, who were supported by the Anglican Church, headed by Elizabeth (19;). This was, therefore, done by the Anglican movement (20;). The new creatures called for a decision on the part of the people as to the Bible organization of its Church or the hierarchical organization of the Church of England, but the public did not respond either way (21;). Then they called attention to their few numbers and the large numbers of the hierarchy, their clergy and followers (22;). Further, they suggested that each side through their respective sacrificial service demonstrate whether the hierarchical or the Congregational position on church government is right (23, 24;). They deferred to the other side as the more numerous one, who should sacrifice first (25;). The defenders of Episcopacy, therefore, proceeded to set forth, especially in writing, their views, the chief writers being Drs. Bancroft, Hooker, Saravia and Bilson, as a cry that hierarchism might be proven the prevailer, but no response came, though they earnestly busied themselves about their church (26;). The Congregational new creatures by act derided them with the indifferent and unresponsive attitude of their principle of power-grasping and lording (27;). Their more or less mutual contradictions lacerated them to their great injury (28;). They continued their discussion for a number of years, but to no avail (29;).

(32) The Congregational new creatures lovingly appealed to the people to be in spirit near them, and then refuted the error, and set forth the truth on the true Church (30;). Then taking twelve truths in harmony with God's real people (31;), they by these gathered the true Church in God's name, and set forth the Word, in a large measure, full of Truth on the false church and the true Church (32;). They arranged well the pertinent truths and made large sacrifices, including the surrender of their liberty and going to prison for their faith in the Word, laying down

especially four truths: (1) justification, and (2) consecration, showing that not English citizenship, but justification and consecration were necessary for membership in the Church, (3) Christ, and not the State in the Sovereign, is the head of the Church, and (4) the Bible alone is the determiner of the faith of the Church (33;). This was done, as charged, three times: (1) by the Browne movement, (2) by the Barrowe movement and (3) by the Ainsworth movement (34;). Those truths filled the true Church and the beliefs of the brethren (35;). Then these new creatures began their sacrifice, partly by writings; in Barrowe's and Greenwood's case it was done, first, by their writing tracts in prison, smuggling these out one page at a time through visitors daily, and sending them to Holland, and, second, by defending the Truth in their examination by the Church of England prelates and scholars; and their efforts were a prayer to God to demonstrate their being His mouthpieces (36;), and that the people recognize that the Lord is God in truth, and thus be converted to Him (37;).

(33) God manifested His accepting their sacrifice in using for His purposes the sacrifice, the Bible passages, truths and historical testimonies and practices (38;). This convinced an ever-increasing number of people who revered and acknowledged Jehovah (39;). Then the new creatures called for an all-round refutation of the defenders of hierarchism and clericalism, which by the Word was done (40;). Furthermore, they invited the Anglican movement to refresh itself; for there was evidence of preparation to issue truth literature (41;). This was done while the new creatures ascended to the sphere of prayer for a downpour of truth (42;). They encouraged their supporters to seek evidence of such approach of truth, and found it only after a sevenfold search performed by their supporters in the movements of the seven churches that they had founded. It was only after the seventh movement was formed that the evidence, first small, but ever

enlarging, appeared, when they charged these to tell the Anglican movement to prepare their organization to escape the downpour (43, 44;). The downpour came in the form of books and tracts; and the Anglican movement fled before it, the new creatures leading the way by the Truth, to their condition of union of church and state, which had its highest expression in Elizabeth as English sovereign and head of the Anglican Church (45, 46;).

(34) The Anglican movement reported to the Anglican Church, especially to Elizabeth, its head, what the Lord's mouthpiece had done, especially how he refuted with the Truth her hierarchy and clergy (1 K. 19:1;). Angered, Elizabeth and the Anglican Church set into operation the instruments of persecution, causing Barrowe, Greenwood, *etc.*, to be hanged for denying her royal supremacy in the Church, imprisoning some others, and exiling still others, and, finally, exiling all who were imprisoned (2;). This course made the other members of the Lord's mouthpiece flee into isolation, some to Scotland, but most of them to Holland, where a liberal government gave them refuge, and where they separated themselves at the well of truth from every little sectarian movement of the seven congregations that confessed Congregationalism (3;). Journeying still further in their isolation, they under the civil protection of Holland fell into much melancholy and desired to give up their office as mouthpiece (4;). While these were asleep as to the real condition, the Lord's messenger, first, Johnson, second, Ainsworth, aroused them into vigorous action in Holland, where they issued to the British authority an important statement on their faith, strengthened in this by Ainsworth's teaching and preaching (5-8;). This enabled them to stand their hard journey to the completion of their task of maintaining the organization of the embryo Church intact (9;). Their hard plight, as well as their words, spoke their discouragement, believing themselves alone and desolate (10;). The Lord

gave them to foresee great theological fights, revolutions and anarchy coming upon the second Anglican movement, and after that a better time (11, 12;). This made these new creatures look into matters more openly in the exercise of their office powers; and in their discouraged condition their words and attitude again told the Lord of their zeal and of the disloyalty of the people, the overthrow of the Church and the cutting off of the Lord's mouthpieces (13, 14;). By His providence the Lord indicated that they should mingle among the Puritans, train certain younger new-creaturely leaders to take up their work, stir up the Puritans to fight the Anglican movement and some of its supporters to rebel against it, which three things would thoroughly refute the Anglican movement (15-17;), the Lord assuring them that there were faithful ones in England who had not grasped for power and lorded it over God's people, nor supported such (18;). Mingling with the members of various denominations, particularly with the Presbyterians (Puritans), they found immature new creatures, and joined them with themselves, and by that association they let them partake with them in their office powers (19;). Some selfishness and worldliness held these immature ones back for awhile, which drew from the faithful a needed rebuke (20;). Renewing their consecration, and benefiting the people, they followed the mature new creatures, ministering to them (21;).

(35) The two long theological controversies that the second Anglican movement had with the Puritans (Presbyterians) are typed in 1 Kings 20. The first of these was from 1583 to 1586, in which the Puritans sought by argument, Parliamentary acts and influential people in the government to set aside: (1) the Anglican hierarchy and to establish Presbyterianism in its stead, (2) the Book of Common Prayer and to substitute for it the Book of Discipline written by the Puritan leaders, Cartwright and Travers, and (3) the 39 Articles of religion and to substitute Calvinism in their

stead. The second of these controversies, begun by the Martin Mar-prelate controversy, was from 1588 to 1593, both controversies ending in failure for the Puritans. We will briefly describe each one of these as typed in 1 Kings 20. Presbyterianism, which in contrast with the second Anglican movement was radical, while the latter was conservative, mustered all its warriors, including 32 special leader movements, with their teachings and organizations, and attacked the Anglican movement, especially through the House of Commons and some of the leaders in the government (1). They sent word to the Anglican movement politically that by right they had the Divine Truth and the Anglican movement's organizations and leading members on their side (2, 3). Overawed to find that the bulk of the members of the Anglican Church and their organizations had by the Puritan methods of boring from within been won over to their side, the Anglican movement was ready to succumb (4). But when the Puritans wanted to set aside the Episcopate, the Prayer Book and the 39 Articles and substitute their Presbyterian system, discipline and creed for them (5, 6), the Anglican movement called its leaders, the two archbishops, especially Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, the primate of all England, their bishops and leading clergy and professors, telling them what concessions it made (7); these advised it strongly to deny all concessions, except those offered before (8). This answer the Anglican movement gave to the Puritan party (9). Angered at this answer, the Puritan party threatened to bring its immense following in clergy and laity, its majority in the House of Commons and its supporters in the government and universities against the Anglican movement (10). Their pride moved the Anglican party to answer, by act rather than by word, that before victory it behooved no one to boast of it (11). This message moved the Puritan party, feasting with its leader movements, to charge that they open up the controversy, by literary works,

sermons, lectures and ordinances introduced into a Puritan-majority Parliament that would have set aside the three above-mentioned things and introduced the three Puritan substitutes therefore (12).

(36) At this juncture certain teaching members of the Anglican movement, led by Archbishop Whitgift, through their resolute and confident stand encouraged the movement with the prospects of certain victory (13), assuring them that the leaders of the nobility, with Elizabeth as their head, would be the ones to effect victory, and that the movement as a whole should take up the aggressive (14). Under the lead of the archbishop it, accordingly, did the following: The archbishop went to Elizabeth and moved her to forbid the House of Commons to pass the legislation which its majority favored passing, and to give as her reason that the tricky legislation that they were about to pass was unconstitutional, since it would nullify her royal supremacy in the church and change the national religion. She also sent word to the House of Lords that if the Commons should pass the legislation, they should reject it and read the Commons a much needed lesson. Overawed by the Queen, Commons dared not pass the ordinance, and it was certainly given a severe reprimand by the House of Lords. The Council, the most powerful body in the kingdom, was on the Puritans' side and sought to discipline Whitgift for some of his official acts; but as they were busy-bodying in his matters the Queen curtly silenced them, for she supported him in everything, having unbounded confidence in him. In spite of every effort of the Puritans against the Anglican movement, they were defeated on all fronts of the fight by the Queen and the nobility, backed by most of her cabinet members and the conforming clergy and laity. The new Parliament turned against the Puritans and their cause was lost (15-19). New measures were enacted that put to flight the remaining efforts of the Puritans, whose ministers were forced to vow loyalty to the Episcopate, the Prayer Book and the 39 Articles, or lose their places. Thus the Puritan

movement was crushed temporarily, and forced from the field very greatly discredited, with their principles repudiated and their organizations overthrown by the full weight of the Anglican movement's attack (20, 21). But the teaching members of the Anglican movement, knowing the character of the Puritan adherents, encouraged the Anglican movement to strengthen its position and act with great circumspection; for they said that as soon as they could recuperate the Puritans would return to the conflict (22). This the Anglican movement did along all lines, *i.e.*, with the Queen, her cabinet, the nobility, the House of Commons, the universities, the hierarchy, the clergy and the laity, unto readiness.

(37) The second onslaught against the second Anglican movement was begun and carried forward by the Puritans, first, through a series of anonymous booklets, printed by presses that they had to move from place to place to evade the searching officers, and entitled, *Martin's Mar-prelate*, and later, by sober literary products. The former were gotten up as satires on Anglicanism in the forms of dialogues in which a number of persons spoke their parts. They were filled with disparaging, yea, even scurrilous personalities against the Anglican hierarchy and clergy and their supporters, and gave rise to a new form of English literature—satire. These were first answered almost as effectively by the Anglicans in the same vein, and later by learned discussions, including the ablest treatises on Episcopacy in itself and in its contrast with Presbyterianism ever issued. Bancroft, Saravia, Bilson and especially Hooker were the main warriors for the Anglican movement; and Hooker's *Laws of the Ecclesiastical Polity* is the finest example of English prose ever produced. In prose he is the equal of Shakespeare in poetry. Of course the Puritans produced sober treatises, too, in this battle; but they were overmatched. However, it was a case of error fighting error, and the abler champions of error were on the

Anglican side; and they were, accordingly, victorious in the fight. These general remarks will prepare us for the details typed in vs. 23-30. The leaders of the Puritans said that in an encounter that involves the civil powers, the power of the Anglican movement was too much for them, but in a merely intellectual battle among the common people they could overcome the Anglican movement (23). Hence they counseled the Puritans as a body to enter a literary debate with the Anglican movement, setting aside their statesmen favorers and putting their theological debaters into the fray (24), with all their doctrines and organizations restored to the battle line, by which they promised them victory. This counsel was accepted and acted upon (25). The Puritan party mustered its forces for what they supposed to be certain victory and took a powerful position (26). The Martin Mar-prelate booklets then set in their appearance. This aroused the Anglican movement to muster its few fighters as against the many on the other side (27). The faithful in this movement, as the Lord's mouthpiece, assured it that as the Puritans had said that the Anglican movement could hold its grounds only by the civil powers, it would be proved that in argument it would more than defeat them by God's power (28).

(38) There were preliminary attacks by satirical booklets on the Anglican movement by individual Puritan writers, but the real fight set in with the appearance of the first of the Martin Mar-prelate booklets entitled, *The Epistle*. Its tone was sharp, its exposures of the evils of certain bishops and higher clergy were most damaging, and its satire most devastating. A second shortly afterward appeared, entitled, *The Epitome*, which was even more damaging than the *Epistle*. The authorship of the Martin Mar-prelate booklets is unknown, but there were a number of writers who cooperated thereon. Almost at the same time as the *Epitome* appeared the first answer to the *Epistle* by a Mr. Nash appeared. Thereafter in quick succession the

two sides assailed one another, and that satirically, but the satire of the Martin Mar-prelate booklets was severer, keener and deadlier. Each side had much of damaging facts against the other; for the bulk of the clergy and leaders of both sides were far from being saints; but when the conflict changed from the satirical and personal to the scholarly and doctrinal, the Anglican side, having abler mouthpieces, won an overwhelming victory (29). The remnant of the Puritan fighters, fleeing to their fortress on presbyters as against bishops, found that under the blows of the Anglican movement's writers, its powers fell; for they refuted still others; and the Puritans sought refuge in secret works (30).

(39) Some of its representatives suggested that they humbly ask from the Anglican movement for concessions permitting Puritanism to survive, which suggestion was accepted (31); and these in an humble attitude asked for such concessions. Anxious for peace, the Anglican movement expressed a fraternal concern for the Puritan movement. The messengers made the most of such fraternity, and a reconciliation took place (33). The Puritans promised to surrender the advantages that they had won under the first phase of the Anglican movement, and to give the Anglican movement the corresponding advantages. The Anglican movement accepted the proposal. It softened somewhat the demanded subjection to the Episcopate and made the subscription to the Prayer Book and the 39 Articles non-obligatory for renewal, which was before demanded, to those already in the ministry, but did require it of new candidates for the ministry (34). With this agreement a temporary peace was made between the two movements. Certain ones of the Lord's mouthpieces asked others of this class to treat them as partially refuted, which was refused, and the refusers were told that the nominal church would rend them, which took place (35, 36). This same group of the Anglican movement asked a Puritan mouthpiece group to do this to them, which was done unto the formers'

wounding (37). Thereafter the first mouthpiece group disguised itself to the Anglican group and told a pertinent illustration to it, which, not seeing the application, condemned the mouthpiece group (38-40). Then the mouthpiece group revealed its real identity, which was by the Anglican movement recognized as such (41). Then the mouthpiece group pronounced the sentence of the Lord, in principle pronounced by the second Anglican movement, that because the second Anglican movement had spared the Puritan movement, the latter would refute it (42), which saddened and displeased the second Anglican movement in its dealings in church and state (43).

(40) The English Congregationalists, Separatists, as they were then called for their separation from the union of state and church, had a sphere of activity all their own, but close to the office functions of the second Anglican movement (1 K. 21:1). Their sphere of activity, separation from the state church, the Anglican movement desired to take from them and offered them, instead, incorporation into the state church, or special privileges otherwise (2). But the Separatists declined to give up their separatism, believing it to be the one given them by the Lord in the original constitution of the Church (3). This saddened and displeased the Anglican movement, which betook itself to its creed, became disgruntled and would accept no refreshment (4). Its complaints, voiced through its leaders, particularly Archbishop Whitgift of Canterbury and Bishop Aylmer of London, reached the Anglican Church headed by Elizabeth, which and who inquired for the reason of its indisposition (5). It answered as indicated above in the explanation of v. 2 (6). They encouraged it to resume its former refreshment and cheer, promising to take the privilege of separation away from the Separatists and to give it into the second Anglican movement's power (7). Through the proper officials they caused word to go out to the leaders and officials in church and state to appoint a time of self-mortification

in the state church for the spread of nonconformity, to single out the Separatists for special prominence as the worst pertinent offenders, and to make the state and ecclesiastical leaders witness against them as heretics against God and rebels against the second Anglican movement, and then, depriving them of their rights, as blasphemers and rebels, to hurl their teachings against them unto their cutting off (9, 10). The officials did as commanded (11).

(41) They appointed a period of self-mortification in view of the disorders in state and church, and put the Separatists into the place of prominence by the unfavorable publicity given them (12). And, true enough, the state and ecclesiastical leaders appeared as witnesses against them as heretics and rebels, and they were condemned as the former by the highest church court, Whitgift and Aylmer being their chief condemners therein, and as the latter by the civil court, the two chief justices being their chief condemners therein. The processes and hearings were numerous for the individually accused ones, but the upshot of it all, the persecution from beginning to end lasting in its imprisonment phase from 1582 to 1597, was Browne's being imprisoned 32 times, six being hanged, including Barrowe, Greenwood and Penry, the first a barrister and the second and third ex-Anglican clergymen, hundreds being imprisoned, among whom at least 26 died from prison severities, and hundreds being exiled to Holland, *etc.*, and some as Pilgrim fathers leaving England and Holland for Massachusetts. Indeed, all others of them were by law sentenced to exile. Public sentiment, contrary to the hierarchy's ordinance introduced into Parliament, would not allow more hangings; and therefore, emptying the prisons, Parliament decreed their banishment. Frances Johnson, first the pastor of the London, and afterwards of the Amsterdam Separatists, seems to be the last released from jail, in 1597, after four years' incarceration (13).

(42) When the Anglican Church headed by Elizabeth

learned of the persecution of these, it told the second Anglican movement to take control of the privileges of the Separatists, whose persecution, they assured it, was a reality that cut them entirely off (14, 15). At this news the Anglican movement advanced to take possession of their privileges (16). The principles of the Lord's Word charged the faithful new creatures to face, by literary products, the Anglican movement, which was mixed up in politics, in its taking possession of the privileges of the Separatists (17, 18). These principles suggested that the faithful new creatures remind it of its cutting off of the Separatists and possessing itself of their sphere of activity. The forecasts of the Word moved them to announce to the Anglican movement that in the sphere of persecution, where sectarians took away the life powers of the Separatists, would sectarians take away the life powers of the Anglican movement (19). It demanded of the faithful new creatures as its enemies whether they had arrived at a Biblical knowledge of it; and it was told that such was the case, and that because it had for a price given itself to do evil in matters related to God (20). Then they announced the Lord's judgment of destruction against it and its immediate successors and descendants, whether bound or free (21), that God would do with the phases of the Anglican movement as He had done with the two phases of the Lutheran movement and the two phases of the Calvinistic movement, and that for its God-provoking wickedness and for making its adherents do evil (22). Furthermore, that sectarians would devour all the policies, powers, arrangements, clergy, hierarchy, *etc.*, that the Anglican Church headed by Elizabeth had established in the state church (23), that sectarians would devour all of the offspring of the Anglican movement that would remain in its state church, and that revolutionists would do that for those of them who would leave it (24). Of all the less favored movements of the Protestant people of God, none did so wickedly as the second

phase of the Anglican movement, and that from 1579 to 1600, stirred up thereto by the Anglican Church headed by Elizabeth (25). It did especially wickedly in various forms of evils, after the manner of the sins of pride, so contrary to the ways of God's real people (26). These rebukes had a corrective effect upon the second Anglican movement, which repented of its course and amended its ways (27). From the Word the faithful new creatures observed this repentance and amendment, and from it they learned that the Lord would delay the execution of the threatened punishment until the end of the Anglican movement's fourth phase (28, 29).

(43) There were two controversies involving the Anglican movement after the controversy that it had on Episcopacy versus Presbyterianism: One was on Calvinistic predestinarianism, in which the dispute was mainly among themselves, in which the Calvinistic theory, held by the Puritans and Separatists, as well as by one side in the Anglican movement, was decidedly worsted. Hence it cannot be typed by the war of Ahab and Jehoshaphat against the Syrians in 1 Kings 22; 2 Chro. 18. The other was the Sabbath controversy. In this controversy the Anglican movement, antitypical Ahab, and the Congregational movement, antitypical Jehoshaphat, took the liberal side and the Puritans (Presbyterians), antitypical Ben-Hadad, took the strict or radical side, applying to Sunday all that the Old Testament applies to the Jewish Sabbath. Previous to this controversy Sunday was generally regarded as a day whose morning should be devoted to church attendance and the rest of the day to worldly sports, business, feasting and pleasure. In 1595 a Puritan divine, a Dr. Bound, wrote a book advocating a strict keeping of Sunday after the manner of the Jewish Sabbath, whose commands and prohibitions he applied as obligatory for Sunday as the alleged place-taker for Christians of the Jewish Sabbath. Shortly thereafter several other Puritan divines published books advocating

the same ideas. In 1597 Dr. Rogers in the preface of his book on the 39 Articles threw out a caution that this "new view" was doubtless being advocated to reflect upon the church holidays (taken over from Rome). But a couple of years passed before the matter broke out as a controversy, which by the Spring of 1600 resulted in a defeat of the defenders of the prevalent loose views of Sunday observance and the triumph of the Sabbatarians. It is this controversy that is typed in 1 Kings 22 and 2 Chro. 18, which will be set forth.

(44) The controversy on Episcopalism and Presbyterianism tapered to an end from 1594 to 1596; and the Sabbath controversy lasted about a year, from the Spring of 1599 to that of 1600 (1 K. 22:1). The Congregational movement possessed much Truth on church government and much honor through its brave stand amid persecution, which resulted in Parliament's abolishing the death penalty and imprisonment against its advocates, though still banishing them (2 C. 18:1). In 1599, agreeing with the Anglican movement on Sunday's not being the Sabbath, and thus not obligatory upon Christians in the sense of the Jewish Sabbath's being obligatory on the Jews, the Congregational movement joined the former against the Puritans (Presbyterians) on the subject (2; 2). This agreement influenced the Anglican movement to show its specially favored attention and desire for its cooperation to wrest through the Sabbath controversy the place of preeminence from the Puritan Presbyterians, which these had taken from it, and which it claimed for itself (3; 2). It, therefore, proposed to the Congregational movement that it join it in the pertinent controversy, which the Congregational movement agreed to do (4; 3). More careful to carry out the Lord's will than the Anglican movement, the Congregational movement proposed that they learn the Lord's present will on the subject (5; 4). The Anglican movement gathered its numerous mouthpieces to inquire what they

considered the Lord's will thereon to be. These encouraged it to enter the controversy, promising it that the Lord would give it victory (6; 5). Still hesitating, the Congregational movement inquired whether there were not a class of mouthpieces who recognizedly spoke in harmony with the Lord's principles (7; 6). The Anglican movement replied that there was one such group of Anglican movement brethren, which it disliked, because it never spoke well, but always evil of the Anglican movement. The former remonstrated with the latter for such sentiments (8; 7). Thereupon the Anglican movement sent for this class to be brought quickly (9; 8). These two movements in their full authority came before the public in political respects; and all the mouthpieces were thus speaking on their affairs (10; 9). One set of these mouthpieces as advisers presented strong arguments for the two movements' position and assured the Anglican movement that thereby they would be able utterly to overthrow the Sabbatarianism of the Puritan Presbyterians (11; 10). This view all the other mouthpiece groups corroborated (12; 11). Those sent to bring the Truth-speaking class told it how all the other mouthpieces foretold prosperity and suggested that it do the same (13; 12). This mouthpiece group solemnly answered that only according to the principles of the Lord's Word would it speak (14; 13).

(45) On its coming into contact with the Anglican movement, the latter asked whether it should struggle for the preeminence on the Sabbath question or not, and, if so, whether it would be successful, to which questions this mouthpiece group gave an ironical and sarcastic answer implying the opposite thought of what a non-ironical and non-sarcastic answer would convey (15; 14). In doubt as to the import of the answer, the Anglican movement remonstrated that it had often solemnly to demand from it a true answer according to the principles of the Word (16; 15). Dropping its irony and sarcasm, it foretold a crushing defeat that would result in the death of the second phase of the

Anglican movement, leaving the Anglicans on the pertinent subject without a leader, with the principles of the Word implying that they would have no real teacher thereon, and that the Anglicans would give up the fight on the Sabbath question (17:16). On hearing this answer the Anglican movement appealed to the Congregational movement to witness that it had foretold, not a prosperous, but a calamitous answer and outcome (18; 17). This mouthpiece then declared that it had seen a set of circumstances manipulated by the Lord (19; 18) whereby God's course showed that He desired to take the supposedly wise Anglican movement in its own craftiness (Job 5:13), which circumstances, so manipulated, appealed for someone to inveigle the Anglican movement into the fatal step of fighting for preeminence with the Puritan Presbyterians on the Sabbath.

(46) Some of these circumstances suggested certain, and some, other courses (20; 19). One of these circumstances suggested a specially deceitful course (21; 20). It was Divinely manipulated to indicate that it would impress the various sets of the Anglican movement's mouthpieces with the thought of certain victory for it; God's favoring this circumstance foretold by act that the ruse would be successful (22; 21). Then the Truth-speaking mouthpiece declared that the Lord's providences suggested to the false prophets a deception as true, but that in truth the principles of the Word forecast calamities upon the Anglican movement (23; 22). Thereupon the boldest group of the false mouthpieces denounced the true one, challenging it to prove that the Truth went from the smiter to the smitten one (24; 23). The latter answered that when the coming defeat would drive the former to hide itself in shameful confusion, it would see how it was (25; 24). Indignant, the Anglican movement charged that the true mouthpiece be handed over to corrective officers (26; 25) and by them be restrained and disciplined with rigor until it would return in triumph (27; 26).

To this the true mouthpiece answered that if it would return in victory in the Sabbath controversy, the Lord would not have spoken by that mouthpiece; and this statement it called upon all to note (28; 27).

(47) Thereupon the Anglican and Separatist movements undertook the campaign to gain the position of preeminence on the Sabbath question, a subject on which both sides were in more or less error, though there was less truth thereon with the Puritan Presbyterians than with the other two movements. It was here the old story of one extreme of error fighting another extreme of error, with the truth lying between them forgotten (29; 28). The Anglican movement proposed that it would hide its real pertinent thoughts, and that the Separatist movement express its real pertinent thoughts, which was done (30; 29). The Presbyterian movement, desiring to defeat the Anglican movement, and not caring so much about the relatively small-numbered Congregational movement, charged its champions to fight against the Anglican movement only (31; 30). Thus they entered the controversy, in which the Separatists expressing their real sentiments, were taken to be the Anglican movement, and the Presbyterians, concentrating on these, soon put them to such distress and expressions of distress as betrayed their real nature, whereby the Lord helped them and moved their attackers to cease their attacks on them (32, 33; 31, 32). A group among the Puritan Presbyterians by hit-and-miss methods struck the Anglican movement in a vulnerable part of its armor—the view that Sunday was the same kind of a day as any of the other festivals of the church year, *e.g.*, like a saint's day, on which after service every kind of worldly sports, competitions, pleasures, business, *etc.*, could properly be indulged. Feeling this blow keenly, it asked that the managers of its organization take it out of the fray, pleading by its condition that in the argument it was sorely smitten (34; 33).

(48) The controversy increased in intensity and the Anglican movement set itself firmly in its organization until April, 1600, when it gave up in complete defeat and its vitality oozed out even unto the lowest adherents of its organization (35; 34). The Anglicans and Separatists by that time were so completely worsted in the controversy, that immediately thereafter the latter accepted the Presbyterians' pertinent position and the Anglicans were more or less driven to a certain kind of compliance, the result being that the British people are the strictest Sunday observers of all peoples (36). Thus the Anglican movement gave up on the main phases of the question, and was brought over to political questions and there entered oblivion on the subject (37). The Anglican organization had to be purged from the death evidences of the second phase of the Anglican movement; and sectarians appropriated these evidences by the aid of the teachings with which the state churches sought to purge their defilements (38). All this was in fulfilment of the Lord's word against the most wicked phase of the less favored movements of the Protestant people of God. The Anglican and other historians have accurately described the history of this movement, as well as the powerful system that it built and its dioceses. So ended the second phase of the Anglican movement; it was succeeded by the third phase of that movement, which had to do with the subject of ecclesiastical versus civil courts (39, 40).

(49) The Separatist or Congregational movement, after the Sabbath controversy, returned to its own sphere of service (2 C. 19:1). But the Lord's mouthpiece in it gave it a strong rebuke for its siding with the hitherto most wicked phase of the less favored movements among the Protestant people of God, and told it that the Lord was displeased with it (2). But praise tempered the dispraise, because it had rejected the union of state and church with its main evils, and because it had faithfully set its heart to become

one with the Lord (3). This movement remained in its stewardship doctrine, congregationalism, and sought to convert to its truth all that it could, from the faithful new creatures to the adherents of the Episcopal Church, and succeeded in so doing with increasing numbers (4). It arranged with more or less error the servants of the local ecclesias as follows: (1) pastors, (2) teachers, (3) ruling elders, (4) deacons, (5) helpers and (6) widows (5), enjoining upon them great carefulness as to themselves and the brethren and to exercise their offices not for man, but for God, who would support them in right and Truth (5, 6). It exhorted them to have reverence for God and to exercise it, since iniquity, partiality and bribery do not prevail in the Lord's affairs (7). Moreover, this movement arranged that the various ecclesias could hold conferences through pastor, teacher, and elder representatives sent by each ecclesia, so that each ecclesia might be helped by the collective wisdom of all, given as advice, not by compulsion, in doctrine and practice, especially on controverted subjects. This done, they returned to each ecclesia as a complete thing in itself (8).

(50) Such servants of the brethren were by it exhorted to act in harmony with their consecration faithfully and single-heartedly (9). It told such servants that in all cases of controversy among the ecclesias on matters affecting brethren and brethren personally and on matters of practice and practice, doctrine and doctrine, they should warn the brethren not to be guilty against God, else wrath would come upon them and upon their brethren, and that by so doing the guilt of unfaithfulness would not attach itself to them (10). It also charged that the pastors were their chief servants in the Lord and that the elders were to rule in the concerns of the ecclesias. (This was the corruption of the stewardship truth that Henry Barrowe as a crown-lost leader introduced, whereby he sought to blend Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, against the teaching of Robert Browne, whose pertinent

teachings were pure Congregationalism.) It also commended the lesser officers to the brethren, as well as exhorted to courage, with the assurance that God would be with the good (11). During this time Romanism had no chief movement in Britain; it had the mere shadow of a movement secretly led and inefficient (1 K. 22:47). During this time (1600-1602) the Congregational movement approached the third phase of the Anglican movement, which was very wicked (44; 2 C. 20:35); and the latter offered to cooperate in making certain groups of scholars seek Divine matters in joint study (48; 36). For this the Congregational movement was denounced by one of the new-creaturely companies and told that this cooperative effort would fail, and that the Lord would destroy its works. This occurred through the learned ones, especially at Oxford and Cambridge, whereby these groups of scholars were unable to make the mental journeys necessary to get the real Divine matters (2 C. 20:37). This occurred after the Congregational movement refused to accept the scholars of the third phase of the Anglican movement into study groups (1 K. 22:49).

(51) The second phase of the Anglican movement ended April, 1600, and was succeeded by its third phase, which was also a power-grasping phase, especially seeking to perpetuate its power through the low and high ecclesiastical courts; but it lasted only two years (51). It continued in all the evils of the second phase of the Anglican movement, of the Anglican Church and of both of the Lutheran movements (52), especially grasping for power and lording it over God's people (53). It met with a calamity in connection with its procedure in its low courts and its Court of High Commission. These courts were marred by the same evils as they committed in the days that Romanism controlled them. They were guilty of many tricks to mulct the people of their money and to delay litigation for gain, as well as of bribery from, and favoritism to the great and of severity toward the poor.

Especially did they do evil in cases of marriage licenses, excommunications and clerical litigation. This diseased condition moved this Anglican movement to seek answer to the question as to its curability, not from the principles of the Lord's Word, but from those of self-preservation, disregarding of the proper means used thereto (2 K. 1:2). The faithful new creatures, as God's mouthpiece, seeing through this evil course, were by the principles of God's Word aroused to expostulate against this course, demanding whether there were no God of Truth and justice among God's people, that the movement made its appeal to wrong principles and methods, as an appeal to Satan and not to God for pertinent information (3). Therefore God's new creatures, as His mouthpiece, announced that the pertinent disease would be fatal, and with this announcement they left the movement's messengers (4).

(52) These returned to the sick Anglican movement and gave the answer given them, after it had expressed its wonder at their so speedy return (5, 6). The movement inquired as to the character of their informants (7). These replied that they were well versed in the Scriptures and served their cause humbly, from which the movement inferred that they were the Lord's new creatures acting as His mouthpiece (8). Partisan warriors of the movement, especially Archbishop Whitgift and certain of his special helpers in 1601, agitated certain reforms as the quick answer to God's mouthpiece, which were in effect a demand upon it to leave the high grounds on which it had taken its stand and to surrender to them as the movement's representatives (9). By the act of calling from the spiritual sphere refutative arguments God's mouthpiece overthrew their points (10). In January, 1602, Whitgift and his supporters offered other reforms as quick refutations of God's mouthpiece, who again by spiritual arguments refuted their attackers (11, 12). Again, but in an humble manner, these came, entreating that spiritual arguments no more be used, as those that refuted them

before, but that the practical aspects of the situation be given consideration, as needed by the critical conditions of the movement on the courts' situation (13, 14). God's mouthpiece condescended to take the lower ground, as directed by their leader, and thereon met the movement on its own grounds (15). There he gave the message of death to the movement on the question of ecclesiastical courts, because of their past and present wickedness in acting out Satan's principles in the past and seeking help from them in the present situation (16). This death set in, and was brought about, not by reforming these courts, but by litigants' obtaining prohibitions from the secular courts, which these were only too glad to grant as a curb on the ecclesiastical courts, estopping the executions of the latter's decisions (17). The historians of the Anglican Church describe this aspect of the Anglican movement (18).

(53) In 1603 (918 B.C.) after Elizabeth's death, and on the accession of James I to the English throne, in the fourth phase of the Anglican movement, 1602-1616 (919-905 B.C.), there arose against the Congregationalists James in autocracy, clericalist Oxford University professors and the statesmen (not Ammonites, but the Meamites, according to Ginsburg's notes, *i.e.*, Edomites; see 2 C. 20:10, 22, 23), who stood for a union of state and church in a controversy on whether the exiled Congregational movement might return to England and enjoy peace and the protection of the laws (2 C. 20:1, 2). The Congregationalist brethren tremblingly betook themselves to fasting and to prayer to the Lord (3). All Congregationalism gathered itself out of all their ecclesias and joined therein (4). The Congregational movement set itself in their midst (5) and prayed to God as universal sovereign and irresistible (6), who had hitherto enabled them to defeat all their enemies as against this sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, and who had given it to God's children for a lasting inheritance (7). These dwelt therein and built up the Church unto God's glory (8), saying that

if controversy, punishment, error or lack of Truth would overtake them, they would appear publicly before the Church, where God's glory dwells, and pray to Him in such trouble, believing that He would hear and deliver them (9). Then they told the Lord that autocratic clericalistic professors and state and church unionistic statesmen, whom God would not permit them to molest when they came out of the kingdom of darkness, and whom they, accordingly, did not harm (10), were now in ingratitude seeking to dispossess them of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, their Divinely, given inheritance (11). They asked God to rule them, pleading their powerlessness, lacks as to the opposing host and their confidence in God (12).

(54) This was done in the presence of all Congregationalists in all their classes (13). Certain of the secondary leaders, deacons, animated by the Lord's Spirit, arose in their midst (14), asking for their attention and declaring the Lord's message, to the effect that they should not be terrified, since the battle was not theirs, but the Lord's (15). These encouraged them to set forth their views on the government of the ecclesias, as to what it should be and should not be for the militant Church (16). They assured them that they would not need to carry on an extended controversy, but content themselves in quietness to see the effect of their presentations of their views as a deliverance from the Lord, whose presence with them should remove all terror from them, since they were simply to go forth and present their views and trust His presence (17). This moved the Congregational movement and all Congregationalism and Congregationalists to bow in worship (18). Certain brethren, led by F. Johnson, the main pastor, and H. Ainsworth, their main teacher, prepared themselves to do the speaking and writing part of their case before the three classes of their enemies (19). These in all prepared four writings for the king, *etc.*, and went to London from Amsterdam to present their case orally and in

writing. The movement itself asked the brethren's attention and exhorted the brethren to faith in God, who would build them up, and to believe in His mouthpieces, which would bring prosperity (20).

(55) With common consent it sent forth the responding messengers, whose presentations of the Word reflected credit upon God (21). These presentations resulted in the autocratic king and the Oxford professors refuting the state- and church-union statesmen, and the autocratic king and Oxford professors refuted one another after the Lord's messengers refuted the position of all three (22, 23). The faithful witnessed the defeat of their enemies and saw them defeated by one another over the statements, especially the 14 points, presented by the messengers (24). Their fourth writing, entitled, *An Apology, or Defense of such True Christians as are Commonly (but unjustly) called Browneists*, made spoil of their adversaries (25). They thereafter assembled in a condition of blessing; for they praised God (26). Victorious in God's sight and their own, they returned to their usual activities, though unable to obtain permission to return to England, glad that they could confess the Truth before the great ones of England, who were by it put to confusion and mutual refutation (27, 28). Their triumphant confession and its effects made a good impression on many, who recognized that God fought for them, and the result was prosperity (29, 30).

(56) It was just after the first of the fourfold verbal and literary attempts of the Congregational movement to secure permission from James I for their exiled members to return to England and to obtain for those there and the returned exiles the privilege of freedom of worship, assembly and propaganda, that a setting aside of the more uncompromising brethren from mouthpieceship and the obtaining of that office by the less uncompromising brethren was to occur (2 K. 2:1). The four stations to which Elijah and Elisha went represent four stages in their later united ministry:

crucial transitory experience (1) with general conditions, (2) with the true Church, (3) with the nominal church, and (4) with the disapproved British peoples. In connection with the first three the more uncompromising brethren's course proved very trialsome to the less uncompromising brethren who yet overcame the trial; and some of the Congregationalist hangers-on forecast at the second and third stages the completion of the change as to mouthpieceship which the less uncompromising brethren anticipated, but on which they desired that silence be kept (2-6). As these brethren while progressing toward this change approached and stood before the disapproved peoples of Britain: the king, nobility, hierarchy and liberty lovers, their course was watched by a large company of hangers-on (7). Uniting all their resources the more uncompromising brethren set forth the evils of the disapproved peoples of Britain, severely rebuked them for these evils and denounced their institutions unto destruction, which divided the disapproved peoples of Britain into (1) autocrats: king, nobility and hierarchy, and (2) the radicals: liberty-lovers and opponents of autocracy, between whom in their two kinds the new-creatures passed unhurt to experiences beyond (8). The course of the more uncompromising ones suggested to the less uncompromising ones that they ask a parting boon. Those in the latter attitude then asked for successorship as mouthpiece under condition of obedience to those in the former attitude (9). Those in the first attitude, stressing the difficulty involved in the request, assured those in the second attitude that their request would be granted, if they continued in cooperation until the change set in (10). This they did. The leader of those in the first attitude was Thomas White, and of those in the second attitude was Francis Johnson. The latter got control of the organization of the Holland Congregationalists and forced those of the other attitude into the background (11). During this change those in the second

attitude recognized those in the first attitude, were at first distressed at the change and at the condition of their own organization, then refused longer to recognize those of the former attitude as controlling, became guilty of many evils, as well as repudiated their subordinate position, taking the controllership that those in the first attitude let slip out of their hands (12). And with their new powers they by word and writing caustically arraigned, rebuked and condemned the disapproved peoples of Britain alienating them increasingly into the above-mentioned groups, and that under the impression that they themselves were the ones acting by right in this matter. Their arraignment, rebukes and condemnation of the peoples of Britain divided the latter more and more. Then they passed between them to other activities, more or less injured by the peoples of Britain (13, 14).

(57) The hangers-on, especially those of them who were in Holland, and who had taken their stand only as far as the third attempt at freedom from the ecclesias' difficulties, accepted these as in the controlling attitude and work; they approached these and became subject to them in their leaders (15). These in a large company proposed to make a reconciliation between those in the two attitudes and activities, fearing the former had by their office powers been too highly exalted or too deeply degraded. Their counsel was by the now controlling group rejected (16). The former continued with their urgings, until out of sheer shame the latter consented to the effort, which proved after lengthy attempts to be a failure (17). After failure they returned to the position taken in the third attempt at freedom from ecclesias' difficulties, where they found those in the second attitude, and were rebuked with the statement, Did we not tell you not to undertake it, as it would end in failure? (18). The adherents of the now controlling group told these that their sphere of activity was good; but that their "teachings," despite their Scriptural proofs for each of the involved

14 points and a more elaborate explanation of those 14 points, made in a confession of faith to James I and his supporters were bitter and their dispositions were resultantly barren (19). This led, at the controllers' request, to the preparation of a new and milder and more Truth-conforming publication; for this request was granted; and the matters were set forth in a publication of Francis Johnson's in 1606, which, while bettering matters, left still much to be bettered, which from time to time was done (20-22). From this sphere of activity the members of the mouthpiece betook themselves to the Anglican Church, emphasizing the 14 above-mentioned points, *i.e.*, set forth their main constructive views and the opposing views of the fourth Anglican movement in 14 articles or propositions on the real and nominal Church.

(58) Therefore undeveloped nominal-churchists greatly derided them as bereft of the Truth and its Spirit (23). This led to their studying these and to their forecasting evil things to come upon them in the Lord's name. Two groups, one of state, the other of church, shortly came out from among earth's great ones, and in controversy rent 42 dioceses in Britain with contentions (24), until 1607 (914 B.C.), when the Jehoshaphat phase of the Congregationalist movement ended. After these things they had a temporary prosperity, but just afterward they became mixed up in church politics among themselves (25); yea, from here on for a long time the Congregationalist movement, beginning with the development in Truth of John Smyth in 1607 (914 B.C.), corresponding with Jehoram of Judah's reign (914-906 B.C.), entered into a reactionary course. Indeed, this reactionism set in as a faint beginning 8 years before and increased to a full head by the end of the first phase of the Congregationalist movement, corresponding to Jehoram's co-regency with his father Jehoshaphat 1599-1607 (922-914 B.C.). It took its rise in an attempt of the Congregationalist leaders in 1599 (922 B.C.) to enlist Dutch ecclesiastics

to take their side against the Anglican movement, which attempt ended in a flat failure. The second phase of the Congregationalist movement was from 1607 to 1615 (914-906 B.C.). But before discussing it we will discuss one thing yet that belongs to its first phase, as set forth in 2 Kings 3, as well as a thing that belongs to the fourth phase of the Anglican movement.

(59) All the forces of the radicals, James I and the Archbishop of Canterbury at their head, both standing for the Divine right of kings, of aristocrats and of those clergy represented especially in the episcopacy, began a siege of the conservatives, especially in the domain of state and church politics. They put into operation a series of arbitrary acts tending to crush the conservatives in state and church. By their active support and the insistence of the king and Convocation, the highest legislative body in the Anglican Church, they did two things: (1) passed a series of 161 canons, divided into 13 chapters, many of which canons were passed legally by Parliament years before, but some of which were new and actually never received Parliamentary sanction, and thus are not a part of the English Church law; and (2) they required all clergymen to subscribe to them and what they sanctioned, *e.g.*, the 39 Articles, the Book of Common Prayer and Apostolic Succession, certain papal ceremonies, *etc.*, and that with their souls' full approval, which put a test of conscience on the Puritans, many of whom were conservatives, by which course the archbishop secured the ousting of 300—"deprived" 300—of such clergymen from their churches; and hundreds of others resigned before they could be ousted. Additionally, the Court of High Commission arbitrarily sought to push its ecclesiastical jurisdiction beyond its sphere of authority against the conservatives. All of this is typed by the siege of Samaria (2 Kings 6:24).

(60) These measures reduced the conservatives in the sphere of state and church politics to great stress,

in which there was the sorest kind of a famine in state and church rights in teaching edifying matters (25). The conservative party in state and the conservative party in church in their desperation entered into deals with each other for their mutual preservation, in which deals, after the latter had made their promised sacrifices, the former refused to make theirs, a thing that the aggrieved party brought to the conservatives as a whole, greatly distressed as it was in the exercise of its powers (26-29). This horrified these to such a degree as to expose its deep mourning over the situation as it was exercising its power (30). This angered it at God's mouthpiece that had encouraged the conservatives to resist the radicals (31). God's mouthpiece was at that time attending to their work with all their leading brethren before them. The conservatives sent a messenger to bring the threat of expulsion against God's mouthpiece, but before he arrived God's mouthpiece declared to the leaders before them that the descendant of the saint-disfellowshipping second Anglican movement was intent on their disfellowshipment, but they charged their auditors to give no access to such, assuring them that the party as a whole was taking action against them (32). Immediately thereafter the messenger of the conservative party came, whereupon God's mouthpiece recognized this misfortune as being providential, and as indicating that they should no longer withhold the Lord's pertinent message (33), which was to the effect that very shortly the famine of rights would end in an abundance of them easily obtained by all (2 K. 7:1).

(61) But the executive committee upon which the conservatives depended to carry out its measures doubted the word of God's mouthpiece, denying that even Divine power could effect this change, to which the latter replied that it would see this, but not enjoy its fruitage (2). In prominent places were certain fence-straddling crown-lost members of Parliament, of the judiciary, of the deprived clergy and of followers

of God's mouthpiece, very much distressed by the crisis in which they found themselves, debating over their situation which would bring them to a cutting off from their places, if persisted in (3). Furthermore, they reasoned that if they allied themselves outrightly with the conservatives they would lose their still possessed but diminished privileges, and that if they continued in their present fence-straddling position they would also be cut off. Hence they determined to fall away to the radicals, concluding that the worst that could from these happen to them was a refusal to receive them, whereas they stood a chance to be accepted by these (4). In their uncertainty they assayed to join themselves to the radicals, but when they came to the position of those who were nearest their own position, they found them to have abandoned it (5). The reason was that the Lord had caused to come to them the news of many organizations and teachings of the Parliamentary, judicial, conservative and independent parties working against them, which caused the radicals to think that all the fearful of all parties and all in harmony with British secular affairs had come to the relief of the conservatives (6).

(62) It happened as follows: In Nov., 1610 (911 B.C.) Bancroft, the very radical Archbishop of Canterbury and the Anglican primate, died and was succeeded by the Puritan Abbot, who largely reversed the radical policies of Bancroft. Furthermore, the judiciary and Parliament deprived the Court of High Commission of all its power, except in purely ecclesiastical matters, and even in these so curbed its power as to give it liberty only in dealing with heresy by imprisonment or death, whereas before it dealt with anything that had an ecclesiastical aspect, *e.g.*, marriage, inheritances. In 570 cases the courts set aside the radical decisions of the Court of High Commission, which very greatly compromised its assumed prerogatives. Parliament came to the aid of the judiciary, dissanctioning the radical autocracy of the king in

state and church and of the radical episcopacy in the church, and demanded the reinstatement of the deprived clergy. Among other things, to the king's great disliking, it caused Dr. Cowel to be imprisoned, as advocating things contrary to the British Constitution in his book, *The Interpreter*, which advocated the propositions that the king was above the law and that he could void it and acts of Parliament at his pleasure, views that the whole radical ecclesiastical party sanctioned. It also caused his book to be suppressed. It continually opposed the autocratic arbitrariness of the king and the bishops. Public sentiment was greatly aroused against the radicals, because the Court of High Commission at the king's insistence, through the connivance of certain hand-picked radical judges, caused several heretics to be publicly burned for their heresy.

(63) All of this, and more too, frightened the radicals, as typed in v. 6; and thereupon they beat a general retreat from advocating their spheres of work, doctrines and principles; in a word, gave up pressing their radical positions and prerogatives into practice, and fled from practicing their radical views in fear of their official lives (7). The fence-straddling crown-losers in their four groups began to enter one position after another, taking as booty the unused and forsaken prerogatives; for they at first made only selfish use of these (8). But they, conscience-stricken, saw through their selfishness and, acknowledging their wrong, decided to break the good news to all the conservatives, also fearing that if their course were to become known, they would suffer for it; therefore they resolved to break the news to the members of the conservative party (9). Hence each one told the leaders of his own individual group, declaring that they had come to the position of the radicals and found no defender of it, no advocacy of it, but each doctrine and principle and sphere of activity standing in its place (11). As one man they encouraged the leaders to make the news known to the members of their

several conservative parties. The conservatives in their ignorance of the situation suspected a stratagem as being worked against them to inveigle them from their position that they might be overwhelmed outside their defenses; and they told their suspicions to one another (12). But the leaders counseled that of the principles of the British Constitution still remaining with them, five be used to test the condition. These five principles were the inviolability of the Constitution, Parliament as the sole law-making body in Britain, the judiciary as the sole interpreter of the law, the king and his cabinet as the executives of Parliament's laws and the competence of Parliament, concerning British matters, to discuss any subject, a thing that the king denied so far as his matters were concerned, most other principles of the British Constitution having, with their advocates, been crushed (13). Thereupon a committee of Parliament and one of the judiciary with pertinent teachings were sent out to investigate the report of the radicals' retreat (14).

(64) Their investigations disclosed the fact that it was apparent even to the most depraved peoples of Britain that the radicals had fled from their positions; and strewn about all the way were scattered the prerogatives and principles cast away, so far as advocating them was concerned, in their flight by radicals; and this news was by the investigators brought back to the conservatives (15). Therefore the conservatives went forth and took advantage of the defense-abandoned position of the radicals to improve their own position. In the parliamentary elections of 1614 (907 B.C.) almost every supporter of the radicals was defeated; and the new Commons met in a very belligerent mood toward the autocratic power-grasping king and episcopacy. This settled the questions at dispute, so far as the votes of Britain were concerned—they had completely rejected the radicalism of the king and the bishops, the thing here typed. This was the beginning of the end of the pertinent struggle, which as it went

forward resulted more and more favorably until the former radicals were utterly defeated in 1646 (875 B.C.) in state and church (16); and this made the conservatives' rights normally maintained and used in great abundance, as the Lord had through His mouthpiece declared would be the case. To secure the inculcation of their principles, the conservatives in their four divisions appointed their fourfold executives to supervise the public operation of this educational work; but the British people, now turned conservative on the questions, took this matter into their own hands as advocates and displaced these executives from their pertinent office, and thus fulfilled the pertinent forecast of God's mouthpiece made when the conservatives came to them to cut them off (17). Vs. 18, 19 are a repetition of vs. 1, 2, made in connection with their fulfilment, hence their antitypes were given above in the explanation of vs. 1, 2 and will not be repeated.

(65) God's mouthpiece had told their supporters in the Congregationalist movement, in which they had aroused a public movement, that the Lord had determined that there would be a destitution of rights and privileges unto a completion in the sphere of their teachings and its spirit, and that they should seek a refuge (2 K. 8:1). Accordingly, such supporters and all they had betook themselves into a sectarian condition until such destitution should come to an end (2), which occurred as the radicals beat a retreat from their domineering over the conservatives in state and church, when the supporters of God's mouthpiece came back from their sectarian position and petitioned the conservatives for a restoration of themselves and their sphere of teaching and its practice (3). At the time of their petitioning Francis Johnson was also engaged in negotiations with the conservatives, who requested him to recount to them some of the great deeds of God's mouthpiece (4). And just at the juncture of his recital of how they had aroused among their supporters into activity a movement toward the public from its

deadness, those supporters among whom this movement was from deadness aroused to life petitioned for the restoration of themselves and their sphere of teaching and its practice, which occasioned Francis Johnson to tell the conservatives that the petitioners and their movement were the supporters of God's mouthpiece, and that their movement was the one that from deadness was by God's mouthpiece aroused to energetic activity (5). Thereupon the conservatives asked these supporters of God's mouthpiece about this event and were by them assured that the thing was true; whereupon the conservatives charged the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Puritan Abbot, and through him his fellow bishops to grant to these the restoration of themselves and their sphere of teaching and practice plus all the benefits that had accrued since they were deprived of these (6).

(66) Now a change came in the picture as it is related by the antitypical Syrians. The Catholic party consisted of two classes in England at that time: a milder and a stricter class. The former were the Anglo-Catholics in so far as they have been hitherto described (7), and the latter were a more fanatical class, the Roman Catholics. The former were led by an Oxford University Professor, William Laud, who later became, first, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, then of London, and in 1633, the Archbishop of Canterbury. This milder class was somewhat like the Anglo-Catholics of the present time, but in principles and practices further than these away from the Roman Catholics, with whom the present Anglo-Catholics seek reunion, but are kept back therefrom by the doctrine of the pope's supremacy and infallibility. The milder class of Catholics had heard that God's mouthpiece was occupied, especially in thought, with the Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic principles. It was during the primacy of Archbishops Abbott (1611-1633) and Laud (1633-1640) that the power of the milder Anglo-Catholic party gradually sickened and weakened, and

at the same time that of the Roman Catholics began secretly, stealthily and gradually to increase, through the intrigues of James I and Charles I. The sickened milder Catholics, learning that those new creatures who actually were God's mouthpiece, but whom they recognized as faithful Christians, were occupied more or less with the radicals, sent some of the more rigid of these by their writings, with courteous exhibitions of amity to inquire of them as to whether they might recover from their increasing loss of power and influence (8). With testful servility, natural to the radicals, these Roman Catholics approached by their writings God's mouthpiece and delivered their inquiry on behalf of the Anglo-Catholics, as if the latter were of the same class as God's mouthpiece (9). While God's mouthpiece through their writings told the Romanists to tell the milder Catholics that they might recover their power and influence, they, nevertheless, assured the Romanists that the milder party would utterly lose its power and influence, which would be gained by the Romanist party (10).

(67) God's mouthpiece then fixedly held before the Romanists this knowledge of the situation until they became ashamed, but the knowledge of God's mouthpiece as to what they under the secret lead, first, of James I and then of Charles I, and finally of Charles II, and the open lead of the Romanist James II would do to the Anglican Church party greatly distressed them (11). This distress prompted the Romanists to inquire as to its cause. The former replied that they knew the evils that the latter would heap upon the Anglican Church party, *i.e.*, overthrow their strong positions, refute their warriors, wreck the faith of the weak and destroy violently the fruit of their labors (12). This statement surprised the rigid radicals (Romanists) in their secret royal allies, who held themselves incapable to do such enormous works. But they were assured by God's mouthpiece through their writings that God had made them understand that

the rigid radicals would become the dominant party of the radicals, yea, that all the radicals would become rigid (13). Leaving God's mouthpiece in their writings, they returned to the weakened mild radicals, who inquired as to what God's mouthpiece had said. The rigid radicals answered that God's mouthpiece had declared that the sick mild radicals would surely recover their strength (14). But the Romanists were intent on suppressing the ascendancy of the Anglo-Catholics. Under the secret lead of James I and Charles I the secret struggle of the Romanist movement began against the Anglo-Catholic movement, and set into operation the smothering of it unto death (15). Here the remark is to be made that it is to be remembered that the types usually mark the beginnings of the antitypes, just as prophecies usually mark the beginnings of their fulfillments. This principle, among other things, works throughout the 2520 years' parallels, *e.g.*, if we would not apply this principle to the events of the Jehu reign (905-875 B.C.) in relation to the Puritan revolution (1616-1646) against the Anglican Church movement and its struggles against the Romanist (radical) movement, we could not construe the pertinent parallels; for the fourth Anglican Church movement changes from the conservative wing of it into the whole Anglican Church movement, *i.e.*, it includes the low, high and broad Anglican Church movements as the later antitype of Jehoram of Israel, whose death at the beginning of Jehu's revolution types the outcome of the Puritan revolution (1616-1646).

(68) A reactionary Congregationalist movement was in the ascendancy from 1607 to 1615 (914-906 B.C.), beginning with the moving of the first contingent of the Scrooby ecclesia in England to Holland in 1607, the rest of this ecclesia moving there in 1608, with its pastor, John Robinson, who was the main leader in this reactionary movement. This movement had six related movements, each existing in a separate ecclesia, *i.e.*, the four ecclesias at Amsterdam respectively presided in by Thomas White, John Smyth, Francis Johnson

and Henry Ainsworth, the original church at London and one in western England, from which Thomas White and others of its members emigrated to Holland (8:16; 21:2). The purer Congregationalist movement, as well as their separate ecclesia bodies, had blessed each of these six ecclesias with many gifts of knowledge and grace; but the chief position was yielded to the movement whose leader was John Robinson, because it was the chief of the seven movements (;3). The acts of the benevolent Congregationalist movement, its first phase, its constructive and refutative powers, are described by Congregationalist and non-Congregationalist historians (1 K. 22:45; 2 C. 20:34). It was as an ascendant movement put to an end in 1607 (914 B.C.) and has been kept in memory as one of Little Flock origination (50; 2 C. 21:1). But after reactionary Congregationalism came into the ascendancy it cut off the other six kindred Congregational movements by withdrawing fellowship from them, as well as cut off the leaders of the Baptist movement from fellowship (;4). This reactionary Congregationalist movement was quite mature when it came to the ascendancy and passed through an eightfold set of experiences (2 K. 8:17; 5). But it was marred by sectarianism and clericalism and some autocracy, and reactionarily did some fellowshipping with the spirit of the Anglican Low Church party, even to the extent of advising its followers to attend the ministry of these and the Dutch National Church, with the result that it did evil before the Lord (18; 6). Yet the Lord spared this movement from eclipse; because it in respect to Congregationalism did better than most of the other six movements that it disfellowshipped; and thus God did according to His promise to the Little Flock, for it was a light in the true Church (19; 7).

(69) The oppressed Armenians, who opposed its Calvinism, rebelled against reactionary Congregationalism and, making a leader over themselves, fought

against it (20; 8). But it invaded the sphere of Arminianism with its leaders, especially John Robinson, and its organizations, and secretly attacked these, who had put it at a disadvantage, and whom it defeated in the debate (21; 9). Yet the Armenians continued to maintain their freedom against it; and at the same time certain enlightened priests turned against it for its wrong-doings (22; 10). Under John Robinson's lead this reactionary Congregationalist movement sanctioned and cooperated with various sects, like the Church of England and the Dutch Reformed Church, and encouraged its members to fellowship with these sects and their sectarian ministries and members (;11). While so engaged there came to it a book of Robert Browne, the Little Flock star-member who started the Congregational movement, setting forth the true pertinent doctrine and chastising the very sins that reactionary Congregationalism was committing, rebuking it for departing from the pure and benevolent Congregationalist movement and from the good ways of the Unitarian movement (;12), for practicing sectarianism and clericalism, for encouraging the brethren to fellowship with harlot sects and for disfellowshipping the other six Congregationalist movements in the other six leading Congregationalist Churches (;13). Then this book of Robert Browne announced God's judgment on their apostacy: a plague of error on its adherents, its converts, its arrangements and its teachings (;14), and a disease upon the movement itself that would make it disintegrate internally by a long-drawn-out process (;15).

(70) This was fulfilled by sectarians from the outside and traitors from the inside attacking them (;16). These came against the reactionary Congregationalist movement's sphere of teaching and spirit, taking away its attainments, its converts and its arrangements, leaving it with but one policy, autocracy (;17). Then internal troubles beset it (;18). And after a lingering disease, due to their desire to escape

from the social conditions in Holland, this reactionary form of Congregationalism through loss of its vital powers ceased to have the ascendancy among Congregationalists, which policy was not held in honor among God's real people (;19), nor was it any more desired by them after passing through its eight stages. Its deeds are recorded by Congregationalist historians (23). It ended as a movement that had some Little Flock aspects, but failed to be a real Little Flock movement (24; 20). It was succeeded by even a worse movement—autocratic Congregationalism, which co-reigned a while with it and which was spared by the traitors in its midst, while the Anglicans were yet in power, who became the antitype of Jehoram of Israel in the changed aspect of his later years (24, 25; 9:29; 2 C. 22:1). This autocratic Congregational movement was a fairly developed movement before it came into the ascendancy and it worked on only one line autocracy. It showed its origin to be of the Low Anglican movement; for its spirit was such as in its Athaliah aspect it agreed to accept episcopacy, in order to get the privilege of a charter from James I for those of its members who would migrate to America as pilgrims (26; 2; by a copyist's mistake Ahaziah was said in ;2 to be 42 at his accession, whereas he was 22, as given in 26; 42 would have made him 2 years older than his father). The Anglican party was its adviser; and it acted autocratically, to its ruin (27; 3, 4). Following their advice, it cooperated with the Anglican Church party in its fight with the rigid Romanist (Hazeal) party for power preeminence (28; 5). In this fight the Anglican Church movement through the double dealings of James I was given with Romanists many reverses (28), from which it sought convalescence from its own Church. It was at this juncture that autocratic Congregationalism joined forces with those of the Anglican Church movement to assist it in its recovery and to fight with it against the

Romanist party as antitypical Hazael working secretly with James I and later with Charles I (29; 6).

(71) The end of the third phase of the Anglican movement has already been discussed. The co-regency of the third phase and the fourth phase, which was contemporaneous with that of the third phase, was from 1600 to 1602 (921 to 919 B.C.), and during the last named year the sole existence of the fourth phase set in; and it lasted until 1616 (919-905 B.C.), 14 years. It started in the year 20 of the first phase of the Congregationalist movement and in the second year of the co-regency of its first and second phase (1602 [919 B.C.]; 2 K. 1:17; 3:1). While the fourth Anglican phase did evil, it was not so bad as its second phase, nor as the Anglican Church headed by Elizabeth; for it modified considerably their power-grasping and lording, *i.e.*, their absolutism (2); yet it served sectarianism and clericalism, the besetting sins of the less favored movements of the Protestant people of God, and persisted therein (3). In Britain the autocracy of the papacy had been subject for years to that of the first and second and even the third phases of the Anglican movement; but in the latter's fourth phase the papacy, through some of its British members, rebelled against the fourth phase (4, 5; 2 K. 1:1). This rebellion reached its height in the infamous Gunpowder Plot, whereby the Romanist autocratic hierarchy sought to blot out the entire royal family, nobility and Commons (when King James I, accompanied by his entire family and other close relatives, was to open Parliament) by exploding in a vault under the hall where all were to be assembled many barrels of gunpowder. The guilty Guy Fawkes, caught in the vault with matches in his pockets, under rack torture confessed the plot and its conspirators. This, of course, unleashed a great controversy between the fourth Anglican movement, whose chief warriors were Bishop Andrews and Dean Field, the Congregationalist movement and the secular rulers of Britain, on the one side, and Romanist

apologists, especially Bellarmine, Rome's greatest controversialist, and Stapleton, on the other side. To this controversy the fourth Anglican movement, using politics, called all its adherents (6). It also asked the Congregationalist movement to be on its side against Rome. To this it willingly consented (7). The latter asked as to the plan of procedure, and the former answered, along statesmanly lines (8). Hence the controversy involved the royal as against the papal power, the Anglican and Congregational and the statesmen, including the king, controverting along that line, and the debating powers of Bellarmine put their supporters to great distress (9).

(72) The Anglican movement fell into despair, thinking all three of the groups were doomed by God to defeat at the hands of autocratic Rome (10). But the Congregationalist movement inquired for a mouthpiece of God, to inquire of the Lord for counsel; and a group of the Anglican movement called attention to the now controlling mouthpiece as well acquainted with God's Word as disciples of the best leaders of the Congregationalist movement (11). Thus all three groups of controversialists went to them for counsel (12). This mouthpiece severely snubbed and reprovved with sarcasm the Anglican movement, telling it to get its counsels from the mouthpieces of its autocratic predecessor and the Anglican Church headed by Queen Elizabeth, to which it demurred, expressing its despair that all three cooperating parties were doomed (13). For the evils of the Anglican movement the Lord's mouthpiece most solemnly asserted by the God whose mouthpiece they were that they would have no regard for, or recognition of the Anglican movement, were it not for their regard for the Congregationalist movement (14). Nevertheless, it called for the Bible that then was undergoing translation into the A. V., and from it at God's enlightenment drew forth teachings against Rome full of refreshment for the Truth-thirsty coming without the ordinary avenues therefore (15-17).

This would be easy for the Lord, they told them, and added that God would deliver to their power the autocratic papists (18), promising them that they would refute their every strong choice teaching and overthrow their every leading representative and all their fundamental writings and make barren their every field of activity in Britain (19).

(73) Shortly thereafter there came new truths from the statesmen for their refreshment (20). The Romanist warriors, on learning of the attack planned against them, had rushed to the defense of their views (21). When they saw the start of the new truths coming to their enemies on account of the Bible's light shining upon them, they thought them to be harbingers of strife and overthrowal among the three confederate groups and exhorted one another to fly to the spoil (22, 23). But instead of spoil they found resourceful warriors awaiting them, who, falling upon them, put them to flight, during which the three confederate groups made spirited pursuing attacks and invaded the positions of the pursued (24). Here they refuted their doctrines and made their teachings barren. They overthrew their literary sources, refuted their leading controversialists and exposed the rise of the papacy, leaving only the primitive doctrines intact, but with questions made these useless for the papacy (25). Seeing that the battle was going against it, the papacy, marshalling its chief warriors, made a determined attack upon the statesman group of the three confederates, especially assailing the defense by James I of the Divine right of kings, on which he wrote a book, to overthrow it, but failed (26). Thereupon they sacrificed their chief defenders in power. Great was the wrath of the papal party at the controversy's outcome; and, it ending in victory for the confederates, the latter desisted from further fighting of the papacy, and returned to their work (27).

(74) The episode of 2 Kings 4:1-7 is connected with the fourth statement that the Congregationalist

exiles made of their faith to James I. As the first three petitions that accompanied their first three statements of faith failed, and after their fourth statement, which was a fair-sized book, was prepared, the Congregationalist churches in England were greatly saddened at their being cut off from their exiled leaders and at the prospect of their consecrated and justified adherents' being greatly oppressed in England by the repressive attitude of the government, and, therefore, poured out their complaints to the Lord's mouthpiece (2 K. 4:1). On the latter's asking them what they had in the way of satisfying the king, they replied that he had assured some of the former petitioners that he was willing to receive any truth of God, and that all should preserve and be allowed to preserve the same attitude (2). Thereupon these advised that these churches secure as many names in England as possible to petitions to the king, asking him to allow the Congregationalists living in England to have their leaders restored to them from their exile (cut-off condition) in Holland (3). These further advised that secretly there be added to these petitions the request that these churches be allowed to enjoy freedom of assembly, worship and propaganda, setting aside each full petition so added to (4). This these churches did, assisted by their consecrated and justified adherents (5). But desiring more petitions, they asked their two kinds of adherents for more. These answered that, having gone over the ground thoroughly, they could get no more, which ended that work (6). These then told the Lord's mouthpiece what had been done, who told them to present these to the king, which was done. While he would not ask Parliament to change the law, he did arrange for a milder enforcement thereof. As a result the Congregationalists in England were not so severely molested as formerly (7).

(75) While engaged in labors among the consecrated and justified certain new-creaturely leaders as God's mouthpieces found support among the

Congregationalists (8), who secured from their leaders permission to give them special help (9-11). These mouthpieces of God asked their leading helper, Francis Johnson, to gather these Congregationalist brethren into assemblies, which was done (12). They expressed appreciation for the kind support that they received from these, and asked what return they might make, suggesting appeal for them to the Anglican movement and its leaders, which they declined (13). Still wondering what to do for them, they were told by Francis Johnson that they had no concerted work toward outsiders, and that their leaders were without the zeal to arouse them thereto (14). Again God's mouthpiece to the public asked him to assemble them, to which they gave a ready response (15). Thereupon it promised them a movement toward the public, which announcement they received with incredulity (16). Yet the mouthpiece's forecast was fulfilled (17). But this movement's activities met with setbacks from the civil powers, while it was trying to gather into the Congregationalists' fold members from the English public, and soon came to an end, despite the Congregationalists' efforts to preserve it (18-20). They lay this movement on the teachings of God's mouthpiece as in secret (21), and asked their leaders for a helper and a teaching that would assist them to lay their case before God's mouthpiece (22).

(76) Their leaders, seeing no reason for such a step, objected mildly, which was overcome by a reassuring answer (23). Thereupon they prepared the pertinent teaching and asked the furnished helper to make rapid progress to God's public mouthpiece (24), and thus approached them, while they were fruitfully engaged. Seeing these afar, they pointed them out to Francis Johnson (25), whom they charged to approach them, inquiring as to them, their leaders and their movement, To these inquiries these said that all was well (26). Their humble attitude influenced Francis Johnson to attempt to repel them, but the mouthpiece forbade this,

recognizing that there was something troubling them concealed from them by God (27). Their sorrow could express itself only in saying that the movement, now dead, had not been asked for by them, and that they be not deceived by too bright hopes (28). They then commissioned Francis Johnson to go without delay and exercise his office for the resuscitation of the dead public movement (29). The Congregationalists did not trust F. Johnson to accomplish this, hence solemnly besought the Lord's mouthpiece to go with them, which they consented to do (30). F. Johnson failed in his efforts and reported the failure to God's mouthpiece (31). The mouthpiece gave their attention to the dead movement resting upon their teachings (32). Secretly they labored for its resuscitation (33), applying to it their whole beings, teachings, perceptive powers and energies, and worked with it to arouse it into activity (34). They continued this course repeatedly, until the movement began to give evidence of life and insight (35). Thereupon they had F. Johnson assemble the Congregationalists and presented the movement to them in activity (36). These humbly expressed their gratitude and accepted their resuscitated movement (37).

(77) God's mouthpiece returned to the subject of the Church as God's embryo kingdom; and there was a famine of Truth, no new truth having come to the Congregationalists since Robert Browne's ministry among them. In fact, Henry Barrowe, *etc.*, had corrupted the pure Congregationalism of Browne into a hybrid by mixing it with Presbyterianism. This made the hangers-on look to God's mouthpiece for spiritual food, who called for the presentation of the Word as spiritual food (38). A group among the Congregationalists taught the error that, since God's people are to have a watch-care over one another, they should consider one another to point out one another's faults to the end that, seeing these, each one might put them aside. They did not, at first, realize the evil of such a course (39).

But the acting out of this evil produced evil-surmising, fault-finding, recrimination, quarrelling, self-justification, *etc.*, which demonstrated the poisonous effect of this evil practice (40). They, complaining of this evil to God's mouthpiece, who asked that the true teaching on the pertinent subject be brought forward, which being done, he mingled it with their general truths and charged that it be given the brethren, who found it wholesome (41). Attention has already been called to Bro. Thomas White as the leader of the more uncompromising brethren who were pushed into the background by the less uncompromising brethren under F. Johnson's lead. Another leader of the former kind, John Smyth, later discredited by sectarian Congregationalists because of continued advancement in the developing Truth, differed from the new-creaturely brethren among the Anglicans, the Puritans and the Congregationalists, from whom he and kindred spirits had separated. In 1607 he gave out a pertinent booklet entitled, *Differences of the Churches of the Separation*, friendly to God's public mouthpiece and adapted to correct evils among the brethren, circulating it especially among associates of F. Johnson. This booklet God's mouthpiece charged to be given to these (42); but F. Johnson sought to prevent their reading it, a year later writing a specious answer to it. However, the mouthpiece overruled him, declaring that it was for them to accept what they could approve and reject what they disapproved (43; 1 Thes. 5:21). This resulted in their reading it, accepting some parts and rejecting other parts of it (44).

(78) Among the Congregationalist brethren there were at first two parties: a radical and a conservative party, and later a party more or less associated with the latter yet somewhat different. The radical group was too rough in its victorious controversies with the Anglicans, Puritans and Romanists, and its leading warriors had thereby contaminated themselves with crown-lost uncleanness (2 K. 5:1). These radicals made inroads

on the sphere of the conservatives, and won for themselves some of the latter's adherents, who served the supporters of the leading radical controversialists (2). These thought and said that God's public mouthpiece, who sided with the conservative Congregationalists, could recover them from the uncleanness that made them abhorrent to the public (3). This statement of these converts to radicalism came, through certain controversialists, to the ears of the radicals, who felt the handicap under which those labored with the public (4). Thereupon the radicals commissioned them to go to the conservatives, sending along a pertinent communication. Thereafter these leading controversialists went, taking along crown-losers with full powers and authority, mingled with some evils (5), and delivered the communication to the conservatives, asking for the healing of the controversialists from the uncleanness that made them abhorrent to the Anglicans, Puritans and Romanists (6). The conservatives, who for a long time had had all sorts of differences with the radicals, construed the radicals' request as an attempt to provoke controversy between them, doing violence to their graces, protesting that, not being God, they could not effect such a cleansing, and calling upon their supporters to note the episode as a trick to provoke strife (7).

(79) But God's public mouthpiece, Ainsworth, *etc.*, hearing of the acts of the conservatives, sent word rebuking them for their misconduct and requested that the leading controversialists be sent to them, from whom they would learn that God had a mouthpiece among the conservatives (8). These leading controversialists, with their teachings and church organizations, came before the office functions of God's mouthpiece, brethren like Ainsworth, who held themselves somewhat aloof from the former (9). They told them by a messenger to mingle completely in teaching ways in a friendly and sympathetic spirit with the Anglicans, Puritans and Romanists, and a healing of the faults

that neutralized their usefulness would set in (10). These leading controversialists, *e.g.*, brethren like Robinson, Johnson, *etc.*, felt offended because the Lord's mouthpiece did not make much ado over them and honor them (11), exclaiming that the more and less radical groups were more to be considered than the public among the Anglicans, Puritans and Romanists; why not, by mingling among the former, be cleansed? Hence they went away in a rage (12). But some of their supporters reasoned respectfully and tactfully with them, showing them that if the Lord's mouthpiece had asked them to do something difficult, they would have done it; why, therefore, not do this easy thing (13)? Persuaded, they mingled in a friendly way with the Anglican, Puritan and Romanist public unto a completion; and the promised healing set in, taking all the roughness away from them and making them winsome (14).

(80) Recovered, they returned with their whole company to God's mouthpiece and confessed their faith in the true God of perfect wisdom, love, justice, and power as alone the God of antitypical Israel, and with this confession offered the place of chief power and authority among God's people to His mouthpiece (15). As a true mouthpiece of God, they solemnly, and that against repeated entreaty, refused the reward that the leading controversialists offered them (16). Refused, they asked for some of the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit as a portion on which they may sacrifice to spiritual Israel's God alone (17). Then these controversialists asked whether they might not with God's forgiving long-suffering give the radicals among the Congregationalists some support in their sacrifices to the god of radicalism (18). This was compromisingly allowed them; and with a, God Bless You, they were sent away (19). But Francis Johnson, who was indeed a power-grasper and lord over God's heritage, saw how he could derive personal gain in power out of the situation (20). Accordingly, he sought the controversial

leaders, who, seeing his desire to meet them, approached him, inquiring, if all was well (21). Giving them an affirmative assurance, he said that God's mouthpiece sent for assistance for the pastors and teachers as confirming their power and for the elders and deacons as confirming their authority in the ecclesia (22) [Among the Congregationalists the officers of the ecclesias were supposedly of four classes: (1) pastors, (2) teachers, (3) elders and (4) deacons; whereas we consider the first three to be names for one kind of officers, elders].

(81) The controversial leaders insisted on what were in reality one class: the pastors, teachers and elders, getting even double the single power asked, *i.e.*, control over the deacons, as well as over the ecclesias, requiring two sets of their supporters to help deliver the pertinent power and authority (23). But by intrigue F. Johnson manipulated matters so that finally he got the main power in the ecclesia (24). Thereafter he was called in question by God's mouthpiece, Ainsworth, *etc.*, and falsified as to his activities, denying that he had been engaged in anything of intrigue (25). Then God's mouthpiece let him know that they knew and, therefore, were saddened at what he had done in intrigue for power-grasping and lording over God's heritage, declaring that at such crucial times it was especially out of order for God's servants to grasp for power, to lord it over God's heritage and to covet controllership over the working spheres of crown-retainers and of crown-losers, over these two kinds of brethren and over the serving brothers and sisters (26). Then they declared that the uncleanness of the controversial leaders would perpetually be upon him and his main supporters in power-grasping and lording. And F. Johnson left their presence leprous with perpetual uncleanness (27).

(82) The unpromising work that the hangers-on did moved them to appeal to God's mouthpiece, Ainsworth, Robinson, *etc.*, to leave off their pertinent work, which

through persecution became too hard for them, and to undertake among the public another work, in which each one, using his human all, might prosper in the work. These were told by God's mouthpiece to undertake it (2 K. 6:1, 2); but the former desired the latter to partake in that new work, which they agreed to do (3). They as a company got out a book entitled, *The Confession of the Exiled Anglican Brethren*, which somewhat later fell under the ban of the government and was prohibited from circulation, which very greatly circumscribed its spread. This caused them great distress, as the loss of a thing not theirs but put into their custody for a while (4, 5). Ainsworth, Robinson, *etc.*, were appealed to, to restore it to its former circulation. At their request they were told of the circumstances and state of its banned condition. Thereupon they set forth a teaching on the right of God's truth to freedom of circulation; and as a result the Confession was reissued with certain revisions and additions (6); and it circulated in several languages in 1607 (914 B.C.), after Ainsworth, *etc.*, had encouraged them to lay hold on it and circulate it again (7).

(83) In the Anglican Church at this time there were three parties: first, the radicals, the High Church or Anglo-Catholic party, who in their radicalism exalted the king, the nobility and the episcopate with the doctrine of the Divine right of kings, aristocracy and bishops. These, in the picture now to be studied, correspond to the king of the Syrians; second, the conservatives with whom the first party in that Church warred. The second or conservative party was the Low Church, or Evangelical party, which corresponds to the king of Israel (8); third, the Puritans, who sided with the Low Church party in its conflicts with the High Church party, *i.e.*, sided with the conservatives against the radicals. The radical party had as its champions James I, the episcopate and most of the higher clergy and nobility, as well as many of the university professors. Apart from these, there were God's mouthpiece, new

creatures, particularly, but not exclusively those in the Congregational movement (9). The radicals decided to attack the conservatives on the question of the Divine right of kings (8), but God's mouthpiece cautioned the latter against this as putting in opposition to them James I, who as shown above held a literary debate with Bellarmine on the subject of *his* Divine right. On exploring this question the conservatives avoided the trap set for them (10); as, warned by God's mouthpiece, they also avoided the trap from the standpoint of the Divine right of the clergy and aristocracy; for the radicals bound it up with that of the Divine right of kings. Many moves were made in this matter by the radicals in Convocation and the king's court; but these were sidestepped by the conservatives, who generally were supported by the House of Commons and the courts, which successfully counteracted the moves of the radicals. These evasions of the radicals' traps not only troubled the latter, but made them suspect treachery in their own ranks (11). But certain members of the radical party, denying the charge, blamed God's mouthpiece, the new creatures, some in Holland, like Ainsworth, Robinson, *etc.*, and some in Britain, as giving the conservatives the Truth on the three Divine-right doctrines, enabling them to evade the argument traps, even the most hidden ones, of the radicals (12). Whereupon the radicals charged their main advocates to investigate the position of God's mouthpiece, that the radicals might capture these in their views. Thereupon, they were informed that these stood on the double teachings of the Old and New Testaments (13).

(84) This prompted the radicals to send secretly a great array of their leading scholars with accompanying teachings and organizations against God's mouthpiece, surrounding them in their Old and New Testaments' position (14). Francis Johnson early recognized the purpose of these scholars in attacking this position with all their teachings and organizations; and, greatly fearing and lamenting, and unable to understand how

to cope with the situation, he cried out for help to God's mouthpiece (15). In full faith these, telling him to quiet his fears, and assuring him that those on their side were more numerous than those on the other side (16), prayed the Lord to open his eyes of understanding to perceive the real situation. The latter thereupon saw that, not only the Lord and His holy angels and people, but also that under sore trial the House of Commons, the judiciary, the conservatives and the bulk of Englishmen were throughout the kingdom on the side of God's mouthpiece (17). When the learned advocates of the radicals came directly against the Lord's mouthpiece the latter prayed to God to blind them as to their theories by the Biblical Truth used against their position, which the Lord did (18). They pointed out that their Biblical points were inapplicable to the situation, and convinced them that their position was not provable from the Bible, but promised them that if they would follow them they would bring them to see in the true light the men whom they sought. These consenting to their arguments, they brought them to the conservatives' pertinent position as its convinced captives (19).

(85) God's mouthpiece then prayed that by the legal and religious arguments of the conservatives, in so far as they involved God's mouthpiece, the radicals might be given a proper understanding of the applicable principles, which the Lord granted, by enabling them to prove that the Divine rightists in all three of their pertinent positions were legally and religiously wrong, which enabled them to see that they were captives in the power of the conservatives' position (20). Seeing their advantage, the conservatives emphatically requested God's mouthpiece for permission utterly to overthrow the arguments of the radicals' advocates (21). While it was God's mouthpiece's arguments that had captured the former, tactfully the latter spoke as though it was those of the conservatives, who, they said, should play the part of a magnanimous host in refreshing their argument-convinced opponents (22).

Thereupon the conservatives gave them a pertinent mental feast that avoided the controversial aspects of the involved questions, which still more convinced the radicals' advocates of the correctness of the conservatives' position. This done, they sent these back to the radicals; and that ended such advocates' entering controversially the position of the conservatives (23). While among the Congregationalists the chief members of God's mouthpiece were Ainsworth and Robinson, among the Anglicans the main members of God's mouthpiece were Bishop Andrews and Dean Field. The main secular members of the conservatives were Coke, the chief justice of Britain, and the leaders in the House of Commons, while Bancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and most of the bishops and certain professors at Oxford and Cambridge universities were, with King James I, leaders of the radicals.

(1) What is the subject of this study? What for centuries has been attempted in vain? By whom? What is presented in EC, 144 (97)-145 (99)? What does this harmonization do with the entire problem? Why? Up to the last half of the 19th century what have chronologians done with the problem? What, at the Bible's expense, have they since attempted? What is the character of this attempt? Why? To clarify the problem what, first of all, must be pointed out? By what two things? What will the first give? The second? What will be done after each of these presentations? What does the first part of the first table give? What is the reign length of each of the six Judahite kings given in this table? How does the Bible prove this in each case? What is the total of their reign lengths? What does the second part of the first table give? What is the reign length of each of the eight Israelite kings given in this table? How does the Bible prove this in each case? What is the total of their reign lengths?

(2) How far apart were the beginnings of Rehoboam's and Jeroboam's reigns? The time of Ahaziah's and Jeroboam's deaths? Despite these two facts, what is the difference between the totals of the reign lengths of the two sets of kings? What should their totals be, in the light of facts given in this paragraph's first sentence? What three

facts bring one face to face with a problem hitherto unsolved by chronologians? What required a solution of this problem? To whom and what was resort taken to solve it? Why? What four considerations prove that the chronology of 2 Chro. is correct? What agrees with it? What thought resultantly struck the praying and meditating mind and heart? What was done with this thought? With what result? How were the ordinal numbers in which the reigns of Judah's kings are given treated? When what was done? Why? After what examples? What makes this procedure necessary? What proves it to be correct? What will now be done?

(3) How long did each Israelite king actually reign, as proven by a comparison with chronological data given in terms of Judah's kings? How does the Bible prove this in each case? What, accordingly, is the total of the eight involved reigns?

(4) What does this method of treatment do with the reigns of the two involved sets of kings? What results from this method of treating the reign lengths of the eight Israelite kings in terms of their comparison with the chronological data connected with the six Judahite kings?

(5) What is the next period calling for our study? What is the character of the seeming discrepancy in this period as to the two sets of the involved king? How is the apparent discrepancy harmonized? After what example? What will first be given? How long did each of the involved seven Judahite kings reign, as required by this table? How does the Bible prove it in, each case? What was the total of these years? How long did each of the involved nine Israelite kings reign, as required by this table? How does the Bible show it in each case? What was the total of these years?

(6) What is the seeming discrepancy here? How is the matter harmonized? How will the plus and minus differences be indicated? How long did each of the involved Israelite kings reign in terms of the years of the involved Judahite kings? What is the plus or minus difference between the reign lengths in the two tables for the involved Israelite kings? How does the Bible prove it in each case? What are the entire and the plus and minus totals? What does the result do with the seeming discrepancy?

(7) What is done with kings Zimri and Shallum in these tables? For what two reasons? What do these last

two tables do with the seeming discrepancy of 22½ years?

(8) What question do the two seeming discrepancies, that of 3 and that of 22½ years, raise? What reply should be given to it from the standpoint of the exact years involved in the Judahite kings? Of the *stated* years of the Israelite kings? Which of these parallels will be presented in this book? What does its proper outworking require? Why the preceding chronological discussion? What has already been discussed in EJ 333-418? What remark is here made as to the length of Athaliah's reign? How do the passages cited in the third table prove this? What fact proves that Jehoash filled out the balance of her seventh year before the length of his reign began to count chronologically? Why was this matter observed? What facts prove this to have been the case? What did our Pastor do with the fraction in Zedekiah's 10½ years' reign? What did he consequently give for the period of the kings? As what should he have given it, according to his data? Why, so far as Athaliah's reign length is concerned? What is the exact length of the period of the kings? What facts prove it? What does this figure require us to do with the period of the judges? How may we justify this from the standpoint of Acts 13:20?

(9) What length do the dates and events of the 2520 years' parallels require for Athaliah's reign? Why? What changes are required by this fact in Studies, Vol. II, 374-376, 380? What will this require as to the A. V. expression, "*fourth* year of Solomon's reign," in 1 Kings 6:1? What regular usage justifies this? What changes does this fact require to be made in Studies, Vol. II, 376, end of par. 1? To what edition of Vol. II are the above references made? As to the seeming discrepancies pointed out above, what are we not to think? What were these seeming discrepancies? What is intended to be indicated by the *expressed* length of the Israelite kings' reign? What does this mean? When, accordingly, were some and others of these acts performed? In either case, why were they so performed? What conclusion results from this fact? Viewed under what condition? Why?

(10) Where are the good acts of Solomon recorded? What does he in the large picture thereby type? Where are his evil acts recorded? From what book are they omitted? What can they not type? Why? What are his evil acts typed as effecting? What do we infer from this

fact? By what two reasons are we warranted in concluding that the two books of Kings are prophecies in form of types? How many known applications do these two books and their companion book have? Of what does the first of these consist? What are some illustrations on this point? What general characteristic do they exhibit? Of what does the second of these applications consist? What are the respective parallel books? Of what does the third of these applications consist? What is the length in years and days of the Judah and American features respectively? Of the Israelite and British features respectively? Of which of these three applications will part of this book consist? Through what will it run?

(11) For what does 1 Kings 11 serve? What is necessary to keep this book within reasonable limits? Why? What will help in connection with this study? Why? Briefly stated, what do the wicked acts of Solomon of 1 Kings 11 type? What are typed by the various acts of Judah's kings after Israel's kings ceased to be? What has so far been given? At what times do the acts of the 2520 years' parallel begin? End? Where was the small 2520 years-and-days parallel given? Where have many of the first application's pictures been given?

(12) What will next be given in this study? What forbidden things did the papacy in those pre-parallel times greatly desire? How typed? Of what period is this particularly true? What evils did it foster? How typed? What did God through His star-members repeatedly threaten, postpone and modify? How typed? What and how many did God raise up early in the Philadelphia period? What was the first one? What activities characterized it? How typed? The second one? Its activities? How typed? The third one? Its activities? How typed? What forecast did its enlightened members make? How typed? What effect on the papacy did these forecasts have? How typed? How did the persecuted ones act? How typed? Where are pertinent details given, in type and antitype?

(13) To what things will resort hereinafter be made, to save space? What are the beginning dates of, and events in the two members of the 2520 years' parallel? Who partook as leaders in the sets of antitypical movements? How do these two sets compare and contrast with each other, (1) in the leaders, (2) as to politics, (3) as to

religion? How typed in each case? How and when did the Lutheran movement begin, for a short time continue and ultimately continue?

(14) How and when did the Zwinglian movement begin and proceed? What difference in Christian life marked these two movements? What did this difference produce? What were their first reactions and expectations toward one another? How typed? What requests did the Lutheran movement make of the Zwinglian movement? How typed? What was done on hearing these requests? How typed? What advice was given respectively by wiser and less wise heads? How typed? After awhile what did the Lutheran movement do? How typed? What, and what kind of an answer was given? How typed? What did the answer effect? How typed? With what kind of a beginning? How typed? What things occurred as to the division with the flight of time? How typed? What did adherents of the Lutheran movement do to messengers of the Zwinglian movement? How typed? What contrasted thing happened in some German states? How typed? How did matters proceed with these two movements? How typed? To what did this lead the Zwinglian movement? How typed? What resulted? How typed? What did the Lutheran movement then do? How typed?

(15) Where did the Zwinglian movement develop itself? How typed? Doing what? How typed? Generally speaking, what were the experiences of the more consecrated public servants of the Truth in the Lutheran movement? How typed? What kind of clergy did the Lutheran movement appoint in their stead? How typed? Who else followed the example of the said more consecrated Truth-servants? How typed? With what result? How long did this continue? What change set in thereafter? How typed? What did the Lutheran movement do to keep its own from joining its rival's movement? How typed? What did it accordingly do? How typed? What did these things become? How typed? What were served in purely Lutheran countries? How? How typed?

(16) What did the Lutheran movement set up as counterfeit? Particularly by what? How typed? What did abler Zwinglians do thereat? How typed? What evidences of this did they give? How typed? What reaction did the Lutheran movement make thereto? With what effect? How typed? What results followed? How typed?

What effect did the impotence of the Lutheran movement have on the witnesses? What resulted from this? How typed? What was the witnesses' response to this? How typed?- With what were they charged? How typed?

(17) What was told Luther, *etc.*, by some of their supporters? How typed? What did these indicate? What was Luther's, *etc.*, reaction thereto? Why? How typed? What followed this? How typed? What resulted from these discussions with some double-dealing? How typed? Who perceived the accompanying inconsistency? What did they forecast? How typed? What two things resulted from their disloyalty recognized and proclaimed in Lutheran circles? How typed? By whom especially? How typed? What did their main supporters do? How typed? What did they find? In what condition? How typed? What as desired for themselves did they give those fallen witnesses? How typed? What desire did they express? How typed? What did these things not effect? How typed? What did these evils move. God to do? How typed?

(18) What did the Zwinglian movement develop? Where? With what result? How typed? What was the chief one? How typed? What did it wisely do? After becoming stronger what did it do? How typed? What followed thereon? How typed? What did papacy do? How typed? Where did it begin? How typed? How proceed? How typed? How did it result? How typed? What did the more pious do? With what results? How typed? What did this move God to do? How typed? With what forecast? How typed? What did the papists do? How typed? In lieu of this, what did the Zwinglian movement do? How typed? Where did they use these? How typed?

(19) What things followed thereupon? How typed? What was the general course of the Zwinglian movement thereafter? How typed? What kind of an adherence did it give the Lord, to His displeasure? How typed? What evils did it commit? How typed? How furthered therein? How typed? Who described its varied history? How typed? What occurred to it in 1538? How typed? What succeeded it? How typed? How long did it function? How typed? What good and evil did it do? How typed? In imitation of what movement? How typed? Why did God continue to use it? How typed? What other

similarity set in? How typed? What did, the Lutheran movement's evils affect the Cranmer movement to dissanction? By what acts? How typed? With what effects? How typed? What were the effects on the Lutheran movement of the Cranmer movement's warfare against it? How typed? What kind was the course of the Cranmer movement? How typed? By whom is its history recorded? How typed? When was it by the Lord set aside? What movement succeeded it? How typed?

(20) How long was the Unitarian movement as the Divinely more favored one operative? While which movement was active? How typed? What was its character as such? What did it set aside? How typed? Whom even did it set aside? Why? How typed? What did it not set aside, despite its almost life-long loyalty? How typed? What good things did it deposit with the Church? How typed? On what did it lay great stress? How typed? Whom and what did it thrust out? With what result? How typed? During what years was it without special controversy? How typed? What two things did Servetus do during these ten years? How typed?

(21) What movement did the Lutherans operate; intended to bring peace? How typed? On what mission and to whom did the Lutheran movement in its secular leaders send messengers, supplying gifts therefore? How typed? What did the latter do? How typed? With what did the Lord intervene? How typed? What did the enlightened leaders first tell the messengers? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Thirdly? How typed? Fourthly? How typed? Fifthly and particularly? How typed? Sixthly? How typed? And seventhly? Why so? How typed? What was done with this message? How typed? What occurred on the arrival of the messengers? How typed? What was its emotional effect? How typed? Who described the history of the Lutheran movement? How typed? When did its above phase cease? How typed? By what succeeded? How typed? What were the chief three events of the second phase of the Lutheran movement? How typed? Who described its history? How typed?

(22) When and how long was the Calvinistic movement operative? How typed? Of what evils was it guilty? How typed? What did a large number of leaders in the Unitarian movement do? Who were the main ones

of these? How is their and their less able brethren's part in these activities typed? Who contended against them? How typed? What did the former do to these, especially on the trinity? How typed? What did this movement do thereover? How typed? What five things did God enable it to do? How typed?

(23) To what did this victory move the Unitarian leaders? How typed? Of what did they remind them? How typed? What lesson was drawn and promise made? How typed? What was the first result? How typed? The second? How typed? The third? What agreement and vows were made amid Truth preaching? How typed? What did these things move them to do? How typed? What correction is made as to the reading in 2 Chro. 15:19? When and by whom did the Unitarian movement become vocal after a rather long silence? How typed? What occurred the next year? Why? How typed? To meet these arguments, to what did the Unitarian movement resort? How typed? What resulted? How typed? How did this affect the Calvinistic movement? How typed? What did the Unitarian movement consequently do? How typed?

(24) What did some Unitarians thereupon do to it? Why? What did they say? How typed? Of what did they remind them? How typed? How did they characterize the two pertinent grounds of argument? How typed? What effect did the rebuke have on the movement? How typed? At the same time, how did it act in Poland and Transylvania? What did certain ones in this movement do to the Calvinistic movement?. Why? How typed? What two things did they foretell as to the Calvinistic movement? How typed? Who gave the history of the latter movement? What occurred in 1567? How typed? What happened to the Calvinistic Knox movement after but a year? How typed?

(25) What occurred at the same time as forecast? Why? How typed? Who described it? How typed? Why did it last but a short time? How typed? In the face of what kind of a movement did it give up? Why was this? How typed? Who have recorded its history? How typed? What do we construe from the cases of the houses of Jeroboam and Baasha? Why is this to be said?

(26) How many and what Protestant parties were there in Britain? Which prevailed? How typed? What was the period of the first phase of the Anglican movement? How

typed? What copyists' error is proved by vs. 15-22, 29, 23 to exist in v. 23? What was it mainly in its first six years? In its last five years? Why this? How typed? What forms did this persecution take? What did it prove to be? When was it set aside? Why? How typed? What did it do, to the Lord's displeasure? How typed? Who have clearly described it? How typed?

(27) In what condition did the first phase of the Anglican movement end? By what kind of a phase was it followed? How typed? What were the period, character and operating agents of this succeeding phase? How typed? How did it treat its rivals and the Anglican Church? How typed? What did it do with the union of state and church toward God in comparison with other Divinely favored Protestant movements? How typed? What was its course on the Divine right of bishops and the effect of that course on the Little Flock leader and supporters and crown-lost leader and supporters? How typed? When did the Unitarian movement cease to operate as the Chief Divinely favored Protestant movement? How was it regarded? Why? How typed? What did it do and experience toward its end? How typed? Who recorded its deeds? How typed?

(28) By what was it succeeded? How typed? What was the period of its operation? How typed? By whom deserted? How typed? What were its good and evil points? How typed? What did it condemn? How typed? What did it develop antitypically? How typed? How did it train its adherents? How typed? Why did God bless it? How typed? In what ways did He bless it? How typed? In what did this result? How typed? Whom did it raise up in 1585? How typed? What did the Anglican movement do to it in contrast with the higher and lower clergy? Why in each case did it so act? How typed? Who gave it some favor? How typed? How did it respond to the conditions? How typed? Especially in what five countries? How typed?

(29) With what statement did Robert Browne and other new creatures face the second Anglican movement? How typed? What did the Word, Spirit and providence prompt them to do? How typed? Who gave them some relief? How typed? What was done thereafter? How typed? What did the outcast Baptists and Puritans tell them? How typed? What did they reply? How typed? What

resulted? How typed? What did the enemies of non-conformists do and effect? How typed? Whom did the outcasts blame for this result? How typed? What was done and by whom? How typed? How did this affect the outcasts? How typed?

(30) What did God move Barrowe and Greenwood in hope to do? How typed? In what did their activities result? How typed? In what activities were the two parties in the Anglican movement engaged? How typed? In what two ways? How typed? With whom did the liberal section come in contact? How typed? What did they find them to be, and what commission did they receive from them? How typed? How did their request strike the liberal party? How typed? What did they protest? How typed? Of what did they testify? How typed? Yet what occurred? How typed?

(31) Of what did the Anglican movement accuse them? How typed? How was the accusation met? How typed? What did their attitude do to that movement? How typed? How was the challenge received? How typed? What did the new creatures call for? How typed? To what did they call attention? How typed? What did they suggest? How typed? What did they then do and why? How typed? What did the defenders of Episcopacy do? Especially how and by whom? How typed? With what results? How typed? How did the new-creaturely Congregationalists react to their efforts? How typed? What did the defenders of Episcopacy do to one another? How typed? How long did their discussion last, and what did it effect? How typed?

(32) What did the Congregational new creatures first do when their turn came? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Thirdly? How typed? What four truths especially did they set forth? How typed? How many times and in what movements was this done? How typed? How did the pertinent truths affect the brethren? How typed? What did the Congregational new creatures then proceed to do? How typed? What did Barrowe and Greenwood do therein? What were their efforts? How typed? What was the effect on the people? How typed?

(33) How did God manifest His acceptance? How typed? How did this affect the real people of God? How typed? For what did the new creatures then call? How typed? What did they invite the Anglican movement to do? Why? How typed? What did the new creatures then

do? How typed? To what did they invite their supporters? When was it found? What occurred after the seventh movement? In what manner? What did they charge as to the Anglican movement? How are these things typed? In what form did the downpour come? What was then done by the Anglican movement and the Congregational new creatures? How typed?

(34) What report was made? By whom? To whom? Especially to whom? How typed? What was Elizabeth's reaction? How typed? What was the effect of this persecution? How typed? In their isolation and despondency what did they desire? How typed? What two things occurred and by whom during their twofold sleep over the real condition? How typed? What was the result of the refreshment? How typed? What spoke their discouragement? Under what impression? How typed? What four things did the Lord give them to foresee? How typed? What effect did these four foreseings have on them? What three things did their words and attitude tell the Lord? How typed? What three things did the Lord's providence indicate to them? How typed? What would these three things effect? How typed? What assurance did the Lord give them? How typed? While mingling with the Puritans whom did they find? How typed? What did they do with them? How typed? What evil qualities of the younger new creatures showed themselves? How typed? What did this draw from the mature new creatures? How typed? What followed then? How typed?

(35) What are typed by 1 Kings 20? When was the first of these waged? By what means did the Puritans (Presbyterians) work in it? What was the first thing that they sought to set aside and to substitute for it? The second? The third? What was the second of these controversies called? When was it? How did both controversies end? What was the contrast between the spirit of the Puritans and the second Anglican movement? What did the former do? Especially through what and whom? How typed? What word did they send to the Anglican movement? How typed? What effect did the pertinent information have on the latter? How typed? What did the six demands of the Puritans move the Anglican movement to do? How typed? What did the latter do? How typed? What pertinent advice was given it? How typed? What as a result did the Anglican move

ment do? How typed? What effect did this answer have upon the Puritans? What did they threaten? How typed? What kind of an answer and what answer did the Anglican movement give? How typed? What was its effect on the Puritans? In what ways? How typed?

(36) What then occurred in the Anglican movement under Archbishop Whitgift's leadership? How typed? What two things did they advise? How typed? What two things did Archbishop Whitgift advise Elizabeth to do? What two reasons were given for the unconstitutionality of the proposed legislation? What word did she send to the House of Lords? What effect did Elizabeth's stand have on the House of Commons? What did the House of Lords do to the House of Commons? On whose side was the Council? What unconstitutional thing did it attempt to do? What did Elizabeth do in these circumstances? Why? In spite of the Puritans' efforts, what was the outcome? By what combination? How did the new Parliament stand on the controversy? With what effect? How are these things typed? What was the effect of new measures? What was required of the Puritan ministers on pain of loss of place? What were the temporary effects on the Puritan movement? How typed? What did the teaching members of the Anglican movement then do? Why? How typed? What was the effect of this advice? On whom?

(37) By whom was the second onslaught against the Anglican movement carried on? Through what at first? Through what later? What were the main characteristics of the Mar-prelate tracts? How were these at first answered? Later on? What are the main characteristics of the sober replies? Who were the chief Anglican warriors? Especially who? What is the name of his chief work? Its main characteristics? What did the Puritans also produce? How did the two sets of writings compare? Of what was this a case? On whose side were the abler errorists? With what result? In what verses is this conflict set forth? What two things did the Puritans assert? How typed? What four counsels did they give? How typed? What was done with these four counsels? How typed? What was accordingly done by the Puritans? In what hope? How typed? What put in their appearance? What was the effect of these steps on the Anglican move

ment? What assurances did the faithful as God's mouthpiece give? How typed?

(38) What was the character of the preliminary attacks on the Anglican movement? With what did the real fight set in? What was its title? Its character? Its effects? What was the title of the second Mar-prelate tract? Its character and effect? Who are the authors of the Mar-prelate tracts? What appeared immediately after the Epitome? Thereafter? How do the Mar-prelate tracts compare with their replies? What did each side have as to the other? Why? From what to what did the conflict change? With what results? How typed? What happened to the remnant of fleeing Puritans and to Puritanism itself? How typed?

(39) What did some of its representatives suggest? What was done with this suggestion? How typed? Thereupon, what did the Puritans do? How typed? How was this received? What did the messengers do? What resulted? How typed? What two things did the Puritans promise? What was the response of the Anglican movement? What three concessions did it make? To whom and to whom not? How are these things typed? What resulted from this agreement? What request was made by certain of the Lord's mouthpieces? What was done with the request? What was then said and done? How are these things typed? What was then requested and done? How typed? What was thereafter done? In what did it result? How typed? What things were then done? How typed? What did the mouthpiece group then do? How typed? What was the effect? How typed?

(40) What were the Congregationalists called? Why? What did they have? Close to whose office was it? How are these things typed? What did the Anglican movement desire and offer in trade? How typed? What did the Separatists do with the offer? Why? What effect did the refusal have upon the former? How typed? By whom especially were its complaints voiced? What and whom did they reach? What did they ask? How are these things typed? What did it answer? How typed? How did these do and promise? How typed? What did they cause to be proclaimed? Through and to whom? Why? Whom did they single out preeminently as the alleged worst offenders? What two classes did they have bear false witness against them? What two false things were

witnessed against them? What other two things were they to do? How are these things typed? What, accordingly, was done? How typed?

(41) What two things did they do? How typed? What then did the state and church leaders do? As what did the highest church court condemn them? The highest civil court? Who were the chief judges in the two courts? Many individuals being involved, what resulted as to the processes and hearings? When did the persecution begin and end? Which leaders did it involve? What were the punishments and sufferings inflicted? What sentence was pronounced upon all the rest of them? Contrary to what would public sentiment not allow further? What did Parliament decree? Who was the last one released? How are these things typed?

(42) What did the Anglican Church then do? How typed? What did the Anglican movement thereupon do? How typed? What did the principles of the Word incite the faithful to do? How? In what was this movement involved while possessing itself of the rights and privileges of the Separatists? How are these things typed? Of what did the pertinent principles remind the faithful? What announcement did these principles cause to be made? How are these things typed? What did the Anglican movement demand of the faithful new creatures as its enemies? What answer was given? Why was this punishment to be meted out? How are these things typed? What did the faithful then announce? How typed? According to what examples would the punishment be inflicted? For what two reasons was this punishment to come? How typed? What third punishment was announced? How typed? What fourth and fifth punishments? How typed? What was the comparative character of the Anglican movement? How long? By what incited? How are these things typed? In what special way did it sin? How typed? What effect did these announcements have? How typed? What did the faithful observe from the Word? Learn from it? How typed?

(43) What was the first controversy involving the Anglican movement after its conflict with Presbyterianism? What does the fact that the Calvinistic view advocated by the radicals was worsted prove as to this controversy in relation to 2 Kings 22 and 2 Chro. 18? What was the second controversy after that against Presbyterianism?

How were the two sides lined up in this controversy? What did the strict side do with the Old Testament passages applying to the Sabbath? Previous to this controversy how was Sunday regarded? On the Puritan side what were the preliminaries to this controversy? On the Anglican movement's side? How long was the controversy delayed? When did it break out? In what did it result? By what is it typed? In what will it be considered?

(44) What happened from 1594 to 1596? From 1599 to 1600? How typed? What did the Congregational movement have? With what result? How typed? On what subject at this time did the Anglican and Congregational movements agree? With what result? How typed? What did their agreement move the former to do? How typed? What did the former propose to the latter? With what result? How typed? In what respect was the latter more careful than the former? With what result? How typed? How did the former respond to the latter's proposal? With what result? How typed? Thereupon what did the latter ask? How typed? What reply did the former give? What did the latter say to the reply? How were these things typed? What effect did the latter's statement have upon the former? How typed? What did the two movements then do? Who spoke then? How are these things typed? What assurance did one set of the advisers give? How typed? How did the other mouthpiece groups express themselves? How typed? What did the messengers say to the Truth-speaking group? How typed? What did these answer? How typed?

(45) What two questions did the Anglican movement ask these? What kind of a reply was given? What was the contents of the reply? How are these things typed? In doubt as to the reply's meaning, what did the Anglican movement ask? How typed? What was the answer? How typed? What was the Anglican movement's reaction to this answer? How typed? What was the answer of the true mouthpiece? How typed?

(46) What did the circumstances varyingly suggest? How typed? What did one of these circumstances suggest? How typed? How was this circumstance Divinely manipulated and accepted by God? How typed? What two things did the true mouthpiece then say? How typed? How did the boldest group of false mouthpieces react to this? How typed? What answer was given it? What did

the Anglican movement then do? How typed?. What did the true mouthpiece answer? How typed?

(47) What then was done? How in relation to truth on the Sabbath did the hostile side stand? In accord with what frequent experience? How are these things typed? What two proposals did the Anglican make to the Congregational movement? How typed? What was the purpose and charge of the Presbyterian movement in this controversy? How typed? How was the controversy waged at first? In what did it soon result? How are these things typed? What view did a hit-and-miss method attack? With what result? How are these things typed?

(48) How did the Anglican movement react to the increasing controversy? With what result? How typed? What was the first result of the Anglicans' and Separatists' defeat? How typed? The second result? How typed? Of what were these things a fulfilment? Who have described the second phase of the Anglican movement and its accomplishments? By what was it succeeded? What was its feature? How are these things typed?

(49) What did the Separatist movement then do? How typed? What did the Lord's mouthpiece do to it? Why? How typed? What tempered the rebuke? Why? How typed? What did it do with and for its stewardship truth? How typed? How did it erroneously in part arrange its elected servants? How typed? What exhortations did it give these? Why? How typed? For what else did it arrange? Why? What was then done? How typed?

(50) In harmony with what were they encouraged to act? How typed? What were they told as to matters of controversy? On what points? Why? How are these things typed? What else did it charge? Of what was this a corruption? What did it do as to the lesser brethren? How are these things typed? What was Romanism's condition then in Britain? How typed? What approach was made by the two Protestant movements? How typed? What did the Separatist movement propose to the Anglican movement? How typed? What was done to it for this course? How was this prediction fulfilled? How typed? After what did this occur? How typed?

(51) When did the second phase of the Anglican movement end? By what kind of a movement was it succeeded? How long did it last? How are these things

typed? What evils did it continue? How typed? Wherein did it meet calamity? What marred the low courts and the Court of High Commission? In what particulars did they do especial evils? What did this diseased condition cause the third Anglican movement to seek? How are these things typed? How did the faithful new creatures react to this procedure? How typed? What did they consequently announce and then do? How typed?

(52) What did its messengers then do? After what? How are these things typed? What did the movement then ask? How typed? What was the answer? From it what did the movement infer? How are these things typed? What did Archbishop Whitgift and his special helpers thereupon do? In effect what was this? How are these things typed? How did God's mouthpiece refute their position? How typed? What did the former class then do? When? How were these things met? By whom? How are these things typed? What did the former class then ask? How? How typed? How did God's mouthpiece react? How typed? What sentence did he announce? Why? How typed? How was the sentence not executed? How was it executed? How typed? What did historians do with the third Anglican phase? How typed?

(53) Who arose against the Congregationalists? After what and during what? What was the period of the fourth Anglican phase? What correction of the reading *Ammonites* should be made? For what and against what did these stand? How are these things typed? To what did the Congregationalists resort? How typed? What did all Congregationalism do? How typed? What things did the Congregationalist movement do? How typed? Of what special things did they make mention? How typed? What had they done as to the Truth and its Spirit? How typed? What did they say? How typed? What did they then tell the Lord? How typed? What did they say as to their enemies' intentions? How typed? What did they ask?

(54) Where was this done? How typed? Who arose in their midst? How typed? What did they ask and declare? How typed? To what did they encourage, negatively and positively? How typed? What assurances did they give? Why? How typed? How did the addresses affect the Congregationalists? What two brothers were

especially correspondingly active? For what did they prepare themselves? How typed? How many writings did they prepare? What did they do with these? What did the movement ask and to what exhort? How typed?

(55) What did the movement and the messengers do? How typed? What was the effect of the message? How typed? What two things did the faithful witness? By what was the refutation especially made? How are these things typed? What made spoil of their enemies? How typed? What did they do thereafter? How typed? What then did they do? In what condition? Despite what? For what? How are these things typed? What two effects did their confession have? How typed?

(56) What occurred after these things? How typed? What four classes had crucial experiences? How typed? What marked the first three crucial experiences? How typed? What did certain hangers-on in the Congregational movement forecast? How typed? How did the less uncompromising brethren react thereto? How typed? Whom did the brethren approach and stand before? Who watched them? How are these things typed? What four things did the more uncompromising brethren do? What did these things effect in the disapproved British people? What did the new creatures do? How are these things typed? What did the course of the more faithful suggest to the less faithful? What did the latter ask? What was the answer? How are these things typed? What did the latter do? Who were the respective leaders of these two classes? What did the second leader do with the first and the latter's powers? How typed? How did the less faithful feel during the change? Over what? What did they later do? How are these typed? What did they do with their new powers? With what effect? Under what impression? How are these things typed? What did their arrangements, rebukes and condemnations effect? What did they do therein? Amid what events? How typed?

(57) What special class of hangers-on accepted the less faithful as controllers and became subject to them? How typed? What did they propose? Why? How was their counsel treated? How are these things typed? What did they continue to do? With what two effects? How are these things typed? What followed upon their failure? How typed? What did the adherents of the controllers

say? How typed? To what did this lead? In what way? How are these things typed? What next did the mouthpiece do? How typed?

(58) What did undeveloped nominal-churchists do to them? How typed? To what did this lead? How was the forecast fulfilled? How are these things typed? When did this phase of the Congregational movement end? What two things set in? How are these things typed? From here on what set in, yea, in a small way, even eight years before? How and when did it take its rise? With what result? What was the period of the second phase of the Congregational movement? What thing will be discussed before that phase is discussed?

(59) Who stood at the head of the radical party? What evil teachings did they hold? Of whom did the radical party consist? By whom typed? What did they do to the conservatives? In what domain? What did they put into operation? What was the highest legislative body in the Anglican Church? By what and whom were two evil things put into operation? What was the first of these two? The second? What resulted from their operation? What additional evil did the Court of High Commission introduce? How are these things typed?

(60) What effect on the conservatives did these measures have? How typed? What did this move the two main conservative parties to do? What did each party do as to fulfilling their respective promises? What did the keepers of their promise do with the violators of theirs? How are these things typed? With what effect on the entire party? How typed? What did the horrible condition move it to determine as to God's mouthpiece? Why? How typed? How was God's mouthpiece then engaged? On what errand was a messenger of the conservatives sent? Before his arrival what pertinent thing did God's mouthpiece declare to their supporters? What did they charge their supporters? With what assurance? How are these things typed? What happened immediately thereafter? How was it looked upon by God's mouthpiece? What did this indicate to God's mouthpiece? How are these things typed? To what effect was the Lord's message? How typed?

(61) What was the attitude of the conservatives' executive to the message? How did God's mouthpiece answer?

How are these things typed? Where were certain fence-straddlers? In how many groups? What were these? How did they feel over the crisis? On what did they debate? What did their situation threaten? How are these things typed? In what two ways did they reason over the possibilities of their situation? To what conclusion did they come? Why? How are these things typed? What did they seek to do? While trying to do this what did they learn? How are these things typed? Why had the radicals abandoned their position? What effect did this news have upon them? How typed?

(62) What were the first two events that produced this effect? What third event produced this effect? What exception did this event contain? Under what limits? What did the secular courts do in 570 cases? With what effect? In what ways did parliament come to the courts' assistance? What did it demand for the deprived clergy? Among other things, what did it do? Why? What propositions did Dr. Cowel's book advocate? What did the radical party do as to these propositions? What did parliament cause to be done with the book? What did parliament do with the autocracy of the king and bishops? What happened to public sentiment? Over what? Through whose connivance? In what did this course result?

(63) What was the twofold effect of these things on the radicals? How typed? In a word, what did they do? How typed? What did the four groups of fence-straddlers do? What kind of use did they make of the situation? How are these things typed? Conscience-stricken, what did they then think and decide to do? At the same time what else did they do? What did these things move them to do? How are these things typed? Accordingly, what did each of the four classes do? How typed? As one man what did they then do? What did the conservatives suspect? What did they do with their suspicions? How are these things typed? What did the leaders counsel? What were the involved five principles? Who had denied the fifth principle, so far as his affairs were concerned? What had been done with most of the rest of constitutional principles and their advocates? How are these things typed? What did the conservatives do? Why? In what groups? How are these things typed?

(64) What did the investigation disclose? What characterized the flight? What did the investigators report? How are these things typed? Thereupon, what did the conservatives do? What happened to the radicals in the 1614 parliamentary elections? In what mood did the new parliament meet? So far as the popular vote was concerned, what did the election settle? What had they done with the king's and bishops' radicalism? What does the involved type set forth? Of what was this the beginning of the end? What resulted gradually and finally? What are the parallel dates? What finally resulted as to the conservatives' rights? According to whose forecast? What did the conservatives do in their four groups to secure their principles? What did the now conservatively-minded British people do in this matter? What did this fulfill? How are these things typed? How are vs. 18, 19 related to vs. 1, 2? What does this fact result in as far as interpreting here vs. 18, 19? How are these things typed?

(65) What had God's mouthpiece told their supporters in the Congregationalist movement? What had they previously done in that movement? How are these things typed? What, accordingly, did such supporters do? How typed? In connection with what occurrence did the evil condition end? What did they do to the conservatives? At the time of their petitioning how was Francis Johnson engaged? What did the conservatives ask him? How are these things typed? At what point of his recital did the supporters of God's mouthpiece appear with their petition? What did this occasion Francis Johnson to do? What did this move the conservatives to ask the petitioners? What answer was given? What charge, accordingly, did the conservatives give Archbishop Abbot and his fellow bishops? How are these things typed?

(66) What set in here as to the antitype of the Syrians? Of how many classes did the British Catholics consist? What were the characters of these? Who were the former? The latter? Who was the leader of the former? What were his progressive officers? Like whom was the former class? What is the difference between them? What had the milder class heard? During whose archbishoprics did the power of the milder party decline? At the same time what was taking place? Through what? What did the milder class do to God's mouthpiece without recognizing them as such? How did they send the messengers? With

what inquiry? How are these things typed? How did these messengers act? What did they do? On what assumption? How are these things typed? What answer did God's mouthpiece first give? Afterward? Who would then get this power? How typed?

(67) What did God's mouthpiece then do? Until what? What was their knowledge of the secret workings of the Romanists? Open workings? Who were the secret workers? The open workers? What effect did this knowledge have upon God's mouthpiece? How are these things typed? What did their distress cause the Romanists to ask? What was the answer? How are these things typed? How did the secret allies of the Romanists feel and answer about this matter? What reply did the mouthpiece give? How are these things typed? After leaving God's mouthpiece what did the rigid radicals do? What did the mild radicals ask? The rigid radicals answer? How are these things typed? On what were the Romanists intent? Through whose secret lead? How did the struggle proceed? What did it set into operation? How are these things typed? What remark is in place here? With what begun?

(68) What operated from 1607 to 1615? What was the parallel reign? With what did it begin? Under whom and when did the rest go to Holland? What was John Robinson's relation to this movement? How many related movements did it have? In what did they exist? What were four of these and their leaders? What were the other two? How are these things typed? What had the former Congregational movement and its separate ecclesias done to these six? To what did it give the chief position? Who was its leader? Why was it made the successor movement? How are these things typed? By whom has the first Congregational movement been described? How typed? When did it end as an ascendant movement? As what was it kept in memory? How are these things typed? What did reactionary Congregationalism, when becoming ascendant, do with the other six movements? How? What else did it do so treat? How are these things typed? What was its condition when it came into the ascendancy? Through how many sets of experiences did it pass? How are these things typed? By what three evils was it marred? What did it reactionally do? To what extent? With what result? How are these things typed? From what did God

spare it? Why? In accord with what promise? How are these things typed?

(69) What did the oppressed Armenians do? To what were they opposed? Making a leader, what did they do? How are these things typed? Thereupon what did reactionary Congregationalism do? With whom and what? What did they secretly do? With what result? How are these things typed? What did the Armenians maintain? What did certain enlightened priests then do? Why? How are these things typed? Under John Robinson's lead what did the reactionary Congregationalism do and encourage? How typed? Amid these activities what came to it? What did it do to it? How are these things typed? Of what particular sins did it rebuke it? How typed? What did Robert Browne's book then do? How typed? What did it say would overtake and disintegrate it? How typed?

(70) By whom was this fulfilled? How typed? How did these effect the fulfilment? How typed? What else beset it? How typed? By what did it lose its ascendancy? Due to what? Through what? How was this policy not held by God's real people? How are these things typed? How did they not feel for it after its eight stages were passed? By what are its deeds recorded? How typed? As what did it end? In what did it fail? How are these things typed? By what was it succeeded? What had it done with it for a while? After what? During what two things in Anglicism? How are these things typed? What was it before coming into ascendancy? Along what one line did it work? What did it show of its origin? What proves this? Why did it so agree? What copyist's error is found in 2 Chro. 22:2 as against 2 Kings 8:26? How else is this error proved? What was its advisor? How did it act? Unto what? How are these things typed? Following its advice what did it do for the Anglican Church party? For what did they fight? How are these things typed? In the fight what did the Anglican Church movement experience? Through whose duplicity? What did it seek from its own Church? How are these things typed? At this juncture what did autocratic Congregationalism do? For what two reasons? With whom did Romanism work secretly in this conflict? Later? How are these things typed?

(71) The end of what phases of the Anglican Movement has already been discussed? With what co-regency

was the third phase contemporaneous? What are the involved parallel dates? When did the sole existence of the fourth phase begin? How long did it last? What are the involved parallel years? How is its start related in time to the first phase of the Congregational Movement? How typed? How in quality did the third and fourth Anglican Movements compare? How typed? In what evils did the latter persist? How typed? In England what had been the papacy's relation to the first three phases of the Anglican Movement? What did it do in the fourth phase? How are these things typed? In what did this rebellion reach its height? What as a result was unleashed? Who were the leading controversialists on each side? What did the fourth Anglican Movement do therein? How are these things typed? What did it also ask? What response did this request receive? How typed? What question was asked by the Congregational Movement; and what was answered? How typed? Along what lines did the controversy move? With what result? How typed?

(72) What was the effect on the fourth Anglican Movement? Why? How typed? How did the first Congregational Movement react thereto? What answer did it receive? How are these things typed? With what result? How typed? What did God's mouthpiece do to the fourth Anglican Movement? How did this affect the fourth Anglican Movement? How are these things typed? In reply what did the Lord's mouthpiece say? How typed? What did the latter then do? How typed? What reassuring things did they then say? How typed? What promises did they make? How typed?

(73) What came shortly thereafter? How typed? How did the Romanist warriors react to the preparations against them? How typed? What impression did the coming of the new truth make upon them? With what result? How are these things typed? Instead of spoil what did they find? With what effect? How are these things typed? What things did the three classes of warriors accomplish? How typed? What response did the papacy make thereto? With what effect? How are these things typed? What did the papacy then do? How did it feel as to the outcome of the controversy? What did the confederates then do? How are these things typed?

(74) With what antitypically is the episode of 2 Kings 4:1-7 connected? What resulted from the first three petitions and the accompanying confessions of faith? What was then prepared? How did the English Congregationalist churches feel? Why? What did this move them to do? How are these things typed? To the question of the Lord's mouthpiece what answer did they give? How typed? What answer did the Lord's mouthpiece give? How typed? What did they advise to be done secretly to these petitions? How typed? What response did the Congregationalist churches make? What did they then desire? What were they answered? How typed? What did they then do? What was told them to do? What was the result of the petitions with the king? With what result? How typed?

(75) While doing their appointed work among the justified and consecrated, what did God's mouthpiece find? How typed? What did the Congregationalist churches secure for these? How typed? What in response did the latter do? With what result? How are these things typed? What did God's mouthpiece then do? What did they suggest? With what result? How are these things typed? While they meditated on what to do for them, what did Francis Johnson say to them? How typed? What then was done? How typed? What did God's mouthpiece then promise? How was the promise received? How are these things typed? What happened with the forecast? How typed? What resulted with the movement? Why? Despite what? How typed? What then did these churches do? How typed?

(76) What was the leaders' response? How was it overcome? How typed? What did they then do and charge? How typed? How was the mouthpiece engaged when they approached him? On seeing them what did the mouthpiece do? How typed? With what did they charge him? What answer did he receive? How are these things typed? To what did their attitude move him? What did the mouthpiece do? Why? How are these things typed? How only did their attitude express itself? How typed? With what did it charge Francis Johnson? How typed? How did the Congregationalists regard this charge? What, accordingly, did they do? How did the mouthpiece respond? How are these things typed? What did Francis Johnson do? How typed? What did the mouthpiece then do? In what condition was the dead movement? How typed? For what and

how did the mouthpiece labor? How typed? What did they apply to it? To what end? How typed? With what and how did they continue? Until what occurred? How typed? Thereupon what two things did the mouthpiece do? How typed? What did the Congregationalists do? How typed?

(77) What did God's mouthpiece then do? What did they find? Why? In fact what had happened? How did this affect the hangers-on? Why? How are these things typed? What error did a group among the Congregationalists teach? Why? What at first did they not perceive? How are these things typed? What did the practice of this error produce? What did these effects prove? How are these things typed? What did they do about this evil? What did the mouthpiece do therewith? What did they then charge? With what result? How are these things typed? To what has attention already been called? What other such leader was there? What were some of his experiences? What did he do in 1607? What did God's mouthpiece charge to be done with this booklet? How are these things typed? Who opposed its reading? By what? What did the mouthpiece do therein? What declaring? How are these things proved? What proves the propriety of the mouthpiece's course? With what results? How typed?

(78) What at first existed among the Congregationalists? Later? What characterized the controversial course of the victorious radical group? With whom? With what result? How typed? What did these radicals do as to the conservatives? What did they win thereby? How typed? What did the winlings think and say? How typed? What resulted therefrom? Why did it arouse their interest? How are these things typed? What, accordingly, did the radicals do? What did the leading controversialists then do? With what equipped? How typed? What did these do to the conservatives? How typed? How had matters for a long time stood between the conservatives and radicals? How did the former construe the latter's pertinent course? With what demonstrations? How typed?

(79) What two things did God's mouthpiece do thereover? Why the second thing? How typed? What and how did the leading controversialists then do? How did God's mouthpiece act toward them? How are these things typed? What did they tell them to do? By whom? How typed? How did this instruction affect the leading controversialists?

Especially whom? Why? How typed? What did they claim? How as a result did they reason? How did they leave? How are these things typed? How in manner and substance did some of their supporters reason thereover with them? How typed? What effect did this have on them? In what did this effect result? How typed?

(80) What on recovery did they do? With this confession what did they offer God's mouthpiece? How are these things typed? What course therein did God's mouthpiece take? How typed? What first did the controversial leaders then ask? How typed? Secondly? How typed? What was done with the second request? How? How were they sent away? How are these things typed? What was reprehensible in Francis Johnson's character? What did he see in this situation? How are these things typed? Whom did he seek? What three things did they first do to him? How typed? What answer did he first give? What falsehood did he tell them of what were in reality two classes of ecclesia servants? What did he ask for each class? How typed? What was the Congregationalist view of the classes of ecclesia servants? What is the true view?

(81) On what did the controversial leaders insist? What did they require of two sets of their supporters? How are these things typed? What did F. Johnson manipulate? How? How typed? What did God's mouthpiece thereafter do? Especially in whom? What did he do to God's mouthpiece? On what line? How typed? What did God's mouthpiece then do? How did they feel over his wrongs? What were they? What did the mouthpiece declare? As to what thing? Classes? Kinds of brothers and sisters? How typed? What did they then declare? How did F. Johnson leave them? How are these things typed?

(82) What moved the hangers-on to appeal to God's mouthpiece? In whom especially? What two things did they request? What were they told by God's mouthpiece? How typed? What did the former desire of the latter? What response did they receive? What as a company had they produced? What befell it? How did this affect them? Why? How typed? Who were appealed to, to restore it to its former circulation? At their request what were told them? What did they then do? With what result? How conditioned? How are these things typed? In what did it circulate? After what? How typed?

(83) At this time of how many parties did the Anglican Church consist? What was the first of these? What did they in radicalism exalt? To whom do they correspond? Of whom did the second party consist? Who warred with them? To whom does the second party correspond? In what are these two parties typed? Who were the third party? With whom did it side in the conflict between the low and high church parties? How also can this conflict be termed? Who were the champions of the radicals? What other persons were concerned in this conflict? With whom in their majority were they associated? How typed? What did the radicals decide to do? On what question? How are these things typed? What caution did God's mouthpiece give the conservatives? On what ground? How did the conservatives react to this caution? How typed? Against what other trap did God's mouthpiece caution them? Why? What was done in this conflict by the radicals? In what spheres? How did the conservatives react thereto? Who generally supported them? With what results? What effects on the radicals did the conservatives' moves have? How are these things typed? Denying the charge, whom did certain radicals blame? Where were the blamed ones located? With what did they blame God's mouthpiece? How are these things typed? As a result whom did the radicals charge? With what? Why? What information was given them? How typed?

(84) What did this prompt the radicals to do? How? How typed? What did Francis Johnson recognize? How soon? How did he react to the situation? Why? To whom did he cry for help? How are these things typed? What two things did these tell him? How typed? In what quality did they act? For what did they pray? What did F. Johnson, as a result, see? How typed? What did the learned radical advocates do? What did God's mouthpiece pray as to these? What did God therein do? How are these things typed? What did these point out? With what effect? What did these promise them? On what condition? What did these do to them? How typed?

(85) For what did God's mouthpiece pray? With what limitation? What did God do as to their prayer? How did He answer the prayer? What did this enable the radicals' advocates to see? How are these things typed? On seeing their advantage what did the conservatives request of

God's mouthpiece? How? How typed? Whose arguments captured the radicals' advocates? Despite this how did God's mouthpiece speak of the conservatives? What did they counsel these to do? How typed? Thereupon what did the conservatives do? What did they avoid? With what effect? What was then done? What did this end? How are these things typed? Who were the leaders among God's mouthpiece? Among Congregationalists? Among the Anglicans? Among the conservatives? Among the radicals?

CHAPTER V

SOME MIDDLE PARALLELS.

2 Kings 9–11:21; 13:1-25; 14:15, 16; 23-29; 15:8-12;
2 Chron. 22:10–23:21.

JEHU. JEHOAHAZ. JEHOASH. JEROBOAM II. ZACHARIAH. ATHALIAH.
JOASH.

THE AUTOCRATIC later course of the fourth phase of the Anglican movement (antitypical Jehoram of Israel), especially in the king and the episcopate, exercised through the doctrine of the Divine right of kings and clergy in theory and practice, provoked toward 1616 resentment very widely, which came to the attention of God's mouthpiece. Some of the main members of God's mouthpiece from 1616 to 1646, the period now to be discussed, were Bros. Jacobs, Bolton, Sibbs, Adams, Leighton, Burton, Bostwick, Prynne (the last four had their ears cut off and their noses slit for their opposition to autocracy in state and church), Marshall, Calamy, Milton, Goodwin, Owen, Lightfoot, *etc.* They, therefore, decided from the principles of God's Word and the indications of the Divine providence, that the time had come to arouse, as forecast, the Puritans in their Presbyterian party, who were inclined to be revolutionists (Jehu, *living*, or *energetic one*), to overthrow autocracy in state and church. To this end God's mouthpiece in the Anglican, Presbyterian, Baptist and Congregational Churches (Elisha, *mighty deliverer*, or *God is deliverance*) prepared in knowledge certain of their hangers-on for the work of such arousing; and after the preparation of these in knowledge was sufficient, they exhorted them to undertake this service, telling them to betake themselves to the sphere of power-preeminence (2 Kings 9:1; Ramoth Gilead, *height of the rough*). They further told these that they were to seek out from among the groups there

assembled the most energetic class of Puritans, the Presbyterians (Jehu, *the living*, or *energetic one*), that, while it was supporting the power-preeminence of the Anglican movement against the Romanist movement, was qualified to execute God's judgments (Jehoshaphat, *Jehovah judges*) and to expose the dominant evils (Nimshi, *exposer*), God's mouthpiece cautioning them to work in secret with that class of Puritans (2). Moreover, they instructed these hangers-on to take the pertinent Divine knowledge, and by this qualify and arouse the pertinent class to the forecast work and to assure it that God Himself was setting it apart to become the dominant party in Britain. Finally, God's mouthpiece charged the hangers-on to depart immediately after this work was done, and for no reason to delay leaving immediately thereafter (3).

(2) Accordingly, these hangers-on betook themselves at once on their errand (4). By their manner and teaching they aroused the attention of the leading groups that defended the power-preeminence of the fourth Anglican movement against Romanism, and that in such a way as made the Presbyterian Puritan opposers of autocracy in state and church wonder to which one among the groups they desired to give their message. The latter assured the former that it was the one desired (5). Privacy was desired and secured for the intended preparation of the Presbyterian Puritan opposers of autocracy for their work of overthrowing it. Hence privately the hangers-on gave these Puritan opponents of autocracy the involved qualification of head and heart, assuring them that God Himself was qualifying them to be the less favored Divinely appointed movement among God's people (6). They declared further that God charged them to refute and overthrow the fourth Anglican movement, their dominators and all the peculiar institutions of the four Anglican movements; to wreak the Lord's vengeance upon the Anglican Church for its persecution of God's mouthpieces and servants (7); to destroy

utterly all autocracy and autocrats and to cut off refutatively and officially from it and them—those who defile the powers of state and church and those who for this course should be restrained and forsaken, *i.e.*, their supporters, whom they should restrain and abandon for such support (8); for God would desolate Anglicism in its four movements from representing Him as the less favored Divine movement, just as He had done to the two Lutheran and the two Calvinistic movements as the less favored Divine movement (9), and would give the Anglican Church to be devoured by sectarians in its union of state and church, so that none would honor her in her destruction. Having thus discharged their mission, the hangers-on immediately left the scene of their pertinent activities with all speed (10). The main secular members of antitypical Jehu from 1616 to 1646 were Coke, Eliot, Hollis, Pym, Haselrig, Hampden, Vane, Cromwell, *etc.* The main religious members of antitypical Jehu were Jacobs, Prynne, Marshall, Calamy, Young, Newcomen, Spurstow, Milton, *etc.*, all very able and brave men.

(3) Before proceeding further it would be well if there are pointed out some facts that will help us to note better the relation of type and antitype in the study of Jehu in their chronological aspects. The chronology for the actual 30 years' reign of Jehu is 905 to 875 B.C., while the antitypical chronology in its parallels is 1616 to 1646 A.D. It will be noted that the only chronology that the Bible gives of Jehu's reign is its beginning and ending (10:36), except, of course, the comparisons of his reign with that of Jehoahaz, which came at the end of Jehu's, and with that of Joash (12:1; 13:1). But to the events of Jehu's reign itself, apart from its start and end, the Bible gives no dates. This fact is important to be kept in mind, because in the antitype the revolutionary acts had only small beginnings from 1616 onward until the Long Parliament assembled, Nov. 3, 1640. These small revolutionary acts consisted of public verbal agitations

against autocracy in state and church made by the Puritans at each tyrannous act in church and state, especially in the former, later in protests in the courts at the same for the rights of individuals being outraged and in outcries in the parliament, whose protests led to their repeated proroguing by James I and afterwards by Charles I, both of them ruling for years without parliament's sitting, which was in gross violation of the British constitution. Since we know that Biblical prophecies and types in their chronology usually mark the beginnings of the forecast events, we can see that the above-mentioned protests are marked in the type as the antitype of Jehu's beginning his revolution, though it took 30 years for the antitype to reach the end of the revolution's full success, in April, 1646, when Charles I, utterly defeated in war by the revolutionists, surrendered to the Scots, the English revolutionists' allies, who kept him as a prisoner. This enables us to see how the great events and results of the English civil war were the outgrowths of the seed of small but growing protests as the formers' beginnings. This principle, accordingly, enables us to see how the pertinent 30 years' protests, struggles, battles and triumphs of the British patriots against the tyranny of the two Stuarts, James I and Charles I, and of the episcopate, are the parallel antitypes of Jehu's 30 years' acts as king of Israel.

(4) The beginning of the 30 years' revolt against Church tyranny was the public formation in London of a Congregational Church under the pastoral care of Mr. Henry Jacobs, who, exiled to Holland, returned to England and formed this Church in 1616, as a protest against the Anglican Church, whose head, the king, James I, was; and the beginning of the 30 years' revolt against state tyranny was Chief Justice Coke's refusal to set aside secular law at the king's command in 1616. The King's Book of Sports, 1618, charging the people to engage in all sorts of games Sunday afternoons, met with much Presbyterian

Puritan opposition. His condemning the Calvinism of the Presbyterian Puritans and disfavoring them and favoring the Armenians against his former convictions increased the formers' opposition. In 1620 he *forbade* parliament to *interfere* with *his government* and aroused it to a protest, which he tore out of its minutes. This tyrannous act made many turn against him in and outside of parliament, who before had no sympathy with the oppressed Presbyterian Puritans. His compromising with Romanists to gain their support connected with his negotiating a marriage between the Prince of Wales and the Spanish king's daughter, his leaving his Protestant son-in-law in the lurch in the latter's war with the papists in the Thirty Years' War and his securing a marriage between the Prince of Wales and Henrietta, the bigoted papist daughter of the French king, which resulted in many advantages to the English Romanists, and was accompanied with the usual Jesuit conspiracies in England one and all aroused opposition, while his ruling for years without parliament's meeting could not but provoke resentment among the liberty-loving English.

(5) Charles I, becoming king in 1625, schooled in his father's absolutism and egged on to tyranny by his Romanist wife, who constantly urged him to be an absolute king like her father, out did his father in tyranny and grossest hypocrisy and dishonesty with parliament and people, all of which met with resentment. His seeking to force parliament to sanction his violations of the constitution, his arousing the episcopacy through the Court of High Commission and the Star Chamber to persecute dissent from the Anglican Church and ritual, his having its hierarchy and clergy preach the Divine right of kings and clergy, to subdue all to him, his proroguing parliament for refusing to sanction his illegalities and for setting forth grievances against his tyranny, his supporting the tyrannies and Romanizings of the episcopate, especially of Laud, the primate, his imprisonment in the Tower of four

leading members of parliament for their righteous protests, *e.g.*, the great and good Eliot detained there until death, his ruling for eleven years without parliament, his permitting prominent opponents of Laudism to be mutilated and pilloried, his making England so uncomfortable for Puritans that many of the best citizens left the country, his prohibiting further exoduses of this kind, his illegal assessing of taxes, his overawing the courts to deny redress to petitioners against these exactions, *e.g.*, Hamden's appeal, his allowing the episcopate to draw a half of chancery business into their hand, which it exercised most tyrannously, his allowing them to hold court in their own names, to form new articles of visitation and to put the examined under oath, his seeking to impose the episcopacy upon the Scotch Presbyterians with all their papistical ritualism, his raising an army to subdue them in their opposition, his baiting the long Parliament, his seeking to arrest its five leaders against his tyrannies and his making war on the long Parliament—one and all provoked great resentment against him and the episcopate, especially against its leader, Laud; and these are some of the main events that aroused the actors in the antitype of Jehu's revolution and reign. We will now trace the matter, type and antitype.

(6) At each of the above-mentioned tyrannies the hangers-on, at the instigation of God's mouthpiece, secretly stirred up the Presbyterian Puritans to revolutionism, and after each of such arousings the latter showed themselves to the groups who were their associates in opposition to Romanists' gaining power-preeminence in England, *i.e.*, the Presbyterians, and later on the less loyal Congregationalists and the Baptists and parliament, the low church party in the Anglican Church and the radical liberty-lovers, *e.g.*, Milton, Ludlow, Harrington, *etc.*, *i.e.*, republicans, who asked whether all was prosperous and what, to them, the fanatical hangers-on desired. They denied knowing what secretly the Puritans told them that they understood

(11). Not understanding the matter, these Presbyterians denied the Puritans' pertinent statements, whereupon the latter told them, after each of such visits and questionings, that these had told them that God was arousing them to lead a revolution (12). And at each stage of the long-drawn-out arousements to oppose the pertinent tyrannies, the above-mentioned groups responded by agreeing to support the Presbyterian opponents of the involved tyranny, offering the support of their several authorities in the heights of their position, and announced by word and act that the energetic Presbyterian Puritan revolutionists were the leader in revolution against the tyranny of king and prelacy (13). Accordingly, the energetic Presbyterian Puritans as executors of God's justice and as exposers of the evils of absolutism in state and church, took counsel with their above-mentioned supporters to overthrow the fourth phase of the Anglican movement, and that at a time it and the rest of Protestants were maintaining its hold on power-preeminence against the radical Romanists (14). So far in this conflict extreme Anglican arbitrary prelacy, the form that antitypical Jehoram had assumed toward the end of its course, had received severe setbacks through James I's blundering compromises with Romanists in England, compromises that continued for years after 1616 and that sorely wounded the prelates in their ascendancy, as did also their Romanizing tendencies, all of which inclined increasing numbers to give increasing support as time went on to the energetic Presbyterian Puritans, as they were more and more, as time went on from 1616 onward, aroused to oppose prelacy. These, recognizing that they ever increasingly received this support, required that no information of these matters be allowed to reach state and church quarters (15).

(7) Assured of sufficient support, the energetic Presbyterian Puritans with their supporters advanced revolutionarily to attack the fourth Anglican movement as it was combined with the state, and as it was,

because of its anti-Romanist conflict, helped by the autocratic Congregationalist movement (16). Their progress in such opposition to arbitrary prelacy was noted by the latter's sentinels in state and church united, who reported what they obscurely observed. Ever suspicious, arbitrary prelacy commanded an ecclesiastical investigation to be made, to find out whether the revolting energetic Presbyterian Puritans intended to keep the peace (17). This ecclesiastical investigation was accordingly made, but the revolting energetic Presbyterian Puritans, doubting the sincerity of their question as to peace, restrained them from returning word to their senders, which fact was noted by the united state-church sentinels (18). Then a state investigation was ordered; for antitypical Jehu was active in state as well as in church matters. But this investigation resulted as the first one resulted (19). The investigations, like the other matters connected with the English revolution, were as repeatedly made as their provoking acts were repeatedly committed. Antitypical Jehoram's sentinels reported the results as the same as those of the preceding attempt, and further announced that the progress of the oncomers was like that of revolting active Presbyterian Puritans, whom they described as progressing as insane ones (20). Hearing this, arbitrary prelacy charged that their organization be made ready, which also the supporting arbitrary Congregational movement likewise did; and thus each in his separate organization went forth to oppose the enraged Presbyterian Puritans; and in the sphere and on the subject of persecution of dissenters they became involved in strife, which increasingly progressed for years after 1616 (21).

(8) Arbitrary prelacy as repeatedly demanded to know whether peace was intended as the Presbyterian Puritans repeatedly advanced in hostility. The latter replied that peace was impossible as long as the Anglican Church so abounded in her illicit union with the arbitrary prelacy and as long as her errors of doctrine

and practice abounded (22). This answer was as oft given by act as the question was asked. The continuance of strife between these parties caused arbitrary prelacy to seek security by flight, at the same time accusing the Presbyterian Puritans, who also belonged under protest to the Anglican Church, of treachery before the arbitrary Congregational movement (23). Unleashing with all their might their sharp theologico-political arguments against arbitrary prelacy, the Presbyterian Puritans completely refuted the former in their organization; and as the involved 30 years progressed, they took away their powers, prerogatives and office, entirely abrogating these and those of their supporting clergy (24). The revolting Presbyterian Puritans by petitions, demands, *etc.*, asked parliament (Bidkar, *stabber*), which increasingly during the involved 30 years, in many of its members, and in the last 5½ years as a body, led the Puritan revolutionists in their thrusts and warfare against autocracy in church and state, to make autocratic prelacy drink the cup of oppression and persecution which they had made the purer form of Congregationalism drink, because this would be in fulfilment of the word that both of them remembered, and that was spoken by God, while they acted under the second phase of the Anglican movement, which persecuted the mouthpieces and servants of God (25); since God had declared that He had kept in mind the persecution and oppression of His saintly mouthpieces and their supporters, and that He would requite the guilty house of the oppressor and persecutor in the sphere of oppression and persecution. Hence the revolting Presbyterian Puritans requested parliament to throw these into the sphere of oppression and persecution according to the Word of God, which was done (26).

(9) The revolting Presbyterian Puritans dealt summarily with autocratic Congregationalism in its cooperation with autocratic prelacy, the type of which is found in vs. 27-29 and in 2 Chro. 22:7, 9. The harmony

of the two accounts will appear from our explanation of the antitype. The Lord arranged for the destruction of the autocratic phase of Congregationalism in connection with its cooperation with arbitrary prelacy against the revolting and exposing Presbyterian Puritans whom God had qualified to destroy the phases of that Anglican movement (7). Autocratic Congregationalism sought to escape from antitypical Jehu by evading responsibility for the fruitage that antitypical Ahab sought to get out of his spoils gotten from the oppressed Congregationalists. But the supporters of the exposing and revolting Presbyterian Puritans pursued them and found them involved in church politics, whence they took them and brought them to the Presbyterian Puritans; but they again escaped; and the Puritans charged their supporters to refute them, which they did while they were seeking to ascend to a strong position (Gur, *lion's whelp*) in the presence of a united people (Ibleam, *confluence of people*). This refutation was a partial one, after which they continued to flee the doctrinal and practical positions of the Puritans; but the effects of the refutation became complete as the opposing forces clashed in destructive conflict (Megiddo, *destruction*). These were by their supporters given respect as constituting a movement of God's more favored people, but they had no power to retain their office functions after exercising that power a year (27-29; 9).

(10) Vs. 30-37 type the destruction of the Anglican Church, which the revolutionists began to effect, first by argument and then, second, through the Long Parliament's enactments shortly after its opening. In his desperation at the need of funds, and after ruling unconstitutionally for eleven years without it, Charles I issued a call, April 13, 1640, for it to be elected and later to meet; and it assembled Nov. 11, 1640. While the Presbyterian Puritans, by 1640 joined by the compromising Congregationalists, were fighting the doctrines and practices of the Anglican Church for years

before the assembling of the Long Parliament, by Charles I's support the prelates and clergy of that Church remained in power all the years previous to the assembling of the Long Parliament. But the revolutionists in church and state after the assembling of that parliament gave their special attention to the subject of union of the arbitrary prelates and the Anglican Church; and on the Anglican Church noting this fact, it tried to beauty-parlor itself as to its theories and practices into attractiveness to the revolutionists; and in this condition it took a public position to observe the revolutionists' doings (30). Perceiving their unfriendly attitude on the subject and their increasing abridgment of her powers and privileges, she sarcastically upbraided their claims of seeking by reforms to give her prosperity, by asking whether the exposers, refuters and overthrowers of their superior, the fourth Anglican movement, could have prosperity in mind for her (31). Stung by this sarcastic upbraiding, and fixing of their hostile attention upon her in her public position, they by various inimical moves emphatically asked as to who among her adherents would support them against her; for there were many of her supporters (1) in the House of Commons, (2) in the House of Lords, and (3) among her less prominent members, who, however, under the repeated exposures of her wrong-doing, gradually and increasingly, as reform measure after reform measure passed by them was opposed by her, losing confidence in her, became increasingly opposed to her, though when the Long Parliament first assembled the bulk of its members, both in Commons and Lords, were her supporters (32).

(11) Increasingly the revolting Presbyterian Puritans by their ever-increasing demands for the reform of the Anglican Church's abuses were favorably responded to by the Commons and the Lords and their adherents, with repressive measures that withdrew one power and privilege after another from her, hurling her down by increasing degrees from her high

position unto complete disruption; for in the end they not only took away from her all her special powers and privileges, deprived her bishops of the privilege of sitting in the House of Lords as lords spiritual, deprived them of their episcopal office, imprisoned all of them, took away her revenues from church property, cast out her clergy of scandalous lives, withdrew the salaries of her clergy, dissanctioned her creed (the 39 articles), abolished her liturgy, suppressed her superstitious Romanizing usages, displaced her clergy with Puritan clergy, finally dissolving the union between her and the state. Thus they hurled her down from her high estate. In her destruction she defiled the powers of the state and its laws, while the revolting Presbyterian Puritans oppressed her and committed the most debasing indignities upon her (33). Turning from their destructive work against her, the revolting Presbyterian Puritans appropriated whatever was of value in her to themselves, including her property, influence, office of teaching and preaching, *etc.* While thus engaged they charged that, though resting under God's and man's curse, she should be disposed of with as much respect as behooved a church born from the union of the state and Romanism (34). But those who undertook to dispose of her remains found that the only things of her that remained were the memory of her creed, of her conduct and of her ministries (35). Reporting this fact to the revolting Presbyterian Puritans, the latter declared that this was in fulfilment of the forecast that the Lord made through His uncompromising mouthpiece in the days of the second phase of the Anglican movement anent its persecution of the Congregationalists at the Anglican Church's instigation, when the aforesaid mouthpiece declared that sectarians would appropriate to themselves everything belonging to the Anglican Church (except her creed, conduct and ministries) in relation to her union with the Anglican movements (36); for they forecast that everywhere in society the Anglican Church would be regarded

as refuse anent her union with the Anglican movements, and thus none would respect her memory (37).

(12) The antitype of 2 Kings 9 gives us the generalities of the Puritan revolution from 1616 to 1646 in Britain, as the less favored movement of the real people of God, in overthrowing the fourth Anglican movement and the Anglican Church; and the antitype of 2 Kings 10 gives us the detail thereon and, additionally, how absolutism in state and church was overthrown; while in a subordinate way the former chapter tells of the overthrow of the more favored movement of God's real people, and the latter chapter gives a few details thereon. These details will come out briefly as we go on in our discussion of chapter 10. The most autocratic of the Anglican movements, the second of these, had developed a counterfeit of the 70 secondarily prophets, in the archbishops and bishops, on the one hand, and in the suffragan bishops, the deans and archdeacons of the Anglican Church, on the other hand, the bulk of whom were, of course, more responsible than any others for the gross abuses of power of which that and the two following Anglican movements had become guilty. These abuses became heaven-crying; and the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans gradually came to the determination to depose all of these. But they did not at first come out plainly on this subject. Rather, their conduct for years became a living and slowly written epistle to the ecclesiastical leaders in the union of the fourth Anglican movement and the Anglican Church, and especially to the leading bishops, like Laud and Williams, and leading helpers of the hierarchy and higher clergy (2 Kings 10:1), suggesting that they set up another Anglican movement, inasmuch as they had all the organizations, teachings, ecclesiasticism and controversial materials necessary to start up such a movement (2), being sure that they select a good and just one to be enthroned, whom they should defend; for we are not to forget that the revolution at first was an agitation

merely to reform the evils of Anglicanism, and not to overthrow it (3).

(13) But overawed by the increasing opposition of the Presbyterian Puritan leaders, seconded by the bulk of the nation; which was increasingly angered by the exposures of Anglicanism made in and out of parliament, and frightened by the overthrow of the less favored (the fourth Anglican) and the more favored (the third Congregationalist) movements of God's real people, these leaders, after their efforts at reform failed, concluded that they could no more make headway against the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans (4). Accordingly, by leaders in church and parliament, as well as in the army, they gradually became subject to the Puritan Presbyterian revolutionists, agreeing to carry out their wishes; for it was a remarkable fact of those times that some who were at first supporters of the Anglican church, hierarchy and clergy took a large part in disestablishing the church and overthrowing its hierarchy and higher clergy (5). After they had acknowledged and exercised submission to, and cooperation with the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans, the latter, not only by words and acts, but also by pertinent laws passed by parliament, in which the revolutionaries as the majority were led by men like Pym, Hollis, Vane, Hampden, Cromwell, Haselrig, Selden, *etc.*, commanded their supporters as gradually as the pertinent laws were passed, to strip the hierarchy and the higher clergy of power after power, prerogative after prerogative, possession after possession and office after office, until they were unbishoped, undeanned and unarchdeaoned and with their great ones and supporters were made subject to the revolutionists' church arrangements (6). And, peculiarly, it was the former leading supporters of these that, as required by the revolutionaries, enforced these laws, and that within the time limits set by these laws; for they forced the hierarchy and higher clergy and their great ones and supporters to come into subjection to

the new church movement then formed by the reformers into antitypical Jehu; and they were brought there in harmony with the laws that they themselves, acting in one capacity, helped to make and, acting in another, to enforce. Not only were the hierarchy and higher clergy deposed, but the bishops were dispossessed of membership in the House of Lords and were imprisoned in the Tower (7).

(14) Word of such treatment of the Anglican hierarchy and higher clergy reached the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans as gradually and increasingly as this treatment gradually and increasingly went on; for this was a matter that covered years until it was brought to a completion. Thereafter the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans had them set forth very publicly unto a completion as of two distinct groups, and that through the writings of Puritans, particularly through the pertinent writings of Smectymnuus (a word formed by the initials of its six authors) and of John Milton, the brightest star on the literary firmament of contemporary Britain, as well as through the writings of less prominent lights, all of whom poured out a flood of writings against prelacy and its chief supporters (8). When the task was well done in each of its parts, the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans appeared publicly in their places, attracting the attention of the whole people on the question as to who (it was especially parliament who did it—the one-time chief support of the bishops, *etc.*) had cut off the bishops and their higher clerical adjutants, acknowledging that they had deliberately planned the overthrow of the fourth phase of the Anglican movement, and assuring the people that they were righteous in the situation (9). Then the Presbyterian Puritans told the people that they should recognize at that time that not a word of God's uncompromising mouthpiece (spoken during and anent the second phase of the Anglican movement and the Anglican Church under Elizabeth for their persecution of the saintly Puritans, Baptists, Congregationalists

and other independent Christians) was spoken in failure of fulfilment, and that God had fulfilled that word then spoken by His uncompromising mouthpiece, now before their very eyes (10). The Presbyterian Puritans continued their verbal and legal attacks against all the rest who stood for the second, third and fourth phases of the Anglican movement, as these were united with the Anglican Church, even the clergy, the principals of the laity, their sympathizers and their sacrificers, and continued it so long and thoroughly that there remained none of such (11).

(15) Then the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans turned their hostile attention to church politics, at first particularizing their attention to the part therein taken by the clergy who had been intent on fleecing the flock by tithes, fees, *etc.* (12). That the 42 brethren of Ahaziah were his cousins, as in oriental countries cousins are also called brethren, is evident from the fact that Ahaziah was the only son of Jehoram of Judah that was not slain by the Arabians (2 Chro. 21:17; 22:1). The supporters of the autocratic Congregationalist movement (antitypical Ahaziah) as alleged special helpers of the star-members (7 sets of these, totaling 49 brethren) are shown to be evil, but the special helpers of such ($42 = 6 \times 7$, 6 being the number of evil and imperfection and 7 being that of the star-member sets, $7 \times 7 = 49$); for they acted autocratically over, and fleeced the Lord's people, being overtaken in the act by the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans, who being apprized by their acts of their unshepherdly characters, and of their purpose to prosper the supporters of the fourth Anglican movement and the Anglican Church (13), charged that they all be shorn of all their powers, prerogatives, and offices in connection with the slanders occasioned by the clergy's covetousness, which was also done (14).

(16) Then the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans gave their special attention to the Long Parliament (Jehonadab, *Jehovah is bounteous*), which, consisting

in a good part of revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans, trusting in God's bountiful help and being the manager of organized British affairs (Rechab, *camel driver*), after it came into session from parliament's nearly 12 years' dissolution, became the reforming power in England in matters of state and church, and in a friendly and helpful spirit approached the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans. These, constituting a large part, yea, the majority of the English people, especially of the Londoners, sought to win parliament to its side and expressed loyalty to it. Little by little and more and more parliament made a favorable response to their desires; and they pledged mutual support and cooperation. Thereafter parliament was taken by the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans into their organization (15). The latter desired the former to witness their zeal for God and God's cause; and thus unitedly these two groups worked together against the fourth Anglican movement, the Anglican Church and the autocratic king, court and army (16). On entering the sphere of church politics, they cut off every supporter of the Anglican Church, particularly those who make politics of religion, even setting aside the Book of Common Prayer, the 39 Articles and the canons of the Anglican Church—in a word, disrupted entirely the Anglican Church, its organization, officers, liturgy, creed and laws, all this in fulfilment of God's Word spoken by His uncompromising mouthpiece (17).

(17) We now come to the overthrow of power-grasping and lording it over God's people as this is typed in vs. 18-29. Through the revolutionary agitations, partly along religious lines and more along the lines of state and church politics in the Long Parliament, the Presbyterian Puritans gathered the British people together along the lines of excitement and partisanship on the involved questions. Their acts of taking more and more of the king's and bishops' powers to themselves gave the people the idea that they in their religious domain were going to act more

autocratically than the second phase of the Anglican movement (18). These acts were a charge that all the propagandists of absolutism in its power-grasping and lording and their supporters and sacrificers, without exception, be gathered together as a party separate and distinct from the liberty-lovers; their conduct giving the impression that they were going at great self-denial to sacrifice to the principle of autocracy in state and church and to cut off all privileges of those power-grasping lords, their supporters and sacrificers who failed to join in this service to power-grasping and lording. At the time, while giving these impressions, they hid their purpose to put down the tyranny of the autocrats (19). The revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans caused to be proclaimed that fasts, watchings, prayers, sermons and speeches be had in and out of parliament anent this work (20). These agitations and proclamations aroused the attention of all England and resulted in the autocrats assembling into one party, some of whom did their assembling about the autocratic King Charles I, *i.e.*, in the state, the others about the autocratic Archbishop Laud, *i.e.*, in the Anglican Church. And the stress of partisanship was so great that all autocratically inclined assembled to this party in its two aspects. These assembled in the sphere of serving autocracy, which was filled from end to end (21).

(18) The revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans came in concealed hostility to the sphere of serving autocracy, as though they would support it, and so pressed matters on the lawyers and judges that these were charged to invest by their legal opinions the autocrats with the authorization to further autocracy. This these lawyers and judges did in setting forth such legal points as gave precedents of autocracy in British history and courts, a thing that, among other ways, shows itself in Hampden's appeal to the high court against the king's tyranny being overruled by the majority of that court (22). These Presbyterian Puritans in the religious

sphere and the Long Parliament, largely Puritan, as the organized director of the revolutionists, in the religious and political sphere came to the sphere of autocracy and by their course charged that no liberty-lover be permitted in that sphere, but only the autocrats and their supporters were to be there (23). As the autocrats lent their services to autocracy, even to the degree of Charles' appearing, in gross violation of parliament's rights, in parliament to arrest its five leading anti-autocratic members, and of his assembling an army and declaring war on parliament, which in accepting the challenge declared that its army was fighting to rescue the king from his abductors (subtlety, v. 19), the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans arranged for their best debaters to be stationed about the active autocrats and their supporters as they were serving autocracy, but outside its sphere, and by word and act charged these to refute in detail such, and warned them that at their peril would they fail in this refutative work (24).

(19) But as soon as the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans finished their pretended service of autocracy, they charged the champions of anti-autocracy to fight these in state and church in the arena of debate, *e.g.*, Hampden, refusing to pay an illegal tax called ship tax, appealed his cause to the courts and won the argument, though the majority of the court in fear of the king decided against him; but the nation in its large majority favored his argument. Milton and lesser lights poured out one pamphlet and book after another in the conflict. Pym and others in parliament made one unanswerable speech after another against autocracy, blaming, not the king ("The king can do no wrong"), but his civil and ecclesiastical ministers. In the argument the autocrats and their supporters were completely refuted. The agitation became so overwhelming that Lord Stratford, Charles I's chief political adviser and supporter, and Laud, his chief religious adviser and supporter, were impeached and beheaded;

and the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans, casting out of office all autocrats, overthrew the Anglican Church as the religious government of autocracy (25). All the theories of autocracy as theories and the practices flowing out of them they overthrew, and by the civil war that ensued they broke up the whole structure of autocracy and, defiling it, left it as an unclean thing in theory and practice (27). In this way autocracy was from then to this day left in wreck and ruins, no more in Britain to come into power (28).

(20) But while the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans destroyed autocracy in state and church, they fostered without deviation clericalism and sectarianism, which had been introduced unto making Protestantism idolistic, by the first phase of the Lutheran movement; for they favored Presbyterianism, which under their sanction and appointment drew up the Westminster Confession and catechisms and a form of worship for the church, as they favored the various sects of that time, particularly Presbyterianism and Congregationalism (29). By His providences and the principles of His Word God approved of the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans' executing His word and will on the Anglican movements and the Anglican Church, and promised them long, but not perpetual continuance as the less favored movement of His real people (30). However, they did not take heed to walk wholeheartedly in the Truth then due and to eschew clericalism and sectarianism as taught in the Word; for they continued to advocate and practice these sins as introduced into Protestantism by the first Lutheran movement (31). It was in the period of the first phase of the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans (1616-1646) that the Romanists made invasions and conquest in Britain and Germany. This began through the compromising spirit of James I, who, to win as a bride for Charles the daughter of Spain's Romanist king, yielded much to Rome in withholding support from his son-in-law, attacked by the Austrian and Spanish

Romanists in the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648).

(21) Failing to win her as the bride of Charles, he entered into compromises with Romanism to win Henrietta, a bigoted Romanist and daughter of France's king, as a bride for Charles. Successful therein, he had to permit many liberties to Romanists in Britain, contrary to law and the strong convictions of the bulk of his Britons. Henrietta was involved in the arousing of the Irish in the Irish massacres, in which in Ulster alone 154,000 were massacred or exiled, besides untold thousands undergoing these fates in other parts of Ireland. During the civil war Henrietta absconded from England with the royal jewels and with their purchase price hired Romanist soldiers (B 340, 341) to invade England to help her husband, Charles I, against the parliament's army. Charles' favoring Romanists for Henrietta's sake, who urged him on to autocratic acts ("Be a *king*," which she understood to mean to rule autocratically, as did the French kings), British Romanists flocked to his standard against parliament and did some of the chief fighting in his army. Through these compromises Romanists not only gained a measure of temporary control in Britain and Ireland (Gilead, *rough*, Manassites, *forgetters*), but did the same in Germany (Reuben, *lo, a son*) and Bohemia and Moravia (Gad, *fortunate*), in all of which, from Britain (Gilead) to Protestantism abroad (Bashan, *campaign country*), Britain as the chief Protestant power had and should have preserved Protestant influence (Jordan, *descender*, eastward), but lost it unto restrained Romanism (Aroer, *enclosure*) and her tumultuous (Arnon, *noisy*) adherents (33). These and other deeds and powers of the first phase of the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans are abundantly described in the historical works, especially in those of British historians treating of the years 1616-1646 (34). They have been in respectful remembrance by the rightly informed, in unison with their Puritan predecessors for their deeds as to church

politics, and were succeeded by the Presbyterian (Jehoahaz, *Jehovah keeps*) Puritans in a reconstructing but weak phase (35), after serving out their full period in church politics (36).

(22) Jehu was succeeded in 875 B.C. by his son Jehoahaz (*Jehovah preserves*—a name given to him in allusion to God's preserving this king and his antitype despite many adverse circumstances, 2 K. 13:1), who reigned for 14 years, according to the compared dates of his reign with those of Joash of Judah; hence he reigned until 861 B.C. Paralleling his reign is the course of the Presbyterian Puritans (from 1646 to 1660; see the chronological tables in P '40, 181, 182), who as the antitype of Jehoahaz pursued a half-way revolutionary course as to autocracy in state and church, and therefore may, in contrast with antitypical Jehu, who was energetically revolutionary, be called compromisingly revolutionary. During the antitypical Jehu phase the Presbyterian Puritans as revolutionists were supported especially by Congregationalist Puritans, and in a very minor, yea, almost negligible degree, by the Baptist Puritans. And as long as the first two had autocracy in state and church to deal with as their opponents, *i.e.*, during the period of antitypical Jehu, they held together quite well, despite their disagreement on matters of church government. But shortly after they had conquered autocracy in state and church, *i.e.*, shortly after the antitypical Jehoahaz phase set in, differences between them began to appear. The Presbyterian Puritans had their main power in the Long Parliament, which they controlled, while the Congregationalist Puritans had their main power in the army, which was overwhelmingly Congregational, and whose ablest and most successful leader was the Congregationalist Oliver Cromwell. The latter as warrior, statesman and ruler was one of the greatest of Englishmen; yea, it is doubtful if ever another Englishman from a combination of these three standpoints ever equaled him. He was a sincere patriot

desiring his beloved England's welfare, to secure which he fought to a complete defeat the army of Charles I, that of the Irish revolutionists and that of the Scotch royalists. But to secure England's welfare he at times violated features of the English constitution and laws.

(23) As a whole the Jehoahaz phase was an evil one (v. 2). It so greatly favored *sectarianism* as to have induced its majority in parliament to set it up as the state religion in England, putting the Westminster Confession forth as the creed in place of the Anglican Church's 39 Articles, and its directory of worship in the place of the former's Common Prayer. Yea, it went so far as to authorize a law to put to death deniers of the trinity, Christ's divinity, the resurrection of the body and free-will asserters, and to imprison deniers of Presbyterianism. Such a law was directly opposed to the Congregational doctrine of tolerance for all Protestants and Jews, and aroused Cromwell's unrelenting and successful opposition. Again, the Presbyterian Puritans sought to organize the religion of England on the Presbyterian model of national assemblies, provincial synods and district and local presbyteries, which again greatly outraged the Congregationalists, as this was *clericalism*, and which again Cromwell as their leader unrelentingly and successfully opposed. In championing sectarianism and clericalism the Presbyterians were guilty of the two sins of the first Lutheran movement (followed the sins of Jeroboam). But there were other evils that antitypical Jehoahaz committed, among which were things that compromised the revolutionary spirit and the fight against Romanism. One of these was their insistence on a union of state and their church, which also antagonized the Congregationalists, especially in the army. Shortly after Charles I fell into the hands of the Long Parliament, *i.e.*, 1646, the Presbyterian Puritans in parliament, contrary to the Congregationalist party in the army, and to secure Cromwell's elimination, sought to effect a reconciliation with Charles

that would have greatly compromised the effects of antitypical Jehu's revolution. This step was effectually stopped by Cromwell's interposition with the army. The Presbyterian Puritans, seeing that the army was getting an overweening influence in English affairs, sought to disband it, which, supported by the army, Cromwell prevented. Of course, the clashes between parliament and the army weakened antitypical Jehoahaz, whose main strength was in parliament.

(24) Just as the Presbyterian majority in parliament was about to effect a reconciliation with Charles I, and to restore him to royalty under conditions which would have given him again the opportunity to tyrannize over England and eliminate Cromwell, the latter sent Col. Pride with two regiments to surround the parliament house and exclude the Presbyterian majority from their seats. This done, the 60 Congregationalist parliamentarians became the sole members of that body and were resultantly called the "Rump Parliament." This act took away from antitypical Jehoahaz all parliamentary power and, of course, greatly weakened them. Great differences arose between many Presbyterian Puritans and the army, because the latter, after seeking a reconciliation with Charles I, found him as deceitful in negotiations as the Presbyterian Puritans had just previously found him to be, and therefore the army and the Rump Parliament decided that Charles must be tried as a tyrant, a traitor and an enemy of the English people. Finding him guilty as charged, they caused him to be beheaded. Upon the Congregationalist Puritans fell the main odium for Charles' execution, since they constituted the parliament that ordered his trial on capital charges, the army and the Londoners clamoring for his death. But part of the evil effect of the king's beheading, Jan. 30, 1649, fell upon the Presbyterian Puritans and contributed also to their ever-increasing weakness, though they tried to save Charles I from the block, for which their weakness made them incapable. Cromwell's

insistence on tolerance for all Protestants and Jews undermined some of antitypical Jehoahaz's influence. Cromwell's absolutism made a reaction in favor of the restoration of the Stuarts to England's throne, in favor of which the Presbyterian Puritans, in one of their huge and fatal compromises, worked. Their course therein gave antitypical Jehoahaz a mortal blow; for it opened the flood gates for a Romanist inundation. Contributory also to their fall on this line were two other things: (1) the inefficiency of Richard Cromwell, who at his father's death succeeded him as Protector of the English Commonwealth, as the English government and nation were called under Oliver Cromwell's rulership, for his inefficiency threw England into disorder and made order-loving people turn toward the monarchy; and (2) the deceitful course of General Monk, who by intrigue created a situation whereby he and the Presbyterian Puritans arranged for Charles' son, the later Charles II, to return and take England's throne.

(25) Various of the acts of antitypical Jehoahaz set forth in the preceding two paragraphs increasingly turned the Lord against this phase of the revolutionists, antitypical Jehoahaz; and this resulted in many misfortunes coming upon the English people (anger ... against Israel, v. 3). This anger of the Lord brought in punishment several things, mentioned in the preceding two paragraphs, upon antitypical Jehoahaz and the English people. In addition to these things, the following may be mentioned as contributory thereto: Charles as Prince of Wales entered Scotland, whose hereditary king he was, and aroused the Scots to make war on England. Cromwell met them at Dunbar, Sept. 3, 1650, and completely crushed their army; and a year later to the day, at Worcester, he crushed the army of the Prince of Wales, who with another army, just before Dunbar, had invaded England from Scotland. These encounters weakened antitypical Jehoahaz: for the Scotch (Presbyterians) were in

religious alliance with the Presbyterian Puritans of England. Moreover, these victories aroused foreign Romanists to side with Charles. Cromwell's severe handling of the Romanist Irish revolutionists, for their cruel massacres of, and other wrongs against Irish Protestants, greatly aroused Romanist anger in England, Ireland, Spain, France, Italy and Austria against both the English Congregationalist Puritans and Presbyterian Puritans; and from Romanist machinations trouble was stirred up in England and in foreign countries against England. Charles' escape from England, after his defeat by Cromwell, to France and his intrigues there against both English revolutionary parties made no end of trouble for them—trouble that arose not only amid direct oppositional Romanist works *religiously* against England (hand of Hazael, v. 3), but also *politically* through the alliances that first Cromwell and later Charles II made with France and through Romanist political works within England (hand of Ben-hadad)—trouble that was of many years' duration against England, continuing even after James II was driven out of England in 1688 (all their days: literally, all days, the rest of antitypical Hazael's and all of antitypical Ben-hadad's).

(26) The earlier calamities of antitypical Jehoahaz's reign led its adherents to repentance and to pleading mercy from the Lord, who extended them mercy (besought the Lord ... harkened unto him, v. 4), and who had compassion upon them as to their oppressions from Romanists in England, Ireland and Scotland (oppression ... king of Syria oppressed them). The Lord gave them deliverance through Oliver Cromwell's victories over the Irish (1649), Scotch (1650) and English (1651) Romanists (gave Israel a saviour ... from under the hand of the Syrians, v. 5), so that so far as Britain and Ireland were concerned they dwelt in safety (Israel dwelt ... as beforetime). Thus we see that some of the events mentioned in preceding paragraphs were, through Cromwell, deliverances

to the English people and the compromising Presbyterian Puritan revolutionists, antitypical Jehoahaz, from Romanist machinations. Despite these delivering acts neither antitypical Jehoahaz nor the English people gave up sectarianism [the calf at Bethel] and clericalism [the calf at Dan], set up by the first Lutheran movement (departed not from the sins ... of Jeroboam, v. 6); for the first Lutheran movement in these two ways led Protestantism in its less favored movements of God's people greatly to sin (made Israel sin). And the virtual union of state and church in feebler manner than that which characterized the various Anglican movements and the Anglican Church still persisted in church and state politics (remained the grove [where unchaste acts occurred] also in Samaria). These wrongs continued to be punished by the Lord until antitypical Jehoahaz was rendered quite powerless; for while Cromwell and his parliaments did not persecute them, they reduced them for their sectarianism and clericalism to impotence (leave ... Jehoahaz but fifty ... ten ... ten thousand, v. 7); for his victorious fights with Romanists continually drew away the support of the people from antitypical Jehoahaz and gave it to him; and thus by indirect effect (threshing) the Romanists (king of Syria) brought about their impotence (destroyed).

(27) The historians of the period of antitypical Jehoahaz have very detailedly discussed this period (1646-1660) and the events of the compromising revolutionaries, antitypical Jehoahaz (acts ... written ... chronicles, v. 8); and by the recall of the Prince of Wales to England and by his turning his back to them after becoming Charles II, though they were the chief ones who brought about his return, they came to an end as the compromising Presbyterian Puritan revolutionaries (slept ... buried, v. 9); and for the next 18 years the Presbyterian Puritans became the persecuted and resurgent revolutionaries, as antitypical Jehoash, or Joash of Israel (Joash ...

in his stead). But all through antitypical Jehoahaz's period, directly by their attacks and revolutions and indirectly, as explained above, by Cromwell's victories over them, the Romanist revolutionaries oppressed this phase of the antitypical Jehu dynasty and the English as antitypical Israel (Hazeal ... oppressed Israel all the days of Jehoahaz, v. 22). But because of their relation to the Covenant in God, Christ and the Little Flock (respect ... covenant ... Jacob, v. 23), God favored (gracious ... had compassion) both antitypical Jehoahaz, as His less favored movement, and the English, as His antitypical Israel, and did not cast them off nor take His favor from them, but punished them measurably, for their reformation (not destroy ... cast ... presence, face, *i.e.*, favor).

(28) We now come to the study of the parallel of Jehoash, otherwise called Joash, of Israel, 861-843 B.C., and his antitype, the Presbyterian Puritans as persecuted but reawakening revolutionaries, 1660-1678. For these dates please see the tables on pages 274-277. The Biblical or typical events on this phase of the parallel are described in 2 Kings 13:10-21, 24, 25. We will here omit the study of the war between Jehoash (*Jehovah secures*, in allusion to God's increasingly making Protestantism safe in England, vs. 10, 12) and Amaziah of Judah, since it will be treated in connection with the study of the parallel of Amaziah. According to a comparison of vs. 22 and 24, 25, Hazeal died during Jehoash's reign. Hazeal in this parallel seems to type Romanism as a predominantly *religious* opponent of Presbyterian Puritans as persecuted but reawakening revolutionaries; and Ben-hadad seems to type it as a predominantly *political* opponent of such revolutionaries, while in each feature the other feature's characteristics is less prominently present. The fulfilled facts give this thought. Charles II, 1660-1685, the son of Charles I, was invited to return to England and to receive the crown by almost unanimous desire of England, the invitation coming mainly through

antitypical Jehoahaz and Gen. Monk, the English nobility and the royalist supporters of his father. His character was one of the most depraved of English kings. He had 16 known mistresses, many of whom he ennobled and whom he loaded with costly favors, at expense of the state, and at least 13 bastard children, most of whom he ennobled, while he neglected and mistreated his legitimate wife, who pined away in worse than widowhood. Most of his youth and young manhood (he being just 30 on his return) he spent in profligacy in France; and on his return he headed the most unchaste, blasphemous and frivolous court ever to reign in England; and out from it flowed a deep and wide stream of profligacy, frivolity and blasphemy, defiling the nobility and other higher classes of England. Trained as a secret Romanist by his bigoted Romanist mother, Henrietta, queen of Charles I, to gain the crown of Scotland he professed Presbyterianism, taking the oath of the League and Covenant, and persecuting all dissenters; and to gain England's crown he professed Anglicanism, likewise persecuting all dissenters. His whole course was one of enmity to the Puritans of all classes—Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist and Quaker—and of favor to Romanism, all of the while pretending to be a member of the Anglican Church, the head of which he as king was *ex officio*. His hand very ungratefully rested most heavily upon the Presbyterian Puritans, now antitypical Jehoash, to whom as antitypical Jehoahaz above all he owed his return and throne.

(29) Scarcely seated on his throne, he ordered the trial and execution of those most concerned in his father's death. These were permitted no defense, 14 of whom he had hanged, drawn (their vital organs torn out and burned in their sight) and quartered (their yet living bodies cut into four quarters), Charles II nearby watching the scene; and 15 he had imprisoned, a treatment very similar to that of the 14 being accorded to the dead bodies of Cromwell, his

son-in-law Ireton, and Bradshaw, the head of the court that condemned Charles I, which were disinterred for the purpose from their graves in Westminster Abbey. Pym's and Blake's bodies were disinterred from the same Abbey and were buried in St. Margaret's churchyard. Similar indignities were offered the bodies of Cromwell's mother and eldest daughter despite their having been models of female virtue. Charles restored wherever possible to all royalists their property confiscated by the revolutionists. He restored the Anglican Church to her place as the state church by the Corporation Act, passed in 1661, by which he required all public officials and army and naval officers to foreswear the League and Covenant, by oath to deny that a subject under any circumstance had a right to resist the king, and publicly to profess Anglicanism and join the national church, an act that cut off all Puritans from public office, steps that favored Romanism, because Anglicanism was half Romanist, and because it weakened Rome's enemies, the Puritans of all creeds, who were genuine Protestants. He then, 1662, caused the Act of Uniformity to be passed, whereby non-conforming ministers to his type of Anglicanism (the Presbyterian Puritans having for a century been the Evangelical wing of the Anglican Church) were to the number of over 2,000 driven from their pulpits and parsonages and were forbidden to be teachers, even of secular subjects, whereby they were reduced to abjectest poverty. This Act he followed with the Conventicle Act, whereby assemblies of five or more were forbidden, unless the Anglican Common Prayer were used. To this he added the Five Miles Act, which forbade the ejected Puritan ministers to come within five miles of a church in which they had formerly preached either regularly or occasionally or but once as a supply. These two Acts resulted in filling English prisons with the best men and some true saints in England. Even before, *i.e.*, in 1660, he ordered the

imprisonment of Independent Puritans who refused to cease preaching, which resulted in John Bunyan's 12 years' imprisonment in Bedford jail, where and when he wrote a number of his best works, including his immortal *Pilgrim's Progress*, the most wide-spread and popular of English religious books, and in the repeated imprisonment of star-member George Fox, the Little Flock leader of the movement later perverted into Quakerism. His first Declaration of Indulgence, 1662, parliament and the people forced him to withdraw, 1663, because they saw that it was actually shielding Romanists, though ostensibly also favoring the Puritans, who could, however, get no benefit from it because of the Corporation and Uniformity Acts.

(30) While he persecuted all Puritans as non-conformists, he singled out the adherents of George Fox as the especial targets for his shafts of oppression and persecution; and in a few years 12,000 of them were languishing in jail, this being the number of them released from prison in 1672 under his second Declaration of Indulgence, whereby also John Bunyan obtained his freedom. Through his agents he most fiendishly persecuted the Scotch Covenanters. Though sworn to the League and Covenant to uphold Presbyterianism in Scotland, he most violently sought to overthrow it and put Episcopacy into its place; and he met resistance to these two measures by war, imprisonment, execution, exile and starvation. In 1662 he caused an Act to be passed requiring all Scotch Presbyterian ministers to be reinstated into their charges at the hands of bishops, ejecting all who refused to comply, to the number of 350. He greatly outraged English feelings by marrying a Romanist princess, the daughter of the Portuguese king. He allowed Romanist priests, monks and nuns, especially Jesuits, to swarm back to England, contrary to the law prohibiting their presence in England. His selling to Romanist Louis XIV Dunkirk, which the latter had given England for Cromwell's successful help of

him against Spain, greatly outraged the English people, as a national humiliation. Entering into a secret treaty (The Treaty of Dover) with Louis XIV by which he agreed for an annual pension of 3,000,000 francs publicly to profess Romanism whenever conditions in England seemed to make it practicable, to accept Louis' promise of 6,000 French soldiers in case England would revolt at his act of professing Romanism, and in alliance with Romanist France to declare war against the Dutch, in order to break up that Protestant power, he brought England into a most unprofitable war with Holland and deeply insulted his people, in that he, their sovereign, should have sunk so low and disgraced them so blatantly, by becoming a pensioner of France. In 1672 he passed a second Declaration of Indulgence to all religions and their professors, intended by him to advance Romanizing England, whose favoring he could secure only, if he gave tolerance to English Puritans, which resulted in freeing from prison tens of thousands of Puritans, including, among others, 12,000 Quakers and John Bunyan. Knowing his Romanist intent therein, parliament refused him supplies for his war against Holland until he rescinded the part of his Declaration that tolerated Romanists. All of his acts set forth in this and the preceding paragraph were, and were intended by him to be, favorable to Rome; and almost all of them were blows at Protestantism; and those of them which were not such blows were as they were, because they were in the ultimate interest of Romanism and favored Protestantism as an indispensable means to that end, as show his two Declarations of Indulgence.

(31) Now let us see the relation of the course of Charles II from 1660 to 1678 to the type of Hazael, Ben-hadad and Jehoash. While some of the above acts were preponderantly *religiously* favorable to Romanism, and are therefore to be viewed as acts of antitypical Hazael, the bulk of them were preponderantly *politically* favorable to Romanism, and therefore are to

be viewed as acts of antitypical Ben-hadad, but in all cases they were acts against antitypical Jehoash, persecuted and reviving Presbyterian Puritan revolutionaries. The pertinent acts of the latter were mainly *political* (Jehoash ... reign over Israel in *Samaria* [*guard, watch*], v. 10). Antitypical Jehoash continued to practice sectarianism and clericalism (sins of Jeroboam, v. 11), as well as did wrong in other ways. They favored some of Charles' measures, *e.g.*, the punishment of the regicides, oppression of the Independent Puritans, *i.e.*, Congregationalists, Baptists, Quakers, *etc.*, and submission to many of his oppressive acts (did that which was evil). Their acts are set forth in the writings of historians, particularly church historians (acts of Joash ... written in ... chronicles of Israel, v. 12). This policy—persecuted but reviving revolutionism—ceased to be the reigning policy in 1678 (Joash slept, v. 13), when it was succeeded by an aggressive revolutionistic policy, which utterly overthrew Romanist attacks on England and preserved tolerance for Protestants of all sects (Jeroboam [II, contention of the people, in allusion to their striving for the rights of the people] sat upon the throne). The Jehoash phase, as said above, was one mainly occupied with the political side of Presbyterian Puritanism, and was set aside as a reigning policy as such (Joash was buried in Samaria). The Puritan period so far considered was one in which God used first uncompromising mouthpieces (Elijah) toward His people, nominal and real, then later more or less compromising mouthpieces (Elisha), both kinds of mouthpieces together prevailing for about 90 years, *i.e.*, from about 1582, when Robert Browne began to function, to about 1672, when brethren like Baxter, Howe, Bunyan and Barclay, respectively representatives of Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist and Quaker Puritans, began to cease acting as God's compromising mouthpiece, under repressive measures of antitypical Hazael and Ben-hadad, weakening (sick, v. 14); and about 1672

ceased to function as such (died). Persecuted but reviving revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans resorted to these for comfort and counsel (Joash came down to him), mourning over their condition (wept over his face), expressing deep respect and filial affection (my father, my father) and much concern over the weak organization that antitypical Joash had (the chariot of Israel) and the leaders thereof, who were faultful, weak and harassed (the horsemen thereof).

(32) The symbolic visit was a long-drawn-out one. It began about 1662, when Charles' oppressive legislation began to weigh heavily on antitypical Jehoash, and continued until about 1672. Antitypical Elisha armed antitypical Joash with the knowledge of the sharp pertinent controversial truths (Take ... arrows, v. 15) to meet the devious course of Charles' Rome-favoring acts, and with the organization and Biblical passages and facts (bow, whose wood types the organization, and string the passages and facts) to shoot forth these truths. Antitypical Joash availed himself of these (took unto him bow and arrows). Then antitypical Elisha encouraged antitypical Joash to lay hold powerfully on the pertinent organization and Bible passages and facts (Put thine hand upon the bow, v. 16), which they did (put his hand). To their power antitypical Elisha gave their powerful support (Elisha put his hands upon the king's hands). Then antitypical Elisha charged antitypical Joash to act in the matter publicly in the interests of the Gospel (Open the window eastward, literally, toward the rising of the sun, v. 17). This they did (opened it). Then came the charge, Shoot, which was done (Shoot. And he shot). This entire scene, so far enacted as a pantomime forecast, was fulfilled in 1663, as follows: In 1662 Charles II issued his first Declaration of Indulgence, a thing that on its face seemed to decree tolerance for all Christian sects. But its real purpose was to protect and further Romanism, which was not covered by the Corporation and Uniformity Acts. Hence, these two

Acts, still applying to Protestants exclusively, could be enforced against them; but not applying to Romanists, the latter in the end, according to Charles' intention, would be the only ones benefited by the first Declaration of Indulgence. Antitypical Elisha, perceiving this, aroused antitypical Joash in and out of parliament, which included almost all Englishmen, to use their organization, Bible passages and facts to propel the sharp truths of Protestant anti-Romanism against this Declaration. As a result a determined agitation throughout parliament and the English public set in with such mighty force as compelled Charles to withdraw this Declaration. Foreseeing this result, in itself given here as a forecast of the future full victory of God's truth against Romanism in Britain, antitypical Elisha described it prophetically with emphasis as a forecast, to be hoped, of deliverance from Romanism in Britain (arrow ... arrow of deliverance from Syria). He added that it prophesied that antitypical Joash would defeat the Romanists (smite the Syrians) as led, secretly, by Charles II, in their power (Aphék, *strength*) unto overcoming them in their pertinent plans (consumed them). The fulfilment of this pantomime forecast was given above, because in the subsequent narrative it is not mentioned, while the fulfilment of the threefold striking with the arrows is later given, as factual fulfillments of the pertinent forecasts.

(33) Continuing the pantomime forecast antitypical Elisha charged antitypical Joash to lay hold on all the rest of the controversial truths against Romanism, which he gave them (Take the arrows, v. 18). This antitypical Joash did (did so). Then antitypical Elisha told him to smite with this Romanism's political social earth (Smite upon the ground). In pantomime antitypical Joash did this only three times (smite thrice) and then ceased so doing (and stayed), *i.e.*, on only three points did he use these truths against Romanist political and social arrangements in relation to England. When describing the fulfilment as typed in v. 25, we

will set forth the antitypical facts. Antitypical Elisha was displeased at this manifestation of little zeal and aggressiveness (was wroth with him, v. 19), telling him that full zeal and aggressiveness would have moved him to smite five or six times (shouldst have smitten five or six times), thereby indicating that a proper zeal and aggressiveness would utterly overthrow Romanism (smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it), whereas their incomplete zeal and aggressiveness would not result in a complete overthrow of Romanism in England (smite Syria but thrice). We are to understand that before each one of the three blows in the antitype antitypical Elisha gave the charge to smite the Romanist works of Charles II. Hence we believe that antitypical Elisha's ceasing to function as God's mouthpiece from the standpoint of separate and distinct pictures was a little time before 1674, when the last of the three defeats was administered to the Romanists as they acted in Charles II. Thus antitypical Elisha ceased to function about 1672, as Rome was about to get the third blow in England that bade her pause (Elisha died, v. 20), and was kept in deep respect by the Puritans of all branches (buried him). With their supporters the wicked Cabal ministry (1667-1673), that negotiated the Treaty of Dover, 1670, whereby Charles for 3,000,000 francs agreed publicly to profess Romanism, to aid Romanist France in a war against Protestant Holland and to receive 6,000 French soldiers on English soil to defend him against a possible revolution raised by his open profession of Romanism, was in their autocracy guilty of many corrupt acts against England politically (Moabites invaded the land). On every opportunity they committed corruption (at the coming of the year).

(34) The exposure of the existence of the infamous Treaty of Dover—so disgraceful to England—forced, in 1673, the resignation of the Cabal ministry. In their cast-off condition they and the bulk of their supporters continued to be political pirates, except

their ablest representative, the Earl of Shaftesbury (Ashley Cooper) and his supporters, who as reformed became dead to them; and as they were ridding themselves of these (they were burying a man, v. 21) their attention was attracted by the agitation over the Titus Oates' and others' outcries of murderous popish plots, which proved to be base inventions, but which were believed in widely, and which stirred up in 1678 Protestant vigilantes to counteractive measures (behold, they spied a band of men). As the majority of the defunct Cabal ministry and their remaining supporters took note of these measures they cast off the Earl of Shaftesbury and his adherents (cast ... sepulchre of Elisha) into contact with the memorials of antitypical Elisha, and in that cast-off and contacting condition these (touched the bones of Elisha) were revived in their British and Protestant patriotism (revived). Thereupon as a counteractive measure he and his supporters caused to pass through both houses of parliament a bill disqualifying all Romanists, except the Duke of York, Charles II's staunch Romanist brother, from sitting in parliament, a law that for over 150 years debarred all Romanists from membership in either house (he stood up on his feet). Vs. 22, 23, having been expounded while antitypical Jehoahaz was being described, we pass by here. It was, as shown above, during antitypical Joash's days (1660-1678) that the Romanism conflict changed in England's experience from a preponderantly religious fight (Hazeal ... died, v. 24) into a predominately political fight (Ben-hadad his son reigned in his stead). And on political lines antitypical Joash—the Presbyterian Puritans as persecuted but revived revolutionaries—drew to their side the Congregationalist, Baptist and Quaker Puritans as religious bodies that Romanists alienated from them during the days of antitypical Jehoahaz, 1646-1660 (Jehoash ... took again ... the cities ... his father, v. 25).

(35) This occurred through a threefold conflict (three times ... beat him) waged against Charles II as the secret leader of political Romanism in England, which conflict will now be described. Still persisting in his attempts to favor Romanists Charles II made a second Declaration of Indulgence, 1672, ostensibly aimed to free all sects from legal disabilities. By now the Presbyterian Puritans had gained much influence in parliament. They recognized that Charles sought to give Romanists liberties forbidden by law. They therefore, by their own members in parliament and others that these convinced of Charles' purpose, refused to vote him supplies until he would withdraw his Declaration. This made him give up his second Declaration of Indulgence; but parliament granted this indulgence to all Protestant sects and excluded Romanists from it. This was the first of the three victories of antitypical Joash over antitypical Ben-hadad; and this victory did its part in freeing the Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist and Quaker churches from Charles II's oppression. As a result John Bunyan was freed from his 12-year confinement in Bedford jail; and 12,000 Quakers got their freedom from prison. The second victory of antitypical Joash over antitypical Ben-hadad was this: Charles had filled many political and civil offices with Romanists, and had made a very large number of them military and naval officers. To break this up and thus deliver England from being betrayed to her Romanist enemies antitypical Joash in parliament passed, 1673, a law called the Test Act, requiring (1) all civil, political, military and naval officers to deny all specifically Romanist doctrines, (2) to belong to, and (3) to commune in the Anglican Church. This law forced the retirement of all Romanists, including the Duke of York, Charles' brother and heir to the throne, who was also commander-in-chief of the navy, from their offices in these four branches of public service, and certainly was a great victory over political Romanism. The third victory of antitypical Joash over

antitypical Ben-hadad was their forcing the dissolution of the Treaty of Dover. This disgraceful treaty, that made the English king a pensioner of Romanist France and offered him 6,000 French soldiers to put down an English uprising at Charles' intended announcement of his going over to Rome, and that made it fight Protestant Holland for Rome, was to the extremist degree a humiliation of Britain, and was most deeply resented by practically the entire English people. Antitypical Joash outside, in and through parliament denounced, 1674, the treaty and forced Charles to give up the alliance with France, to make peace with Holland, 1674, and to withdraw Protestant England's support of Romanist Louis XIV in his war against Protestant Holland. That infamous treaty was kept a secret from 1670 until 1673; and on its becoming known an outraged public sentiment forced the overthrow of the Cabal ministry, which had negotiated it, as well as moved parliament to take the three steps set forth in the second preceding sentence. A decidedly Protestant ministry succeeding the Cabal ministry kept Charles in check until the Joash phase ended.

(36) The antitypical Jeroboam II phase, 1678-1730 (parallel years are 846-791 B.C.; see pages 275-277), witnessed the complete overthrow of religious and political Romanism in Britain, so far as controllership in its affairs is concerned, as it witnessed the full enjoyment of tolerance on the part of the non-conformists, non-Anglicans—a thing that grew stronger throughout this entire phase. First the historical events in the development of these two sets of activities will be set forth; then their relation to the type of Jeroboam's activities and accomplishments will be shown. These events form a very large part of the history of religious and political England during the period, 1678-1730. By the year 1678 the bulk of the British people became fully convinced that Charles II, backed by Louis XIV of France, was intent on ruining English liberty, trampling on English law, introducing Romanism

as the state religion in England and Romanizing the English people. Taking advantage of such a state of the public mind, Titus Oates, first an apostate Baptist preacher, then a Romanist pervert, then a Jesuit, then an adventurer, an imposter and an unequaled falsifier, spread widely a lying invention that the Jesuits were on the eve of executing a plan to murder the king and parliament, then overthrow Protestantism by a Romanist uprising in England and a Romanist invasion from Spain and France and bring England into subjection to the papacy. His ever-growing and gruesome stories gained such popular credence as engrossed the attention of parliament, before which, at its invitation, he gave details on his exposures of the alleged conspiracy.

(37) It was as a result of this agitation that Lord Shaftesbury caused his bill mentioned above to pass through parliament disqualifying Romanists from sitting in either house of parliament. It also resulted in the trial and execution of many prominent innocent Romanists. This agitation and the desire to prevent the exposure of the worst feature of Charles II's disgraceful bargain with Louis XIV moved him to agree to the dissolution of his partisan parliament, the Cavalier Parliament, by which he had from 1661 to 1678 been able to work so effectively for Rome and against the Puritans of all sects. The new parliament, thoroughly anti-Romanist, both religiously and politically, passed (1679) the Habeas Corpus Act, one of the three great liberty Acts of England, which greatly freed accused Britons from the king's power to imprison arbitrarily, without charge or trial, those in the way of his schemes. Three times in as many years (1679, 1680, 1681) Charles dissolved parliament for its anti-Romanism. In 1682 the changing fortunes of the strife between Charles and parliament gave him the advantage over parliament; and for three years he ruled as an absolute monarch, *i.e.*, he ignored the Test Act, appointing Romanists to civil, military and naval

offices, and had his Scotch representatives terribly to persecute the Covenanters. Some base criminals were exposed as guilty of what was called the Rye House Plot, whereby they sought to kill Charles and the Duke of York; and the king brought to trial before a packed court and jury and had executed five innocent nobles as alleged participants in that plot. And when about to die he had his Romanist brother bring a Romanist priest to hear his confession and administer extreme unction to him.

(38) His last three years of favoring Rome and quenching Protestant liberty were followed by three years of stubborn effort by his brother and successor as James II to destroy English liberty and Protestantism, to make Romanism the state religion and to pervert the English people to Romanism. He was a most arbitrary, stubborn and unreasonable ruler, and by his course brought about what is called the "Glorious Revolution," whereby civil and religious liberty for Protestantism and the repression of Romanism became dominant British policies. These six years, the last three of Charles' and the three of James' entire reign (1682-1688) were antitypical Ben-hadad's time of strenuous fight against antitypical Jeroboam II, a fight that resulted in undoing everything as to the Presbyterian Puritan revolutionaries that antitypical Hazael and Ben-hadad had done against them throughout the reigns of the first four Stuarts: James I, Charles I and II and James II. When the last named succeeded Charles II, he by oath promised the King's Council that he would reign according to the English constitution and laws, and would support and uphold the Anglican Church, whose head he became on becoming king; but during his three years' reign he defied public sentiment, trampled on the constitution and laws and became very malignant to all who would not favor his scheme of Romanizing England religiously, politically, educationally, diplomatically and socially.

(39) Three days after his accession, without the authorization of parliament and against the earnest advice of his council, he lawlessly levied customs. He carried his first parliamentary election by violence and fraud. He had his Scotch representatives make laws against, and fiendishly persecute the Covenanters. Most brutally he suppressed a Scotch revolution and an English revolution against his Romanist schemes. Not content with executing their leaders, he, against their followers and alleged followers, had the most infamous of judges, Chief Justice Jeffries, hold court, who had 300 of them hanged, in many cases on the flimsiest or no evidence; and he commissioned Col. Kirke with his ruthless soldiers, ironically called Kirke's Lambs, to execute without trial anyone against whom suspicion was raised. Rewards to informers induced such, to secure them, to accuse hundreds of innocent persons, who were ruthlessly executed by Kirke's Lambs, they beating drums in harmony with the "dancing" of the toes of those being hanged. Thus Romanist James II introduced the second English "reign of terror," Romanist "Bloody Mary" having introduced the first, in burning at least 283 Protestants and putting into prison and starving there thousands of other Protestants. He, determined to make Romanism the state religion, defied parliament's protests at his filling offices with Romanists against the Test Act, and prorogued it for refusing to vote him supplies, until he set aside his violations of that Act. He dismissed four judges of the King's Court who refused to justify his illegalities.

(40) Thereupon he packed the court and got it to decide that he could override any law. Then he greatly increased his filling civil, military and naval offices with Romanists, including the appointment of four Romanist lords to the Privy Council. He ignored the law forbidding Romanist priests, monks, especially Jesuits, and nuns to live in England. He caused, against the law, Romanist churches and chapels to be opened and public Romanist worship to be therein held. He

opened a gorgeous chapel for his own Romanist worship in St. James Palace, and sought to force his Protestant officers to attend him there, dismissing those who refused. Riots being aroused through his lawless act, he had 13,000 soldiers stationed in London to overawe the objecting London populace. He set out vigorously to stamp out Protestantism in Scotland and Ireland by cruel persecutions. In Ireland all Protestant officers were dismissed from the army. In a short time every privy councilor, judge, mayor and alderman in Ireland was a Romanist. Then he set out to overthrow the Anglican Church in England. Against the law he set up again the Court of High Commission, under the name of Ecclesiastical Commission, appointing thereto seven commissioners, with the infamous Jeffries at their head. Then he forbade Protestant ministers to preach or speak against Romanism, and suspended the Bishop of London for refusing to suspend a dean who ignored this prohibition. Pressure from his Ecclesiastical Commission aroused bolder Protestant defiance, which asserted itself in numerous anti-Romanist pamphlets and sermons. Next, contrary to law, James II sought to Romanize the English universities, by appointing Romanist presidents and professors and fellows therein, which led to determined professorial and student resistance, which he arbitrarily and stubbornly fought with manifold schemes and acts. By 1687 his lawless, pro-Romanist and anti-Protestant course aroused nation-wide resistance. His wilfulness paid no heed to the advice of moderate Romanists, including that of the pope, all of whom had good reason to fear that he was pulling down the house upon himself and them. He silenced the protest of parliament by frequent prorogations and finally dissolved it. He removed every Protestant who refused to sanction his lawlessness and installed Romanists in their places, even doing this in the case of his cabinet members and privy councilors. He made the Jesuit Petre, who had no legal right to be in England, a privy councilor, received the

papal nuncio in state at Windsor, and dismissed the Protestant Duke of Somerset, who refused to do the lawless act of presenting him in the Chamber of Presence. Truly, it may be said of his course: Whom God is about to destroy He first makes mad.

(41) Discerning from his pro-Romanist and anti-Protestant lawless acts and words that his purposes were anti-English, the English people in all ranks set up a determined resistance. Despite his recommending and commanding by letter the governors of the Charter House, containing among them some of the greatest nobles of England, they refused to receive Romanists among their number. Even his most devoted Tories rebelled when he required of them as an evidence of loyalty that they renounce the Anglican and join the Romanist Church. He issued in the beginning and then toward the end of his reign Declarations of Indulgence, allegedly in the interests of all non-Anglicans, but intended, of course, to help Romanists, annulling all laws to the contrary; but Protestants of all parties, *e.g.*, Presbyterian Baxter, Congregationalist Howe, Baptist Bunyan and Quaker Fox, refused to accept or become beneficiaries of this illegal act. This failure made him seek the repeal of the Test Act. He caused such voting regulations to be set up as he thought would return only such parliamentary candidates as would vote to repeal this Act. On the magistrates' and Lord Lieutenants' refusing to lend themselves to such corruption of the ballot, he dismissed them and appointed compliant ones. But the voters elected a parliament that refused to rescind the Test Act.

(42) Thereupon he published a new Declaration of Indulgence, ordering every Anglican clergyman to read it from the pulpit to their congregations on two successive Sundays. Only about 200 out of 10,000 obeyed this order. In only four London churches was this attempted; but on the reading's beginning the four congregations arose and rushed out of the churches. The bishops supported their clergy in this refusal. The

primate, Archbishop Sancroft, called the bishops together to form a protest at, and petition against such reading. But due to the shortness of the time only six bishops got to Canterbury, the primate's seat, in time. These seven ecclesiastics drew up a mild protest and humble petition and took them together in a body to James II. On receiving it the king cried out: "It is a standard of rebellion," and had the seven committed to the Tower, which in those days was used as a prison for noble political prisoners, they refusing to furnish bail against such an unheard-of act of arbitrariness. All London and England supported them. The people knelt in the streets begging their blessing, both as they were taken to the Tower and from it to court for trial. Again the king rejected counsels of caution and mildness. Brought to the bar as criminals the bishops were, June 30, 1688, by the jury acquitted. This decision was celebrated throughout London with greatest demonstrations of joy and by parades, speeches and bon-fires. Horsemen departed from the city on the rendering of the verdict and published the news broadcast throughout England, everywhere demonstrations of joy and triumph occurring, as in London. Even the army of 13,000 troops, stationed in London to overawe the populace, joined with them in the celebrations, for which James removed it and broke up its companies and incorporated these soldiers into other companies at distant points, thus dispersing his special guard. These demonstrations convinced him that he was deserted by all ranks, callings and stations in England.

(43) Almost all English officials had by him been illegally appointed, which made their acts null and void; and to reestablish law in England a reversal of practically every public act, arrangement and appointment of his had to be made. He sought to punish by dismissal from office, *etc.*, all who sided with the protesting and petitioning seven bishops. He sought to foist upon England an Irish army, which aroused further English resistance. Englishmen were patient and

longsuffering with him, since he was old and might soon die, and his two Protestant daughters were next in line for succession to the throne. But the birth of a Prince of Wales in 1688 as the next heir to the throne, which engendered the fear that they would have another Romanist as king, convinced them that to save Protestantism and British liberty and to repel Romanism they must dethrone him. Leading statesmen, nobles, bishops, military and naval officers invited his son-in-law, William of Orange, the ruler of Holland, and his daughter, Mary, William's wife, to deliver England from James II and become England's king and queen. William and Mary, aware of James' plan to extirpate Protestantism and British liberty and enthrone Romanism, accepted this invitation. Seeing the drift of things James sought to reverse his course, but none trusted him, feeling sure that he was bending to the storm from necessity, and not conviction, and that as soon as the storm would subside he would re-embark on his former course. William landed with a Dutch army, which was quickly and hugely reinforced by English soldiers; for regiment after regiment forsook James and joined William. Panic-stricken, James fled London, but was, contrary to William's wishes, who felt that the simplest solution would be his flight to France, captured and brought back. To the relief of all the Protestant leaders, who did not desire his death, but his riddance, he again fled and this time reached France. Parliament declared that his oppressions, lawlessness and flight made his throne vacant. After William and Mary had promised to respect the English constitution and laws and preserve English liberty and Protestantism and had accepted a bill of rights for Englishmen, they were crowned king and queen.

(44) James' Romanist organization of Ireland's government made Ireland loyal to his cause. His Irish army plundered and slew Protestants right and left in the war that resulted in Ireland from his overthrow in England. In several sieges of Protestant cities, Londonderry

especially, their defenders and inhabitants were reduced to extreme famine, but held out until relieved by an English army that came to Ireland. James in an un-British spirit brought from France a French army to reinforce his Irish army. An indecisive campaign was carried on during 1689, but on William's arrival with reinforcements in 1690 the tide turned against the Irish and French army. The two armies came into battle at the River Boyne, July 12, and the Irish and French army was completely routed. Witnessing from a neighboring hill the battle and the defeat of his Irish and French army, James in cowardly flight escaped and left Ireland for France. In this battle William was wounded, but his generals followed up his victory with others and pacified the country. In the peace terms they allowed 15,000 Irish Romanist officers and soldiers to leave Ireland and enter the army of Louis XIV. Following this war the rebelliousness of the Irish Romanists against English rule was responsible for many repressive measures; and for a full century Romanist Ireland was thereby made a poverty-stricken and backward country, while Ulster became a prosperous and orderly Protestant country. In harmony with their promise not to keep a standing army in times of peace, except by parliament's consent, not to suspend any law without parliament's consent and not to rule without it, to call parliament in frequent session, faithfully to execute the law, to grant tolerance to all Protestants of whatsoever sect, to allow free and honest elections to, and debate in parliament, to enforce all anti-Romanist laws, to grant the right of petition, free speech, free press and assembly and to respect the bill of rights, William and Mary ruled in England as efficient king and queen.

(45) Indeed, William, called the III, was the rallying center and leader, not only of Protestant England and Holland, but also of all Protestant Europe, against Louis XIV, who sought to subjugate all Protestant countries under the Roman yoke. To this day his memory is kept green as the deliverer of British and European

Protestantism; particularly in Ulster and wherever Ulstermen have emigrated he is held high as the deliverer of Protestant Ulster; and the names of his house, the house of Orange, and of the Battle of the Boyne are perpetuated by the Order of Loyal Orangemen. The constitutional reforms of the day of William and Mary undid all the Romanist and Romanizing measures of James I, Charles I and II and James II. And thus as a result they undid the autocracies of the Tudor and Stuart kings and reintroduced with marked additions the English liberties enjoyed by Englishmen during the days of the Plantagenets, from John Lackland's days, 1199-1204, to the first Tudor, Henry VII, 1485. The revolution of 1688 was accomplished in England without shedding one drop of blood and in contrast with "the bloody revolution" of 1616-1646, particularly in its violent form, 1641-1646, it is in English history called "the Glorious Revolution."

(46) The main part of the fight in England between antitypical Jeroboam and Ben-hadad was from 1678 to 1688. The struggle, however, afterward took on international forms, due partly to the intrigues of James II and his son, whom his followers called James III, conducted mainly in France, and partly through the intrigues and wars of Louis XIV in his efforts to overthrow English, Dutch, Scandinavian and German Protestantism and to enthrone Romanism. The general results were the victory and strengthening of Protestantism and the general defeat and weakening of Romanism internationally. In 1701 the Act of Settlement excluded forever Romanists from the English throne. Throughout his reign William III opposed religious persecution, rightly reasoning that to force religious opinion benefits religion none at all and injures its enforcers and victims. During his reign, 1688-1702, the rights of the king, parliament and people were strictly defined and secured by law against usurpations of the king and lawlessness of the people. From then on the cabinet was not appointed by, and made responsible to the king,

but by and to the House of Commons. Indeed, the reforms of this and the subsequent period of antitypical Jeroboam are the basis of America's Declaration of Independence and its constitution; and the Common Law of England, developed from many centuries of English experience, became the Common Law of the U.S. From these standpoints and those of the individual's "inalienable rights" [before human law] of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" England is very properly the mother country to America, even as for long she was generally thus called. Louis XIV's severe persecution of French Protestants, called "Huguenots," especially after his revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which had guaranteed their liberty and other rights, solidified Protestant countries against his Romanist course. When at the death of James II, in 1701, Louis XIV proclaimed James' son king of England as James III, parliament for Louis' busy-bodying in English affairs declared James III and his descendants forever incapable of sitting on Britain's throne. During the war of the Spanish Succession, 1702-1714, caused in part by the Romanist ambitions of Louis XIV, he suffered an almost continuous succession of defeats from the Protestant powers, including England, Holland, parts of Germany and Scandinavia, which further weakened political Romanism.

(47) To the further strengthening of political Protestantism and weakening of political Romanism, England and Scotland (1707) united as the one kingdom of Great Britain, with religious liberty made operative in both countries, Anglicanism and Presbyterianism remaining the state churches in them respectively. During 1714-1716 the Jacobites, the name given to the supporters of James II and his son, the so-called James III, were very active in agitating for the latter's enthronement in Britain after the death of his stepsister, "Good Queen Anne," the sister of William's Mary, and the last Stuart to sit on England's throne, who was in 1714 succeeded by George I, a German

Protestant prince and the first British king of the Windsor family, still the reigning house of the kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The Jacobites sought to dethrone him in favor of James, so-called III. First they demanded his enthronement instead of that of George I. In fact the Tory (Conservative) ministry plotted his enthronement, which led to its dismissal and the choice of a Whig (Liberal) ministry as the faithful upholders of the settlement of 1688.

(48) Tory riots followed in the Pretender's (James II's son) interests, which grew into revolutionary uprisings in England and Scotland, and which was marked by the Pretender's landing in Scotland from France; but in both countries the revolutions were squelched, and the kingdom was saved the evil of another Romanist Stuart as king. Charles XII of Sweden plotted to invade Scotland and put the Pretender on the Scotch throne, but his plot came to an end through his death, Dec. 11, 1718. During 1718-1720 Britain waged war against Romanist Spain for its plots to put the Pretender on its throne. Spain's defeat resulted in the collapse of the plot, and the disappointment of the Pretender. In 1719 a bill passed parliament relieving Protestant dissenters from certain evils of the Test Act, still enforcing the fines of the Act, but returning the fines after they were paid. In 1723 Bishop Atterbury of the Rochester diocese, the leader of the Jacobites, was discovered in a plot to restore the Stuarts in the person of the Pretender and was deprived of his see and banished to France, where he continued without fruitage his Jacobite plots. He was on British soil their last able leader. During 1727-1729 Romanist Spain, again at war with Britain, sought to seat the Pretender on Britain's throne and arranged for an invasion, but its fleet was defeated, and Romanist James Stuart again failed to become Britain's king. By the next year (1730) he gave up all *personal* efforts to gain that throne, and with that the triumph of antitypical Jeroboam was fully realized over

antitypical Ben-hadad, though his son without his father's cooperation, in 1745, led a futile insurrection in Scotland and England to instate him as Britain's king.

(49) Briefly will the foregoing discussion be connected as antitype with the type set forth in 2 Kings 14:16, 23-29. Antitypical Jeroboam (II; *strife of the people*; 14:16) certainly fittingly by the significance of the name led the great conflict of the Presbyterian Puritan revolutionaries as fighting the people's battles for freedom from Romanist autocracy. They were occupied with politics in their religious and liberty applications (reign in Samaria). But his course in many ways was evil, compromising in overmuch longsuffering, especially from 1683 to 1688; with antitypical Ben-hadad in the last three years of Charles II and the full three years of James II (did ... evil, v. 24). Like the rest of the less favored movements of God's real people he followed the course of the first Lutheran movement in sectarianism and clericalism (sins of Jeroboam [I]). Nevertheless all of the conquests of antitypical Hazael (predominately religious Romanism) and Ben-hadad (predominately political Romanism) against antitypical Jehu, Jehoahaz and Jehoash he undid, and restored everything that they had undone throughout Protestant England (Hamath [*fortress*] unto the sea of the plain, the Dead Sea, v. 25). This was prophesied by Jonah (*dove*), the son of Amittai (*true*, Jonah 1:1), of Gath-hepher (*winepress of the pit*), in a prophecy not recorded by him, though here mentioned. The Lord wrought this deliverance for His people in England, Scotland and Ireland out of deep sympathy for their oppressions (Lord saw the affliction ... very bitter, v. 26), since no crown-loser (shut up) nor crown-retainer (any left) was able to deliver them (any helper for Israel), and God would not yet cast them off (blot out ... Israel, v. 27).

(50) Hence He delivered them by the victorious revolutionaries of the Presbyterian Puritans, whose principles were adapted thereto (saved them by ...

Jeroboam), the successors of the revived revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans (son of Joash). The acts of antitypical Jeroboam (acts of Jeroboam, v. 28), their conflicts and victories (warred ... recovered) in restoring to antitypical Israel all their belongings acquired by the Church as antitypical David of antitypical Judah (Damascus and Hamath ... Judah), are described by very many historians, the ablest for the period of 1678-1702 being Lord Macaulay in his five-volumed History of England, entirely devoted to this period (written ... chronicles ... Israel). After a period of 52 years, 1678-1730, this phase of revolutionary Presbyterian Puritanism ceased to be the ascendant movement (slept, v. 29), and was succeeded for a short period by a Presbyterian Puritan movement that sought to have the Test Act, which was no more actually and finally enforced against them, repealed, 1730-1731 (Zachariah [*remembrance of Jehovah*] his son reigned in his stead).

(51) As shown above, in 1719, as a part of antitypical Jeroboam's activity, the non-Anglican sects—Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists and Quakers—received an amelioration of certain disadvantages that they incurred through the operation of the Test Act, which allowed only those to be civil, military and naval officers who conformed to the Anglican Church. Some members of these sects to have such offices rendered an occasional conformity, *i.e.*, occasionally attended Anglican services, occasionally communed there and did other acts of occasional conformity. Strict Anglicans objected to this course, and had a bill passed fining such occasional conformity. Without annulling the Test Act a bill had in 1719 been passed returning these fines after they were imposed and paid. The antitypical Zachariah movement in 1730 began an agitation to set aside the Test Act altogether in its application to them, though they desired it to continue to operate against Romanists. They truly set forth as inducements to such an annulment the fact that they had

always staunchly defended the principles of the 1688 revolution, "the Glorious Revolution," and therefore should have its full benefits. The Whigs, then in power, under the leadership of Sir Robert Walpole, agreed with their view of the matter, but urged delay, as, they affirmed, conditions were not ripe for the change. This discussion went on for years, but by 1731 the Whigs were determined not to make the change; and all they would do was to soften the application of the Occasional Conformity Act, the government asserting that the Puritans had all the liberties and privileges extant, except their being the state church. And with this decision the antitypical Zachariah phase ended and with it ended the Presbyterian Puritan revolutionary movements as the most prominent movement among God's less favored people, *i.e.*, the antitypical Jehu dynasty ceased to operate, after winning for Britain some of its most prized and cherished features of liberty, and after crushing in Britain Romanist religious and political oppressions and other Romanist evils.

(52) The antitypical Zachariah phase lasted but a year, 1730-1731, the parallel year of typical Zachariah being 791-790 B.C. For the data on this phase see pages 275-277 (Zachariah ... reigned over Israel, 15:8). Briefly will we connect the type with the facts presented in the preceding paragraph: The coming into the ascendancy of this phase of the antitypical Jehu dynasty as active in religio-political aspects is typed (Zachariah reigned ... Samaria [*watch tower*]). It was guilty of the evils inherent in every phase of the antitypical Jehu dynasty (he did ... evil ... as his fathers had done, v. 9), and that while engaging in matters pertinent to the Lord (before the Lord). Nor did this movement give up the evils that the first Lutheran movement introduced, *i.e.*, it was guilty of sectarianism and clericalism, evils of which every one of the movements of God's less favored people were guilty and caused such people to commit (sins of Jeroboam ... who made Israel to sin). The Whigs, especially

their leaders, purposely kept putting these Puritans off as to fulfilling their requests to have the Test Act annulled so far as Protestants were concerned (Shallum [*retribution*] ... Jabesh [*dry*] conspired against him, v. 10); and their decision fully made not to grant it was the public act that ended antitypical Zachariah (smote him before the people) and they briefly exercised the power of the most prominent movement in this aspect of their activity (reigned in his stead). The acts of antitypical Zachariah are recorded in the histories of this movement as those of this aspect, the last one of the house of antitypical Jehu (acts ... written ... chronicles ... Israel, v. 11). Thus was fulfilled a forecast that God made, probably through antitypical Elisha, that there would be four dominant policies carried out by those who had succeeded antitypical Jehu and worked for their principles (2 Kings 10:30). Antitypical Elisha did use antitypical Jehu's revolutions as an application and an arousal to the revolution that, beginning in 1616, came to a successful issue in 1646. It is therefore probable that they promised these four descendent policies to operate through the Presbyterian Puritans, though we do not know the writings or sayings in which this prophecy was made (word ... spake ... sons ... throne ... unto the fourth generation, v. 12). So was it fulfilled (so it came to pass), as are all of God's prophecies.

(53) After having studied the parallels of Israel's kings of the Jehu dynasty, we now return to a consideration of the parallels of Judah's kings. A very brief review of the parallels of Judah's kings, Jehoshaphat, Jehoram and Ahaziah, will help us better to consider the Athaliah and Joash, or Jehoash, parallels, to which this study will be devoted. Jehoshaphat (939-914 B.C.) parallels the Congregational movement benevolent and helpful to the second phase of the Anglican movement (1582-1607). It began with Robert Browne, progressed through Henry Barrowe and came to an end in Francis Johnson before he became thoroughly reactionary,

though the last seven years of the antitypical Jehoshaphat phase, from its becoming confederate with the second phase of the Anglican movement against the Romanists as antitypical Syrians, were accompanied by Francis Johnson's brand of Congregationalism reactionary as paralleling Jehoram's coregency with Jehoshaphat. Jehoram (of Judah, not Jehoram of Israel, 914-906 B.C.) parallels the Congregational movement thoroughly reactionary (1607-1615), wherein, misled into a *quasi*-Presbyterianism through Francis Johnson's aberrations and into a *quasi*-unionism with apostate churches through John Robinson's compromises, it showed a decidedly reactionary spirit. Ahaziah (906-905) parallels the Congregational movement autocratic (1615-1616), and as such associated with the fourth phase of the Anglican movement. Francis Johnson and John Robinson headed this phase of Congregationalism in Holland, and practically all England's Congregational leaders exemplified this phase of Congregationalism in England, where they battled side by side with the fourth Anglican movement (antitypical Jehoram of Israel) against the antitypical Hazael movement (Romanism) and the antitypical Jehu movement. In the conflict with the latter it came to an end, 1616. This is a brief review of the first three Congregationalist movements and brings us up to a fourth Congregational movement, which was, strange to say, that of a church, a symbolic woman, the Congregational Church at Leyden, Holland, presided over by John Robinson who was injuriously active in three Congregational movements: that of reactionism, that of autocracy and that of anti-separatism, the latter typed by Athaliah (*afflicted by Jehovah*). The parallel dates are 905-898 B.C. and 1616-1623 A.D.

(54) When the Leyden Congregational Church saw that both in England and in Holland autocracy was overthrown as a bad Congregational movement, it under the leading of John Robinson embarked on an anti-separatism movement. The faithful Congregationalists

were Separatists, *i.e.*, they avoided all fellowship with the Anglican and other denominational movements. Their idea was that only that was a true church which was separate and distinct from all sectarianism, and which was united in justification and sanctification by a covenant Godward and fellowmemberward. Into this covenant they solemnly entered by the entire assembly clasping hands and binding themselves to obey the Lord, to put away evil and to walk in the light already had and yet to come. Hence they refused to fellowship with those not so covenanting with the Lord and one another, and holding membership in apostate churches, from which they had separated themselves. Hence they were called Separatists, and their theory and practice Separatism. During the seven years, 1616-1623, the Leyden Church, on seeing that Congregational autocracy was refuted, which it had mothered (Athaliah the mother of Ahaziah, 2 Kings 11:1; 2 Chro. 22:10), repudiated this theory and practice and their involved principles and practices (destroyed ... royal). But the covenant, in its keepers, that Congregationalists had made (Jehosheba [*oath of Jehovah*], 2; 11, Jehoshabeath, a phonetic variation of the same name), which even Congregationalism reactionary held as a power of its own (daughter of king Jehoram), yea, which even Congregationalism autocratic cherished (sister of Ahaziah), resting in its adherents, laid hold on (took ... stole), from among the repudiated policies (sons ... slain), protected, even in secrecy, among God's people the principle and practice of Separatism (hid him), as well as those who ministered thereto (nurse), and kept them in the sphere of faith (bedchamber), against the repudiating activities of the Leyden Congregational Church (from Athaliah). Thus this covenant in its adherents, as a feature of Christ's Bride (wife of Jehoiada, *Jehovah knows*), shielded the principle and practice of Separatism from repudiators (hid ... him).

(55) The following are 16 of the principles and practices that the Leyden Church under John Robinson's

leading repudiated, as can be seen in his and their theories and practices (sons ... slain). He and they joined with the Dutch Reformed Church in fighting Arminianism in public debate, thus rejecting some advancing light, contrary to the covenant; he became a religious teacher in their university (combinationism), also against the covenant; they fellowshipped with the Dutch Reformed Church, which was also against the covenant; they took with them the Lord's Supper; advocated attendance reciprocally at church together; joined in prayer with them, though recognizing that they were not consecrated; in private and public they accepted God's nominal people as their brethren; offered fellowship to the Church of Scotland (a state church, thoroughly sectarian and sharply opposed to the covenant); offered church fellowship to the Church of England, the bitter persecutor of Congregationalism, and the executor of some of its leading lights; asserted that they would not have separated from the Church of England, if it had allowed them liberty to teach and preach their convictions and not bound them to its ceremonies and its creed; advised Congregationalists to attend Anglican Church services, taking part devoutly therein; advocated that elders be elected for life; to get sanction from James I to colonize New England with the pilgrim fathers, even agreed to accept the Anglican Episcopacy, as not of Divine but human right; as a church engaged in the secular business of colonization, *etc.*; encouraged forming a Congregational denomination; and encouraged and practiced clericalism of a *quasi*-Presbyterian kind. Thus they repudiated vital Congregational principles flowing out of their idea of the nature of the Church as a company of saints separate and distinct from nominal churches and those owning fealty to them. Certainly, they repudiated the distinctive thing in the idea of the ecclesia as a company of God's saints that under Christ was mistress in her own midst, and that while fellowshipping with like ecclesias as brethren, yet remained

free from all external union with them, and thus avoided constituting a denomination. The Leyden Church certainly repudiated these principles and practices and therein antityped Athaliah in murdering her grandchildren, but failing to kill Separatism's type.

(56) This teaching of Separatism was held secretly among the faithful for six full years, from 1616 to 1622 (hid in the house ... six years, 3; 12). And all this time the Leyden anti-separationist movement was the chief influence in the six involved years in the sphere of God's most favored people (Athaliah reigned over the land). But from April, 1622, to April, 1623, our Lord (seventh year Jehoiada, 4; 23:1), first, strengthened Himself in His faithful (strengthened himself, ;1), and, secondly, aroused the leaders in the four Amsterdam churches and the one London church (rulers over hundreds), especially the error-refutative leaders (captains [literally, Cherethites, executors], 4;) and the Truth-defending leaders (guard [literally, the runners, *i.e.*, the Pelethites], 4;). These were the leaders of the Ainsworth ecclesia (Azariah [*help of Jehovah*] ... Jeroham [*cherished*]), those of the Johnson ecclesia (Ishmael [*God hears*] ... Jehohanan [*Jehovah favors*]), those of the White ecclesia (Azariah [*help of Jehovah*] ... Obed [*servile*]), those of the Smyth ecclesia (Maaseiah [*deed of Jehovah*] ... Adaiiah [*ornament of Jehovah*]), all four being ecclesias in Amsterdam, Holland, and those of the Jacob (London) ecclesia (Elishaphat [*God judges*] ... Zichri [*remembering*]). These He bound to Himself by vows (made a covenant with them) with great solemnity (oath, 4;). This He did among God's people secretly (house of the Lord), and clarified and stressed to them the truth on Separatism (shewed them the king's son, 4;). These leaders busied themselves in the sphere of God's more favored people (went about in Judah, ;2) and gathered therefrom to their support the other leaders (Levites [here used of all descendants of Levi], those technically called priests and Levites, ;2), as

well as all others of special influence but not leaders (chief of the fathers of Israel, ;2). These they brought to the executive sphere of God's more favored people (Jerusalem, ;2). All of the faithful of God's more favored people in their assemblies vowed loyalty to Separatism (all ... covenant with the king in the house of God, ;3). Jesus made clear to them that Separatism as a truth of the Lord would continue and prevail (king's son shall reign, ;3), even as the Bible teaches of the principles of Apostles (Lord hath said of the sons of David, ;3). Our Lord, according to their differing abilities, spirit and providential situations, gave them a fourfold work (a third part ... a third part ... a third part ... two parts, 5-7; 4-6). The first of these activities was that of helping winnable people to come among the brethren (sabbath ... porter of the doors, ;4 ... gate behind the guard, 6); a second was to defend Separatism against attacks as a matter of practice (king's house, ;5 ... watch of the king's house, 5); a third was to attack the error as it would seek entrance among God's people (gate of Sur [*entrance*], 6; ... gate of the foundation, ;5); and the fourth was the regular work of the ministering priests to defend God's people in relation to Separatism as a matter of doctrine (two parts ... sabbath ... watch of the house ... king, 7;). And all of the other brethren, the non-official and non-influential brethren were mutually to defend one another against error and sin unto truth and righteousness as supporters of their abler brethren (people shall keep the watch of the Lord, ;6). But none but the leaders were to do public service (none ... save the priests ... Levites, ;6). These should do their consecrated service as public ministers of the Word (go in ... holy, ;6).

(57) The subordinate leaders (Levites, ;7) and the warriors (ye, 8;) were controversially (weapons in his hand) to serve in defense of Separatism in every phase of it (compass the king round about). Any one coming among God's people inimically disposed on the

subject should be refuted forthwith (cometh ... slain). They were especially to support and defend Separatism in every activity into which it might come (with the king ... in ... out). The warrior leaders of all the five involved ecclesias (captains, 9;), the subordinate ministering leaders (Levites, ;8) and all of the rest of the Congregational movement (all Judah, ;8) did as our Lord Jesus charged (Jehoiada ... commanded) and the main sacrificing leaders also cooperated (in ... and out on the sabbath); for the Lord Jesus kept the main leaders active in their varied services without intermission (dismissed not the courses, ;8). Our Lord saw to it that all the main leaders were provided with controversial pen-products (spears, 10; 9) and immovable (bucklers, ;9) and movable (shields, 10; 9) defensive armor, contained in the writings of the Apostles (king David, ;9) and placed in the Church (house of God, 10; 9). These all came to our Lord for His present purposes (came to Jehoiada, 9;). Taking their positions as upholders of the sacrificing Christ and the Church (along by the altar, 11; 10) and of the brethren (temple) in support of Separatism on all sides (round about the king), the trained defenders (guard, 11;) and all other brethren (all the people) stood ready to defend the entire Church (right ... temple ... left ... temple), fully armed for all eventualities (weapons in his hand). Then they began publicly to expound, prove and refute as to Separatism (brought forth the king's son, 12; 11), set it forth as the Divinely-authorized teaching (put the crown upon him), gave God's attestation to their act (testimony), and thus set it forth as the prevailing pertinent teaching (made him king). Jesus as High Priest and the Church as under-priests (Jehoiada and his sons, ;11) gave to the teaching and practice of Separatism in its maintainers the full qualification of the necessary wisdom, power, justice and love for their pertinent work (anointed him). Then all the faithful demonstrated their approval and praise

(clapped their hands, 12;) and prayed God's support upon Separatism as the prevailing Congregational teaching and practice (God save the king).

(58) When the Leyden Church Congregational anti-separatist movement perceived the demonstrations in favor of the separatist movement (Athaliah ... noise, 13; 12), both of the official and non-official loyal ones (guard ... people), by conduct and propaganda supporting Separatism (running and praising the king, ;12), coming among them in the Church, it intervened among the demonstrators (came ... into the temple). Their discussions revealed to its inquiring eyes of understanding in its adherents the doctrine and practice of Separatism (looked ... king, 14; 13) as its position, as propounded by Robert Browne, its introducer (stood ... pillar), who started the Little Flock movement (at the entering in, ;13) later sectarianized by Henry Barrowe, *etc.*, even as was the case in such matters (as the manner was, 14;). The leaders and lecturers stood, advocating the Separatist movement (princes ... king). And all Congregationalists, apart from those belonging to the Leyden Church, were very glad over the situation (all ... rejoiced). All lecturers and conversationalists joined in such advocacy (blew the trumpets). Their preachers (singers, ;13) orally and by pertinent literature (instruments of music, ;13) and those who acted as instructors in the school of prophets (taught to sing, ;13) joined in the propaganda.

(59) On the Leyden Church movement's seeing what was going on, it as the anti-separatist movement did great violence to its graces in seeking to defend its position (rent her clothes), accusing the faithful as its betrayers and maligners (Treason, Treason). Jesus as High Priest then brought the leaders of the five above-mentioned churches in their warrior aspects into special and official prominence (brought out ... set over the host, 15; 14) and charged them (charged ... said) to attack it on its secular wrongs, those connected with

its concessions on policies and practices of church and state toward James I in their compromising efforts to have him sanction their emigrating as pilgrim fathers to what became New England (Have her forth without the ranges [outside the temple]). He also charged these leaders to refute all who would defend it (followeth her kill ... slain with the sword, 15; 14). He prohibited that it be attacked on special religious grounds (Slay her not in the house of the Lord). Taking this as the line of their attack, they in argument seized that compromising church (laid hands on her, 16; 15); and, avoiding special religious arguments, they led it forth (went by the way) to the teachings (horses came into the king's house ... entering of the horse gate) pertaining to royal prerogatives and powers, in connection with which it compromised the Truth, and revealed its compromising and treasonable acts as against the Lord, the Truth and the brethren, and thus thoroughly refuted it (there was she slain ... slew her there, 16; 15). The movement championed by the Leyden Congregational Church took its place as a decadent one; and in less than two years after its death-thrust, its chief spirit, John Robinson, died; and the *quasi*-Presbyteriano-Congregationalism that he through the pilgrim fathers transplanted to New England got a real Congregational teaching and practice nearly a hundred years later, through John Wise of Ipswich, Mass. During the first part of this brand of *quasi*-Congregationalism it was guilty of great evils in persecuting dissenters unto banishment, *e.g.*, Roger Williams, and even unto death, *e.g.*, Quakers; and its witch huntings, trials and executions have made, among others, Salem, Mass., a blot on Massachusetts' early reputation. Certainly these facts prove that the Leyden brand of Congregationalism was decadent and ceased to be the most prominent movement of God's more favored people.

(60) Our Lord Jesus effected an agreement between Himself as God's Representative, and thus between

God (made a covenant between him ... the Lord, 17; 16), and the separatist movement and the loyal Congregationalists. On God's part this was an acceptance of the separatist movement as the more favored movement of God's people, and of the people as adherents of that movement. On the movement's and the people's part it was an agreement to believe and practice according to the responsibilities and privileges of being the more favored movement of God's people in Congregationalism (people ... king ... Lord's people). It also implied on the part of the movement and its adherents that they be loyal to one another as to Separatism as a teaching and practice (king ... people, 17;). These brethren in loyalty to their agreement entered the sphere of power-grasping and lording it over God's people as it was exemplified in Romanism, Anglicanism and Presbyterianism (went to the house of Baal [*lord*], 18; 17); and, first, utterly refuted these as spheres of Biblical theories and practices (brake it down) and refuted the ideas of their adherents that their respective churches were the true Church (brake his altars) and refuted their false creeds (images in pieces) from top to bottom (thoroughly, 18;); and, secondly, utterly refuted their hierarchy and clergy (slew Mattan, *gift*) as they were exercising their offices in the interests of their respective churches (before the altars). Our Lord arranged for the public ministrations in the Church (appointed ... offices ... Lord, 18; 18) through the main leaders (by the hand of the priests the Levites [here the priests are set forth as descendants of Levi, not their assistants who are technically and usually called Levites]), according to the arrangements of the Apostles as set forth in the Bible (whom David had distributed [in 24 courses] ... Lord, ;18). Their work was to offer sacrifices manifesting God's approval of Jesus' sacrifice (burnt offerings), as Jesus indicated in the New Testament writings (as ... law of Moses, ;18). These offerings were administered as a joyous privilege (with rejoicing, ;18)

and with preaching of the Word (singing, ;18), even as the Apostles had arranged (by David). They also arranged for evangelists to lead new ones through repentance and faith unto justification (porters at the gates, ;19), that they might admit no unjustified, impenitent and disfellowshipped ones into the courts of the Lord's house (unclean ... should enter, ;19).

(61) These arrangements for a proper ecclesiaism having been set into operation, another thing was done to make complete the reformation initiated by our Lord among Congregationalists: To put Separatism into its proper place as the prevailing policy and movement among God's more favored people; for separatism was not to be merely a prevailing theory; it was also to be made a prevailing practice. And this is set forth in 19, 20; 20, 21. This work was participated in by all, but in an orderly way, *i.e.*, with all in harmony with their places in the Church. First, the main leaders in each of the five involved ecclesias as controversialists, both in parrying off attacks and in refuting the errorists (rulers ... captains of hundreds [instead of the translation, "*and* captains" (19;), it should be, "*even* captains"], 19; 20), took the most prominent part in putting Separatism as a principle and a practice into operation. Next, the less prominent defenders acted to the same end (guard, 19;). Following these, thirdly, the most prominent unofficial brethren contributed their share in this good work (the nobles, ;20). Strangely enough, fourthly, the elders in these five ecclesias, who in zeal for this work we would think should have preceded the more prominent unofficial brethren, came after the latter in support of this work (governors of the people, ;20). And, finally, the non-prominent brethren of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit gave their cooperation to the work at hand (all the people of the land). All of these cooperated to make Separatism the prevailing Congregationalist movement among God's more favored people (brought down the king) as a thing that operated

not simply in religious relations (from the house of the Lord). They exalted (came through the high gate, ;20) the teaching and practice of Separatism by means of those who defended the pertinent teaching and practice (way ... guard) and put it into the sphere of polity controllership (king's house), and constituted it as the Divinely-authorized separationist movement (set the king upon the throne, ;20); and in its adherents the separatist movement among Congregationalists exercised this Divinely-authorized power as it did also among other movements of God's more favored people internally and externally (sat on the throne of the kings, 19;). This condition made all loyal Congregationalists very glad (people ... rejoiced, 20; 21); and peace reigned in the sphere of Separatism's executiveship (the city was quiet) after they had thoroughly refuted the Leyden Congregationalist Church's anti-separatist movement (slain ... slew Athaliah) with the Word of Truth (sword) on prevailing policy matters (king's house, 20;).

(1) What did the autocratic later course of the fourth phase of the Anglican movement provoke? Especially through what teaching and practice? To whose attention did this come? Who were some of their main members from 1616-1646, the period now to be discussed? What did they decide? From what? Whom does Jehu type? What pertinent thing did God's mouthpiece do? How typed? After such preparation what exhortation did they give these? How typed? What further exhortation did they give these? What were the energetic Presbyterian Puritans doing in the fight for power-preeminence? How typed? What characteristics were theirs? How typed? What third exhortation did God's mouthpiece give their hangers-on? How typed? Fourth instruction? How typed?

(2) What did the hangers-on then do? How typed? What did their manner and teachings do? With what effect? How typed? What answer did the hangers-on give to this question? How typed? What was desired and secured? For, what? How typed? What privately did they give the revolution-tending Puritans? With what assurance? How typed? What were the first and second charges

as God's will that they gave? How typed? What were the third and fourth charges? How typed? What was God's intention as to all four Anglican movements? After what examples? How typed? What was His intention as to the Anglican Church? How typed? What did the hangers-on then do? How typed? Who were some of the main secular members of antitypical Jehu? Religious members?

(3) What would it be well to do before proceeding further? What is the chronology involved in Jehu's reign? That of the antitype? How only is chronology stated as to Jehu's reign? What exception is there to this statement? For what in his reign are no Biblical dates given? Why is this fact important to keep in mind? Of what did the small revolutionary acts at first consist? Against what? By whom? In the second place? In what cases? In the third place? In what two things did parliament's protests repeatedly result? By whom at first and afterward? What was the character of the second result? What things do Biblical types and antitypes usually mark? What can we see from this? Despite what fact? What two events mark the end of antitypical Jehu's revolution? What did the Scots do with Charles I after his surrender? What will this enable us to see? What will the involved principle enable us to see?

(4) What was the ecclesiastical event that marked the religious phase of the revolt against tyranny in state and church? The political event? What reception from the Puritans did James I's Book of Sports receive? His disfavoring Calvinism and favoring Arminianism against his former views? His prohibition of parliament to interfere with his government? His negotiations for the marriage of his heir with the Spanish king's daughter? Leaving his son-in-law in the lurch in the Thirty Years' War? Securing his heir's marriage with the bigoted Romanist Henrietta, daughter of France's king? Why? His ruling for years without parliament's meeting?

(5) When did Charles I become king of England? What two things encouraged his tyranny? How did he compare as king with his father as to parliament and people? What did his tyranny arouse? What was the first cause of provocation against himself and the episcopate? The second? The third? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? The seventh? The eighth? The ninth? The tenth?

The eleventh? The twelfth? *E.g.* The thirteenth? The fourteenth? The fifteenth? The sixteenth? The seventeenth? The eighteenth? The nineteenth? The twentieth? Whom did these events, as main provocations, arouse? What will now be done?

(6) What did each of these tyrannies effect in the hangers-on at the instigation of God's mouthpiece? What did each of such arousings effect in the Puritans? How typed? What classes constituted these associates? How typed? What did they ask of the Puritans? How typed? What did they deny? How typed? What did the Puritans answer after each arousing? How typed? What response was made at each stage of the Puritans' declaration of the facts? How typed? What did they offer? How typed? What did they announce? How typed? What did the revolutionary Puritans then do? How typed? Under what time and circumstance? How typed? What form had Anglican prelacy by then assumed? How typed? What had it received? Through what? How long did these compromises last? What effect did this have on prelacy? How typed? What effect did this have on many and upon the energetic Puritans? How typed? Recognizing their increasing support, what did they require? How typed?

(7) Assured of sufficient support, what did the energetic Puritans then do? How typed? In what twofold condition was autocratic prelacy then? How typed? Who noted the progress of the revolutionary Presbyterian Puritans? How typed? What did they tell? How typed? In suspicion what did the prelacy command? How typed? In response what was done? How typed? How did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans respond to the insincere inquiries as to their intentions on peace? How typed? How did they act thereon? How typed? What did the sentinels do at this outcome? How typed? What was then ordered? Why? How typed? How did this investigation result? How typed? How often were these investigations made? What did the sentinels do on observing the effect of the second set of investigations? How typed? What two things did they announce? How typed? On hearing this, what two classes acted? What did they do? How typed? What did they, so organized, do? How typed? Over what did the opposing forces become involved in strife? How

typed? How long were the antitypical events in enacting?

(8) What did arbitrary prelacy demand? How typed? How often? What reply did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans give? How typed? How often was the answer given? What caused arbitrary prelacy to seek security in flight? How typed? What did they charge? On what ground? How typed? Before whom? How typed? What three things did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans then do? How typed? What and by what means did they ask parliament? How typed? What had parliament individually and as a body been doing during the involved 30 years? How typed? As the fulfilment of what was this done? What reason did they give for this outcome? How typed? Accordingly, what did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans ask parliament? How typed? What was then done? How typed?

(9) What did the revolting Puritans then do with the autocratic Congregational movement as cooperator with arbitrary prelacy? Where is this typed? What will show the harmony of the two accounts? For what did God arrange? In connection with what? How typed? Through whom? How typed? What did autocratic Congregationalism seek to do? How? How typed? After this what two things did supporters of the revolting Puritans do? How typed? Wherein did they find them? How typed? What did they then do? What did the former then do? How typed? What did the latter then do? How typed? Under what circumstances? How typed? What was the character of the refutation? How typed? What did the partially refuted then do? How typed? When did the refutation become complete? How typed? What did their supporters do to refute autocratic Congregationalism? How typed? How long did their office power last? How typed?

(10) What is typed in vs. 30-37? By what two means did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans effect the destruction of the Anglican Church? In desperation what did Charles I do April 13, 1640? When did it assemble? What for years, before the Long Parliament, had the Puritans been doing as to the Anglican Church? By Charles I's support how were the Anglican prelates and the clergy conditioned? When? Thereafter what did the revolutionists do? Who noted this? How typed? What did she do

with herself? As to what? To whom? How typed? So conditioned what did she do? How typed? What did she perceive? How typed? What did she do? How typed? Ask? How typed? Stung by the sarcasm, what two things did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans do? How typed? What three groups had supported her? How typed? What had undermined their loyalty to her? What resulted there from? Up to the assembling of the Long Parliament what had been their attitude toward her?

(11) What did the Presbyterian Puritans increasingly demand? How typed? What kind of an increased response was made by the three pertinent groups? Resulting in what? How did this affect her? In the end what 12 things did they do to her? How is all this typed? What did she do in her destruction? How typed? How did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans then treat her? How typed? Who constituted the revolting Puritans? What did these then do as to her powers, *etc.*? How typed? While so engaged, what did they charge? Why? Despite what? How typed? What only did those so charged find of her? How in each case typed? What did they then do? How typed? What did the revolting say thereover? How typed? Anent what was the forecast made? What were the contents of the forecast? How typed? What of hers did the sectarians not appropriate? What of hers did they appropriate? As what did they forecast that she would be regarded? With what results? How typed?

(12) What does 2 Kings 9 give us? As what? In what? What two things does 2 Kings 10 give us? What else do these two chapters give? What will come out as we discuss 2 Kings 10? What was the most autocratic of the four Anglican movements? What did it develop? In what two ranks? How are these typed? Of what were they more responsible? What did these abuses become? To what determination did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans come? What course did they pursue? What did their conduct gradually become? To whom? In what? Especially to whom? What did it suggest? Why? How are these things typed? What kind of a movement did it suggest? What did it tell them to do for it? How typed? What two things should we not forget?

(13) What things moved these people not to accept the suggestions? How typed? Through whom did they become subject to the revolting Presbyterian Puritans? How typed? What is a pertinent, remarkable fact of those times? How typed? Who were the revolutionary leaders in parliament? After the supporters of Anglicanism became subject to the revolting Presbyterian Puritans, what did they do as to parliament's laws on Anglicanism? To what extent? To what did they become subject? How typed? What peculiarity is here presented? Within what time limit? How typed? To what did they force the Anglican episcopate and clergy to be subject? How was this brought about? To what limits did they enforce the laws? How are these things typed?

(14) What came to the revolting Puritans? How? For how long? How typed? How and in what ways did the revolting Puritans have the Anglican leaders set forth? By what means? More particularly through whose writings? Less particularly through whom? How voluminously? How are these things typed? When this was in each part done, who appeared on the scene? How? How typed? What did they ask? Who had done it? What did they acknowledge? Whom did they acquit of the deeds? How are these things typed? What did the revolting Puritans tell the people? When and under what circumstances was the forecast made? How were these things typed? What did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans continue? Against whom? To what extent? How typed?

(15) To what did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans then give attention? At first particularly to what? How typed? How were not and how were the 42 related to Ahaziah? How proven? Who were the antitypical 42 allegedly? How typed as such allegedly? What was their actual character? How typed? What proves this? How did they act toward God's people? How were they overtaken? Of what two things were their captors apprized? How typed? What did they charge as to these? What was, accordingly, done to them? How typed?

(16) What did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans then do? How typed? Of whom did the Long Parliament largely consist? What were its powers? How did it use these? How are these things typed? How long had there

previously been no parliament in session? What did the Long Parliament become? In what spirit did it approach the revolting Presbyterian Puritans? How typed? How numerous among the English people, especially among the Londoners, were the Puritans? What did they seek to do with parliament? How typed? What kind of a response did parliament make? How as to time? What did they pledge mutually? How are these things typed? What was then done? How typed? What did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans desire? How typed? What henceforth did the two do together? On entering the sphere of church politics, what did they do? Even to what extent? In a word, what? In fulfilment of what? How typed?

(17) To what do we now come? Where typed? Through what two forms of agitation did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans assemble the British people? Along what lines? What gave the people the idea that the revolting Presbyterian Puritans were going to act more autocratically than even the second Anglican movement? How typed? Of what were these acts a charge? What two impressions did their conduct give? How typed? While giving these impressions, what did they do? How typed? What did they cause to be proclaimed? How typed? What did these agitations and proclamations arouse and bring about? In what two fronts? What did the stress of partisanship effect? How are these things typed? How was this assembling? How typed?

(18) How did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans come to this assembling? How did they therein appear? How typed? To what degree did they press matters? How typed? What did the lawyers and judges then do? What example shows this? How typed? Who then came together to the sphere of autocracy? In what way did they agree and differ therein? How are these things typed? What two things did their course charge? How typed? To what three extremes did autocratic Charles I proceed? How typed? How even at this stage did the revolutionists act? How typed? For what did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans arrange? Under what conditions? How typed? What did they charge these? How? How typed? What warning did they give against a lack of zeal in refutation? How typed?

(19) What did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans finish? How typed? What did they immediately thereafter charge? How typed? What instances are illustrations of these refutations? How did the debate result? What resulted from the agitation to Lord Stratford and Archbishop Laud? How are these things typed? What was done with all autocrats? With the Anglican Church? How typed? With all theories and practices of autocracy? How typed? Its whole structure, Through what? How did they treat and leave it? How are these things typed? In what condition was it left? How typed?

(20) While overthrowing autocracy, what two evils without deviation did the revolting Presbyterian Puritans foster? By whom had they been introduced? Unto what even? What facts prove their fostering these two evils? How are these things typed? What did God do with the Presbyterian Puritans' pertinent works? By what did He show that He approved of them? What did He, accordingly, promise them? How are these things typed? In what two things did they fail to give heed? How typed? Instead, what did they do? After whose example? How typed? What occurred in the first phase of revolutionary Presbyterian Puritanism? How did it occur? How typed?

(21) Failing in paternal marriage negotiations with the Spanish king, what did James I next do in such marriage negotiations? What compromises with Romanism did success therein bring? How was this related to certain British laws and the convictions of most Britons? What was the first Romanism-favoring act committed by the bigoted Romanist wife of the crown-prince of England? With what consequences in Ireland? Her second act? Her series of acts goading Charles I to favor Romanists and absolutism? What effect did this have on Romanists? Where did these compromises advance Romanism against Protestantism? Of what are these Romanism-favoring acts the antitype? How typed in detail? What should Britain have done in these matters? What effect on universal Protestantism and Romanism did these acts have? How typed? Where are these acts of revolting Presbyterian Puritanism described? How typed? How have the acts of revolting Presbyterian Puritanism been regarded by the rightly informed? In unison with whom? How typed?

By whom were they succeeded? After what? How typed?

(22) Who succeeded Jehu? When? What does the name *Jehoahaz* mean? In allusion to what? How long did he reign? Where and how is this proved? Until when did he reign? What parallels his reign? From when to when? How proved? What kind of a policy did antitypical Jehoahaz pursue? How briefly are this policy and antitypical Jehu's policy contrasted? By whom and how was antitypical Jehu supported? What occurred after the antitypical Jehu phase ended? Wherein lays the main power of the Presbyterian Puritan revolutionists? Who was its ablest and most successful leader? How does he rank as an Englishman? In what particulars? What was his character? Against what enemies was he successful? What did he do in some cases to gain his end—England's welfare?

(23) What as a whole was the character of antitypical Jehoahaz? To what degree did it favor sectarianism? Even what extreme measures did its majority favor? How did these measures stand as to Congregational principles? What did they arouse? How did they seek to organize religion in England? How did this affect Congregationalists? Why? Cromwell in particular? Of what two sins did antitypical Jehoahaz thus become guilty? After what movement's example? How are these things typed? How else did they act? What was one of these things? To the antagonism of whom? What evil did they do shortly after Charles I's capture? Why? What effect would their kind of a reconciliation with Charles I have had on the objects and effects of antitypical Jehu's revolution? What did they seek to do with the army? Why? How did Cromwell act in the premises? What effect did the clashes between parliament and the army have on antitypical Jehoahaz? Why?

(24) What two things did Col. Pride at Cromwell's charge do? What two evils did these two things prevent? How did it in number and faith leave the membership of parliament? What were the remaining members called? What did they do as to antitypical Jehoahaz? With what effects on him? Why did great differences arise between Presbyterian Puritans and the army? Why? What did Charles I's deceitfulness toward both move the

army and the Rump Parliament to decide? On his being found guilty what was done to him? Upon whom did the main odium therefore fall? Why? Who clamored for his death? Upon whom did the minor odium therefore fall? With what result? Despite what? Why did their efforts therein fail? What else undermined some of antitypical Jehoahaz's influence? In what did Cromwell's absolutism result? How did antitypical Jehoahaz work in this matter? What did their pertinent course give them? Why? What two other things contributed to a return of the Stuart later called Charles II? How did they contribute to this effect?

(25) How did the various acts of antitypical Jehoahaz described in the preceding two paragraphs affect the Lord as to them? With what result? How are these things typed? What did the Lord's anger bring? Upon whom? Were these the only things contributory thereto? What wars and two battles contributed thereto? Why? Whom did three Cromwellian victories arouse against England? In what countries was Romanist anger aroused against both parties of the English revolution? In what did this anger result? What acts of Charles stirred up trouble against both of these revolutionary parties? In what two ways? How typed in each case? How long did these troubles last? How typed?

(26) To what did the earlier calamities of antitypical Jehoahaz lead? How typed? What did the Lord accordingly do? How typed? What did the Lord do for them? Where in each case? How typed? With what result? How typed? Through whom? To whom? From what? Despite this, what did the delivered not give up? By what were these introduced? How typed? How did they affect succeeding movements? How typed? What other evil in a feebler form persisted? How typed? What did God do for these evils? Until what effect was wrought? How was it brought about? How typed? How so? How typed? What was the ultimate effect on antitypical Jehoahaz? How typed?

(27) Who have discussed this period (1646-1660) and antitypical Jehoahaz? How typed? Through what did they come to an end? Despite what? How typed? What did they become during the next 18 years? How typed?

What occurred throughout their period? In what two ways? How typed? What did they receive? Why? How typed? By whom? How typed? What two things did God not do? Yet what did He do to them? How typed?

(28) To what does our study now bring us? In what respects does Jehoash or Joash type his parallel? How as movements do antitypical Jehoahaz and Joash compare or contrast with one another? What are the parallel periods? Where is this proved? Where are the Biblical or typical events given? What will be here omitted? Why? When did Hazael die? How proved? How do antitypical Hazael and Ben-hadad compare or contrast with one another? Whence do we get this thought? Who was Charles II? When did he reign? What was he invited to do? By whom generally? Particularly? What was his character? What in part proves his depravity? How and where did he spend most of his youth and young manhood? On his return what did he head? What flowed from his court? How and by whom was he trained? What did he do to gain Scotland's crown? England's crown? In both reigns what did he do to dissenters? What two evils marked his whole course? All the time of his English reign how did he act the hypocrite? How was his ingratitude shown?

(29) Scarcely enthroned, what did he order? Of what elementary right did he deprive them? How did he have them punished? What did he do to this scene? How many were so executed? How many did he imprison? How did he treat the dead bodies of Cromwell, Ireton and Bradshaw? Those of Pym and Blake? The bodies of Cromwell's mother and eldest daughter? Despite what? What did he restore to all royalists, whenever possible? To the Anglican Church? By what Act? What other things did the Act require? What evil effect did it work? Why was the effect evil? What Act did he have passed in 1662? What were the effects of this Act? What Act did he make follow this one? What was its effect? To this what Act did he add? What did it forbid? In what did these two Acts result? What did he in 1660 order? In whose imprisonment did this result? How long? Where? What did he there write? Including what book? Whose frequent imprisonment did it also effect? What

did parliament and the people force him to do with his first Declaration of Indulgence? Why?

(30) While persecuting all Puritans, whom did he especially single out? Within a few years how many did he have in prison? When was that number released? Through what? Who else at that time and by that declaration obtained his freedom? What did he do with the Scotch Covenanters? Contrary to his oath what two things did he do to the Scotch? With what did he meet resistance to these two measures? What Act did he put into effect as to all Scotch Presbyterian ministers? With what result to 350? By what did he greatly outrage English feelings? What illegal thing did he permit? By what other act did he as a national humiliation outrage English feeling? By a secret treaty to what three things for an annual pension of 3,000,000 francs did he agree? What two effects followed this treaty? What subtle act did he do in 1672? Why were Protestants favored thereby? With what results? Knowing his intent, what did parliament do in opposition? Until what? What was the primary purpose and effect of all the acts referred to in this and the preceding paragraph? The nature of most of them? What was the purpose of those of them that were not blows on Protestantism? When only did he favor it? What corroborates this?

(31) What should we now see? What was the character of some of these acts? Hence are covered by what type? The character of most of them? Hence covered by what type? What was their intention in all cases? As what does Jehoahaz stand as a type? What was the main character of his antitype's works? How typed? What evils did they continue? How typed? What did he do in other ways? What are three examples? How typed? Wherein are their acts set forth? How typed? When did the Jehoash policy cease acting as predominant? How typed? By what policy was it succeeded? What two things did the successor achieve? How typed? What was the main feature of the Joash phase? What two kinds of mouthpieces did God use during the Puritan period so far considered? Who typed each kind? How long combinedly did they function? Who was the Elijah leader at the beginning? Who were the Elisha representatives

in the four sects chiefly involved as weakening toward its end? How typed? How and through what did this weakening set in? When did it cease to function? How typed? What did antitypical Joash do at that period? Why? How typed? How did they act? How typed? What three things did they express? How typed in each case?

(32) What was the time character of the symbolic visit? When and through what did it begin? When end? With what four things did antitypical Elisha arm antitypical Joash? How was the first type? The second, third and fourth? What were these to do with the first? What response did antitypical Joash make? How typed? What did antitypical Elisha then do? How typed? What was the response? How typed? What did antitypical Elisha then do? How typed? What was their next instruction? How typed? What was the response? How typed? What charge and response was then made? How typed? What was the nature of this scene so far enacted? When was it fulfilled? What were the incidences antecedent and connected with its fulfilment? What was the trickery connected with Charles' pertinent course? How did antitypical Elisha perceive and do on this matter? With what effect in and out of parliament? On Charles? As what is this matter set forth? How did antitypical Elisha prophesy this event? How typed? What did they add prophetically? How typed? Unto what result? How typed? Why was the fulfilment of this forecast given above? What course is followed as to the threefold smiting with the arrows, type and antitype?

(33) In continuing the pantomime forecast what did antitypical Elisha then do? How typed? What response followed? How typed? Thereupon what did antitypical Elisha charge? How typed? What pantomimic response followed? How typed? What followed? How typed? In connection with what will the antitypical facts be given? What effect on antitypical Elisha did the mere threefold smiting have? How typed? What did they tell them? How typed? What did they say should have been done and resulted? How typed? What did they say would be the result of the threefold smiting? How typed? What are we to understand preceded each of the three antitypical smittings? What chronological conclusion is drawn

from this fact? What pertinent thing occurred in 1674? What is the approximate date of antitypical Elisha's ceasing to function? How typed? What infamous treaty did the Cabal ministry make? What were to England its main degrading provisions? Of what and in what was it guilty? How typed? When did they so act? How typed?

(34) What occurred in 1672? What did it force? In the Cabal's and the bulk of its supporters' cast-off condition what did they continue to do? With what exception? As reformed what did they become to the rest of the Cabal and its supporters? Accordingly, what did they do to these? How typed? What attracted their attention? How typed? What effect did their noting these measures have on them? How typed? What did they do with the Earl of Shaftesbury and his supporters? How typed? What resulted therefrom? How typed? What counteractive measure did he and his supporters cause to pass through parliament? How long did its provisions operate? How was this activity typed? What is here done with vs. 22, 23? Why? What was shown above? How was the thing shown above typed? In this changed phase of the conflict whom did antitypical Joash draw to his side? As religious bodies what did they become during antitypical Jehoahaz's days? Through what? How typed?

(35) Through what did this occur? How typed? In what did Charles II persist? What did he resultantly make? When? Ostensibly aimed at what? In the meantime what did the Presbyterians gain? What did they recognize? What counteractive steps did they take? With what results? Thereupon what did parliament do on the subject of Charles' Declaration? Of what were these Protestant successes the antitype? What did this victory first accomplish? Second? What was the antecedent of antitypical Joash's second victory? To break up this condition and free England from betrayal to Rome, what did antitypical Joash do? What were the three pro-Protestant and anti-Romanist provisions of the Test Act? What did this law force? Including even whom? What was it of a certainty? What was their third great victory over antitypical Ben-hadad? What were the three worst and to England greatest humiliating features? How did the bulk of Englishmen feel over it? What did antitypical

Joash in, out of and by parliament do in 1674 with this treaty? And what three things to Charles? What had been done with that treaty? From when to when? What did an outraged public sentiment force? As well as what other three things? What succeeded the Cabal ministry? What did it do to Charles? Until when? What happened in that year? To what kind of a phase did it give way?

(36) What were the first and last years of the Jeroboam phase? What were the parallel years? Where proven? What did it witness? In so far as what is concerned? What else did it witness? How did it grow? What will here first be set forth? Thereafter what? What do these events form? When? By 1678 of what four things had the bulk of the English people become convinced? In view of this state of public opinion, what did Titus Otis do? What kind of a man was he? What did he spread? How did his stories affect the populace and parliament? What did he do in parliament?

(37) What anti-Romanist measure did the resultant agitation make a law? What other unhappy things did it effect? To what did this agitation and the desire to prevent the exposure of the worst feature of Charles' bargain with Louis move him to agree? What was the period and the general work of the Cavalier Parliament? What was the character of the new parliament? What great Act in 1679, preservative of freedom against tyrants' arbitrariness and selfishness, did it pass? What did Charles do three times? How long apart? Why? What occurred in 1682? In what two ways did Charles exercise autocracy? As an excuse for what did he use the Rye House Plot? When about to die what did he do?

(38) By what four evils were his last three Rome-favoring and Protestant-opposing years followed? Through whom? What was his character as ruler? What did his course effect? What did the Glorious Revolution effect? What characterized the involved six years? What did this fight undo? What two things on beginning his reign did James II swear to do? Despite his oath, what three things did he do throughout his reign? What was his scheme?

(39) What lawless thing did he do three days after he became king? Despite what two things? How did he carry

his first parliament? What two things did he have done in Scotland? What two things did he brutally suppress? What did he do with their leaders? What did he do through Chief Justice Jeffries? Through Col. Kirke and Kirke's Lambs? How did he suborn witnesses? How did his Lambs mock the "dancing" of those hanged? What did James II introduce? Who introduced the first one? On what did he determine? On what did he defy parliament's protests? Why did he prorogue parliament? What did he do to four judges of the King's Court? Why?

(40) What did he then do? What did he do as a result? Including what? What law did he ignore? How? What illegal thing did he next do? Next after this? What did he in connection therewith seek to enforce? How did he treat non-compliance therewith? What did these lawless acts arouse? Against these what did he do? What did he then do? What did he do to Protestant officers in the Irish army? What condition set in shortly? What did he then set out to do? Against the law what did he re-establish? Under what name, number and head? What did he then forbid? How in London did he seek to enforce this prohibition? What did pressure from this Commission arouse? How did it assert itself? What next did he seek to Romanize? By what acts? Who resisted? How did he treat them? What by 1687 was aroused? How did he treat advice to be moderate? Even whose advice? Why did they give it? How did he silence parliament's protests? What did he do with remonstrating Protestants? Whom did he put in their places? Even in what cases? To what extreme did he go with the Jesuit Petre? Why was this an extreme step? With the papal nuncio? How did he treat the Protestant Duke of Somerset for refusing to break the law by leading him into the Presence Chamber? What may truly be said of his course?

(41) What did the English people discern as his purposes? What, accordingly, did they do? Despite his recommendations and commands, what did the governors of the Charter House refuse to do? Who were found among them? What produced rebellion in his most devoted Tories? What in the beginning and toward the end of his reign did he issue? What were their ostensible and real purposes? What did he do with the contrary laws? What

was the Protestant reaction? Whose, for example? What did his pertinent failure prompt him to seek? What kind of voting regulations did he set up? Who refused to enforce them? Against this what two things did he do? What did the voters do?

(42) What did he then do? How many read it? Refused to read it? How many started to read it in London churches? How was their compliance frustrated? What did the bishops do as to the clergy's refusal to read it? What did the primate do about it? How many bishops had time sufficient to reach Canterbury? What did the seven bishops do? What did the king answer? Do? What did they refuse to give? Who supported them? How did the people show their attitude? What again did the king reject? What was the jury's verdict on them, charged as criminals? How did the London populace celebrate the acquittal? What was done for those outside London throughout England? How did such respond? Even who celebrated the acquittal? How did James react to their attitude? Of what did these demonstrations convince him?

(43) How had he made his appointments to office? What did this make their acts? Accordingly, what had to be done to reestablish law in England? How did he treat officials who sided with the seven bishops? What did he seek to foist upon England? With what result? For what three reasons did the English put up with him? What put an end to their longsuffering? Why? What three motives determined them to dethrone him? Who acted to this end? What did they do? What prompted William and Mary to accept the invitation? How did James react to this? How were his reactions received? Why? With what did William come? Who in great numbers joined it? How did James react to this? Contrary to William's desire what happened? Why did William not desire it? What happened again? To whose relief? What did parliament declare of him? What conditions were imposed upon William and Mary? On their promising to observe this what was done to them?

(44) What did James' Romanist organization of Ireland effect for him? How did his Irish army treat Irish Protestants? In what? What occurred in several sieges of Protestant cities? Especially in that of Londonderry?

Until when did they hold out? What un-British thing did James then do? What was carried on in 1689? What in 1690 occurred that changed the course of events? Where and when did the two armies join battle? With what result? Where was James during the battle? How did he react to the defeat? What happened to William in this battle? What did his generals do thereafter? What did he allow in the peace terms? What conditions followed the war? With what results in Romanist Ireland? In Protestant (Ulster) Ireland?

(45) What twelve promises were made by William and Mary in England? Keeping these promises, how did they rule? To what high position did William III attain? How and by what and where is he held in high honor? What did the constitutional reformers of William and Mary's day undo? With what result? Without what was the revolution of 1688 accomplished in England? How is it called? In contrast with what?

(46) Where and when was the main part of antitypical Jeroboam's and Ben-hadad's fight? What aspect did it take on afterward? Due to the intrigues of what two sets of agents? What did Louis XIV seek to do? By what? What were the two general results? What English Act was passed in 1701? What did William always oppose? Why? When did he reign? What were strictly defined and secured during his reign? What cabinet reform was then introduced? Of what are the reforms of this and the subsequent period of antitypical Jeroboam the basis? How are the Common Laws of both countries related? From these standpoints and those of the individual's inalienable rights before human law, what is England to America and what was she long called? What solidified Protestant countries against Louis XIV's Romanist course? What did he do at James II's death in 1701? How did parliament react to this busybodying in England's affairs? How did the war of the Spanish Succession proceed and result for Protestantism and Romanism?

(47) What in 1707 further strengthened Protestantism and weakened Romanism? Under what conditions did this take place? What did the Jacobites do during 1714 to 1716? Anent what circumstances? What did the Jacobites attempt to do? Who joined the plot? Its result?

(48) What followed? In whose interests? Into what did they grow? Where? What marked it? What was the final result? What did Charles XII of Sweden plot? What put an end to it? What did Britain, 1718-1720, do? Why? With what result? What bill was passed in 1719 helpful to Protestant dissenters' sects? How was it helpful? What occurred in 1723 as to Bishop Atterbury? How did he stand among Jacobites? What did Spain at war with Britain, 1727-1729, seek to do? What were the things it did to secure the Pretender's enthronement? What was the outcome? What did the Pretender give up in 1730? What was thereby realized? Despite what?

(49) What will now be done with the foregoing discussion? What do the meaning of Jeroboam and his acts imply as to the antitype? How typed? With what were they occupied? How typed? What in many ways was the character of their acts? Especially when? How typed? What course did they follow? Like whom? How typed? Despite this what good did he do? How typed? By whom was this prophesied? What peculiarity does this prophecy have? Who accomplished this deliverance? Why? How typed? Who were unable to do it? How typed?

(50) Through whom did He work the deliverance? How typed? How were they related to the antitypical Joash? How typed? Where are the various features of their works recorded? How typed in each feature? Whose pertinent work is the ablest? How long and when was this the ascendant movement? When did it end? How typed? By what was it succeeded? What did it seek to have rescinded? How typed?

(51) As shown above, what amelioration of the Test Act was given the British non-Anglican sects? Under what disadvantages did they yet suffer by it? What did some members of dissenting sects do as to the Test Act? Why? What did strict Anglicans do as to occasional conformity? Without annulling the Act what kind of an ameliorating bill as to it had been passed? What in 1730 did antitypical Zachariah do? With what proviso? In favor of their object what did they set forth? What party was then in power? Under whose leadership? How did they view the involved principles? Yet what did they

urge? Why? How long did the discussion go on? What had the Whigs determined by 1731? What was the only concession that they would make? What reason was given therefore? With this decision what took place? With it what also ended? As what? What does this imply? After achieving what two general effects?

(52) How long did the antitypical Zachariah phase last? What are the parallel years? Where is this shown? How typed? What will now be briefly done? What is Scripturally done as to the coming of this phase into activity? In what language is it typed? Of what was it guilty? How typed? Under what circumstances did it become thus guilty? How typed? What did it not give up, introduced by the first Lutheran movement? What were these evils? Who else was guilty of them? What did the Whig leaders do as to the Presbyterian Puritans' request? How typed? What did their full decision end? How typed? What did they briefly do? How typed? What was done as to the acts of antitypical Zachariah? How typed? What was thus fulfilled? Through whom was it probably given? What did the prophecy say? Where is it recorded? How did antitypical Elisha use Jehu's revolution? When did that revolution begin and end successfully? What is therefore probable? Of what in this matter do we not know? How is this matter typed? What occurred with the prophecy? How typed?

(53) What study is now taken up? After what? What will prove helpful at this point? For what? What does Jehoshaphat parallel? How? What are the parallel years? Through whom did it develop as such? Despite what during its last seven years? Jehoram? How? The parallel years? Ahaziah? How? How did the Congregationalists in England react thereto? The parallel years? When and how did it end? What was the peculiarity of the fourth Congregational movement? Which was this church? Who was its leader? In what three movements was he injuriously active? What typed the anti-separatist movement of the Leyden Congregational Church? What are the parallel years?

(54) What did the Leyden Church see? What thereupon did it do? Under whose lead? What were the faithful

Congregationalists? What does this mean? What was their pertinent idea? How did they enter this covenant? To what did they bind themselves? What did they refuse? With whom? What resultantly were they called? What church took another attitude? On seeing what? During what period? How typed? In this attitude what did it do? How typed? What did the Congregationalists make? In whom? How typed? How did Congregationalism reactionary stand toward it? Congregationalism autocratic? How typed in each case? What did this covenant in its adherents do secretly? How typed in detail? In what did it keep them? How typed? Against what? How typed? What is a summary of its activities in its adherents? How typed? As a feature of what? How typed? From what did it give this protection? How typed? With what result? How typed?

(55) How many principles and practices of Congregational separatism did they repudiate? Under whose leadership? How typed? Wherein does this appear? What is the first of these repudiations? The second? Third? Fourth? Fifth? Sixth? Seventh? Eighth? Ninth? Tenth? Eleventh? Twelfth? Thirteenth? Fourteenth? Fifteenth? Sixteenth? What vital principle did they repudiate? From what did it flow? What are some more details involved in their repudiations? In repudiating these things what did the Leyden Church become? In what act? What did she fail to do?

(56) How long was this principle held secretly? What were the years? How typed? During this time what prevailed? Where? How typed? When did our Lord take charge of counteractive measures? How is the time typed? What did He first do? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Especially what two classes? How typed in each case? How is each of the five ecclesias' leaders typed separately? What did our Lord do as to these? How typed? How? How typed? How and where did He do this? How typed? What did He clarify and stress? How typed? In what did these leaders busy themselves? How typed? What did they do there? How typed? Whom else? How typed? Where did they bring these? How typed? What did all the faithful do? When? How typed? What did Jesus make clear? How typed? According to

what? How typed? What work did He give them? How differing? How is the fourfoldness of the work typed? What was the first of these activities? How typed? The second? How typed? The third? How typed? The fourth? How typed? What were the rest of the brethren to do? How did they differ? How typed? Who were alone to do public service? How typed? How should these do their service? How typed?

(57) What were two of these sets of brethren to do? How typed in each case? How were they to act? How typed? What were they to do? How typed? What should be done to the inimically disposed? How typed? What were they especially to do? How typed? What four groups were involved? How typed in each case? What did they do? How typed? What particular work did He have the fourth group do? How typed? What three things did our Lord provide? For whom? How typed in each case? Where found? How typed? Where placed? How typed? To whom did they come? Why? How typed? Where did they take their position? As what? How typed? In support of what? How? How typed? What two classes were involved? How typed? How did they stand? For what? How typed? How were they equipped? For what? How typed? What three things did they begin to do? How typed? As what did they set it forth? How typed? What did they give to it? How typed? As what did they set it forth? How typed? Who especially now acted? How typed? What did they do? How typed? What did all the faithful then do? How typed? For what did they pray? How typed?

(58) Who took cognizance of the demonstration? How typed? Who were the demonstrators observed? How typed? How were they supporting Separatism? How typed? What did it first do? Secondly? How typed? What did their discussions reveal? To what? How typed? How formed? By whom? How typed? What had he done? How typed? Who perverted it into a sect? What was the pertinent custom? How typed? What did the leaders and lecturers do? How typed? What was the attitude of the others? Except whom? How typed? Who all joined in such advocacy? How typed? What did

their preachers do? How? How typed? Who else joined in the propaganda? How typed?

(59) Seeing the happenings, what did the Leyden Church movement do? As what? Seeking to do what? How are these things typed? Of what did it accuse the faithful? How typed? Whom did Jesus bring into extra prominence? How typed? What did He charge? On what were the concessions made? How were these things typed? Toward whom were they made? In what compromising efforts? How typed? What also did He charge as to its defenders? How typed? What did He prohibit? How typed? Taking this cue, what did they do? How typed? What did they avoid? What did they do? How typed? To what teachings? How typed? What had it done as to these teachings? What did they reveal? And thus do? How typed? What did the pertinent movement do? What occurred in less than two years thereafter? What happened about 100 years later to the *quasi*-Presbyterio-Congregationalism transplanted by him to New England? During the first part of those about 100 years of what was it guilty? With what effect on Massachusetts' early reputation? What do these facts prove of the Leyden brand of Congregationalism?

(60) What did our Lord effect? Between whom? How typed? On God's part what did it do? On the movement's and the people's part what did it do? How typed? What else did it imply? How typed? In loyalty to their agreement what did they enter? How typed? What did they therein do first? How? How typed? Secondly? How typed? While how engaged? How typed? For what did our Lord arrange? How typed? Through whom? How typed? According to what? How typed? What was their work? How typed? According to what? How typed? In what spirit did they sacrifice? How typed? Doing what? How typed? According to whose arrangements? How typed? For what did they also arrange? How typed? For what precaution? How typed?

(61) What arrangements were made to operate? Why was another thing done? What was it? Why? Where is this set forth? Who participated in this? In what order? What was the first in order? What was their work? The second? To what end? How typed? The third?

What did they do? How typed? The fourth? What unexpectable thing marked these? How typed? The fifth? What did they do? How typed? To what end did all these cooperate? How typed? As a thing not simply operating in what way? How typed? What did they do with Separatism? How typed? By whose means? How typed? Into what sphere did they put it? How typed? As what did they constitute it? How typed? In its adherents what did it exercise? According to what example? How typed? What was the effect on all loyal Congregationalists? How typed? What resultantly reigned? Where? How typed? After what? How typed? With what was it accomplished? How typed? On what subject? How typed?

CHAPTER VI

OTHER MIDDLE PARALLELS.

2 Kings 11:21–12:21; 14:1-14, 17-20; 2 Chron. 24:1–25:28.

JOASH (OF JUDAH). AMAZIAH. WAR BETWEEN AMAZIAH AND JOASH (OF ISRAEL).

HAVING studied the overthrow of the anti-separatist Congregationalist movement, as antitypical Athaliah, by the Separatist Congregational movement, as antitypical Joash, or, Jehoash (*Jehovah supports*), and the installation of the latter as the more favored movement of God's people, we are now ready to study the further history of this latter movement, whose forty years' period of preeminence in Congregationalism was from 1623 to 1663, paralleling the reign of typical Joash, 898-858 B.C. (2 Kings 11:21—12:1; 2 Chro. 24:1). Separatism's preeminence was divided into two parts, the first of which consisted of its period of loyalty to the principle of separatism (1-16), and the second of which consisted of its period of disloyalty to that principle (17-21; 17-27). During this time it exercised its preeminence in the sphere of executiveship among God's more favored people (Jerusalem, 12:1; 1) and began it properly (seven years, 11:21; 1). The doctrine of consecration mothered this movement, which doctrine is closely related to the truth of the Oath-bound Covenant (Zibiah [*deer*], Beersheba [*well the oath*]). As long as this movement recognized and accepted Jesus as its High-priestly Leader and Teacher it did right in the Lord's service (right ... Lord ... Jehoiada [*Yahweh knows*] ... instructed him, 2; 2). Our Lord enlisted in its support non-sectarian consecrated Anglicans and non-sectarian consecrated Puritan Presbyterians (Jehoiada ... two wives, ;3), by whom it developed various

movements, *e.g.*, movements against sectarian Anglicanism, Puritan Presbyterianism, Romanism, in the activities of Christianizing the parliamentary army and of civil and religious liberty as against Charles I's and the Anglican hierarchy's tyranny (begat sons) and various powers toward parliament, its army and its church and for the rights of existence, conscience, propaganda and controversy (daughters). Nevertheless it permitted without remonstrance denominations to flourish in its sphere of executiveship and in the sphere of its teachings (high places were not taken away, 3;); and it allowed its adherents to minister therein (people still sacrificed) and to offer their choice powers in the interests of denominationalism (burnt incense). Marked illustrations of these things are seen in its parliamentary members' working on forming a new national church and some of its leaders, 11 able men, as members of the Westminster Assembly, helping to form parts of the Westminster Confession and its two catechisms, the main creed of English-speaking Presbyterians.

(10) The Separatist movement shortly after overthrowing antitypical Athaliah (after this, ;4) was determined to repair the damages done to God's people as His temple (minded to repair the house of the Lord), which damages were made by the followers of the movement that John Robinson led as the leader of antitypical Athaliah; for the followers of that evil movement (sons ... wicked woman, ;7 [as the wife of Jehoram of Judah and the mother of his children; all of Athaliah's children, except Ahaziah (also called Jehoahaz), were slain during Jehoram's lifetime by the Arabians (2 Chro. 21:17; 22:1); accordingly, we understand the word *sons* here to mean certain subordinates of Athaliah, those who had her spirit]) had by the evils, introduced among God's people and set forth in our discussion of 2 Kings 11 and 2 Chro. 22:10—23:21, done untold harm to God's people as His temple (broken up the house of God) and had

perverted the things consecrated to God by His people to the use of power-graspers and lords over God's heritage (dedicated things ... bestow upon Baalim [*lords*]). Accordingly, the Separatist movement attracted the attention of the main and subordinate leaders of the movement (gathered ... priests and the Levites, ;5) to the work of getting for the repairing of God's people as His temple (repair the house of your God) the things of God's people as classes (cities of Judah) and individuals (all Israel) adapted to such work—the things of their humanity and of their new-creaturely possessions and abilities applicable to such work. Included among such latter things were the pertinent Scripture passages and their new-creaturely pertinent oral and written teachings (money). These they were to assemble at all opportune times (year to year). This antitypical money was the applicable things of God's people's consecrations given for temple uses (dedicated things ... house of God, 4;), *i.e.*, their applicable abilities (passeth the account) according to the Lord's and His people's judgment (every man is set at), even everything that was freely and willingly devoted to the purpose at hand (cometh ... heart ... house). These were the things that the main leaders were to take into their charge (Let the priests take it to them, 5;) from all whose abilities the main leaders knew (of his acquaintance); and they were to use these as available to repair the damages done the Church (repair breaches), regardless of where these damages existed (wheresoever ... found). They were charged to do this work expeditiously (hasten, ;5); but the subordinate leaders did not hasten therein (Levites hastened not). The work dragged along from shortly after 1623 until 1646, the year of Charles I's complete defeat and the time that the dissenting Congregationalist leaders withdrew from the Westminster Assembly (three and twentieth year ... not repaired ... house, 6;).

(11) Varifold were the reasons why this work dragged on. The first of these was the persecution that the Congregationalists in England had to endure at the hands of James I and Charles I, goaded on by the Anglican hierarchy, especially by Archbishop Laud and his Star Chamber Court and High Commission Court. The second of these was their preoccupation in the debates that then agitated the British people between the civil and religious liberty-lovers in and out of parliament and the tyranny-exercisers, especially Charles I and the Anglican hierarchy. The third of these was the years-long revolution between parliament and its supporters, on the one hand, and Charles I and his supporters, on the other hand. The fourth of these was the participation of eleven among ablest Congregationalist leaders in the Westminster Assembly, working for years on the Westminster Confession and its two catechisms. The five main leaders among these eleven were Nye, (Thomas) Goodwin, Bridge, Simson and Burroughs, called the dissenting brethren, who had as Congregationalists a most strenuous debate with the Presbyterian majority in that Assembly, and who finally withdrew from it shortly before it was at long last adjourned, because they would not endorse its majority-adopted Presbyterian order of church government. Other able Congregationalists then active, though not members of that Assembly, were Howe and (John) Owen, the latter being perhaps the greatest one of all of Congregationalist theologians. The fifth reason for their delay was that very many Congregationalist ministers were chaplains in the parliament's army, which increasingly became Congregationalist, until the vast bulk of it was such by the end of the fighting part of the revolution, 1646. Oliver Cromwell increasingly became a main lay Congregationalist leader, until he became, through his victories and elevation to be head of the English Commonwealth, their lay leader by preeminence, despite the fact that the puritan Presbyterians

were the leaders of the less favored movement of God's people (Levites hastened it not, ;5).

(12) This delay to repair the damages wrought among God's people as His temple by antitypical Athaliah and her supporters greatly weighed upon Separatism and its leaders and ledlings (king Joash, 7; 6) and moved it to appeal to Jesus as High Priest and to the main leaders under Him (called for Jehoiada ... priests, 7; the chief, ;6), asking why they did not repair these damages (Why ... breaches, 7;) and why Jesus did not have the subordinate leaders make available for this work, of the human and new-creaturely abilities, *etc.* (Why ... Levites, ;6), of God's more favored people and those of them in their executive sphere (Judah ... Jerusalem, ;6), those things (collection) adapted to restoring temple breaches, even as Jesus and God's people had charged throughout the Gospel Age to be done for the erection of the antitypical Gospel-Age Tabernacle (commandment of Moses ... congregation ... tabernacle, Ex. 35:4-29; 36:3-6). The main Congregational leaders had appropriated to themselves for their uses, as indicated in their activities set forth in the preceding paragraph, things in the human and new-creaturely abilities, *etc.*, consecrated by their supporters to the Lord. This antitypical Joash forbade to be done any more (receive no more money of your acquaintance, 7;) but commanded them to cause these things to be made available to restore the Church as God's temple (deliver ... breaches). Recognizing the propriety of this charge, the main leaders agreed to make no more these consecrated things available to their own uses (consented to receive ... people, 8;), except to make them available to restore God's people as His temple to an orderly condition (neither [literally, except, as the connection clearly shows] to repair ... the house). Thereupon at the recommendation of antitypical Joash (king's commandment, ;8) and by Jesus' cooperation (Jehoiada, 9;) a committee, as a school of the

prophets, was suggested to be appointed in each ecclesia (chest, 9; 8), suitable to receive (bored a hole, 9;) by its leaders (lid, 9;) whatsoever offerings in money, Scripture passages, talents, discourses, pen-products, *etc.*, were presented. These were made available for use to repair the aforesaid damages done God's people as His temple. This arrangement was decided on for every ecclesia (set beside [to the east, at the gate not to the north or south side in the court] the altar, 9;) in relation to consecration, so that it would include those about to consecrate, as well as those already consecrated (set it without at the gate, ;8, as one cometh into the house, 9;). These committees, as schools of the prophets, it was planned, were to be dominated by love (to the right side, 9;—in the type the chest was located east of the altar, not in the court, but outside the gate that corresponds to the tabernacle's gate of the court, but so located that if a straight line were drawn eastward along the north side of the altar and projected to and outside the gate, the chest, at the right, would be north of that line, *i.e.*, toward the north side of the temple, which symbolizes love). And those main leaders who did evangelistic work were planned to be used to supervise the offering made in each committee as a school of prophets (priests ... door ... put ... brought, 9;). These schools of prophets were, as decided on, conducted in a manner similar to our suggestions in these columns as to how schools of prophets should be conducted in Epiphany ecclesias.

(13) These arrangements having been decided on, everywhere among God's more favored people (through Judah, ;9) and in their sphere of executiveship (Jerusalem) it was widely advocated (proclaimed) to make available such offerings as their schools of prophets had prepared (collection) for the Lord's service (bring in to the Lord), even as Jesus had taught personally and by His special mouthpieces, the Apostles and other star-members, should be done during the

Gospel Age with the consecrated people's human all and their new-creaturely attainments, *etc.* (Moses ... laid ... wilderness). This work of agitation heard by all the leaders and all the ledlings (princes ... people, ;10), first, made them very glad indeed (rejoiced), and, secondly, in the spirit of joyful cooperation they arranged for such committees, as schools of the prophets, in all the ecclesias, many offering themselves as trainees (brought in), making in them the pertinent human all and new-creaturely attainments available by training to be fruitfully used to restore the Church from its damages (cast into the chest); and this good work was continued to a completion with remarkable success as to a fine spirit shown and a great increase of members won (made an end), *e.g.*, even the privates, as well as the officers, in the parliamentary army became through this method of training for God's service so well developed in their ability to explain and defend their truths and to refute the opposing errors that they confounded all opponents, puzzling even Richard Baxter, the ablest Presbyterian divine of his and most other times. These soldiers became very able preachers and expounders of the Word, using much of their time in its study and proclamation. The same is true of the non-military members of the Congregational ecclesias of England. Their propaganda resulted in an immense increase of Congregationalists in Britain.

(14) When it was brought to the administrative attention of antitypical Joash (saw, 10;, brought unto the king's office, ;11) that a very generous response was made in volunteering their pertinent human all and their new-creaturely abilities and possessions in the school of prophets (much money in the chest, 10;, much money, ;11), ministered to by the subordinate leaders as leaders in such schools (the Levites), Separatism's scholarly representatives (king's scribe, 10;) and the Lord Jesus' representatives (high priest's officer, ;11) saw to the graduation of fit ones from such schools of prophets (emptied the chest, ;11) and

gave them diplomas to the branches of service to which each was specially fitted, *e.g.*, some as teachers, some as evangelists, some as catechists, some as extension workers, *etc.* (put up in bags, 10;) and described the available talents, *etc.* (told [counted] the money), usable for and in the Church (house, 10;); and then installed these into their places of service in the Church (carried it to his place, ;11). This was repeatedly done, whenever these sons of the prophets were fitted for their several places of service (did day by day, ;11). These schools of prophets proved to be an abundantly fruitful means of providing the necessary talent for the Lord's pertinent service (gathered money in abundance, ;11). Antitypical Joash and our Lord (they, 11;, the king and Jehoiada, ;12) put these talents so described (told, 11;) into the charge of their leading brethren in the service (gave ... did the work ... oversight). These put these talents into the hands of those who worked along lines of justification (laid it, 11;, hired, ;12, carpenters and builders) and of new-creatureship (masons and hewers of stone, 12;, masons, ;12), in order that they might win new justified ones and new consecrated ones (to buy timber and hewed stones, 12;). This was done to replenish the Church (repair the breaches of, 12;, repair the house of the Lord, ;12). Especially did they employ these talents to put the workers into a position to make strong those justified ones that they had won (such as wrought iron and brass, ;12, all laid out ... to repair, 12;); and so did they seek to restore the Church unto a sound condition (mend the house, ;12, repair it, 12;).

(15) Accordingly, the involved pastors, the teachers, ruling elders, teaching elders, and their helpers, worked upon the Church and repaired completely the damages that were wrought upon it by antitypical Athaliah and her subordinates (wrought ... perfected, ;13). According to the view of the Congregationalists, not seeing that Eph. 4:11, as the Greek indicates, uses the

terms *pastors* and *teachers* synonymously, and taking them to mean two different kinds of officers in the ecclesias, such officers among Congregationalists were: first, pastors; second, teachers; third, ruling elders (the word *ruling* in passages that suggest such elders is a mistranslation; it should be given as presiding, in the sense of administering officially); fourth, teaching elders (here, again, they were not clear, for all elders were pastors, or teachers); fifth, deacons, and sixth, deaconesses. From among the ruling elders, as a rule, the secretary and treasurer were appointed. They developed the Church into a good condition in grace, knowledge and service (set ... in his state) and then strengthened it therein (strengthened it). But up to this stage of the work they had not prepared refutative writings (bowls of silver, 13;), corrective writings (snuffers), doctrinal writings (basons) or other, *i.e.*, ethical, writings (vessels) of Divine Truth (gold ... silver) and the announcements of special teachings by lecturers (trumpets), from the talents made available for such work for the Church (money ... house), since up to this time the main and great stress was laid as to the use of these talents on the Truth workers to repair the damages that the Church had sustained (gave ... workmen, and repaired ... house, 14;). There was such fidelity (dealt faithfully, 15;) shown by those supervising brethren who were commissioned to oversee the work of placing these talents into the hands of the pastors, teachers, *etc.*, under appointment by antitypical Joash and our Lord Jesus, that they needed not censoriously to be rebuked, nor suspiciously to be overseen (reckoned not with the men ... delivered ... bestowed on workmen). And after the work on the Church was completed (finished) they made available the remaining and pertinent talents (brought the rest of the money, ;14), before the Separatist movement and Jesus as High Priest (king and Jehoiada); and by these were made doctrinal, refutative, corrective and ethical writings, even teachings

(vessels) to advance the Church in every good word and work (for the house). These written and oral teachings served to advance the brethren (vessels to minister), to delight the Lord as antitypical censers to burn acceptable incense before the Lord (to offer) and especially to help all along ethical lines (spoons); for they consisted of Divine truths. The main workers on these antitypical vessels were John Owen and Thomas Goodwin, who were the leading professors and executives of the Oxford University at that time. Other able assistants of these were Philip Nye, William Bridge, Sydrach Simson and John Howe. Especially did John Owen and Thomas Goodwin do extraordinarily able work as authors.

(16) The advantages that came from the reformatory deeds of those that had to make good for wrong-doing (trespass money, 16;) and the advantages that arose from the privilege of sharing with the Lord in the sin-offerings did not accrue to the generality of the Congregationalists (was not ... house); for these fell to the lot of the Congregationalist main leaders; for the wrong-doers (trespass), among other things, had to give up their positions, which fell to the lot of the main leaders among the Congregationalists, *e.g.*, Owen and (Thomas, not John) Goodwin were given the highest positions at the Oxford University, that the former wrong-doing incumbents had to give up for their wrong-doing. So, too, were similar changes made in favor of able Congregationalist preachers as to important pulpits for the wrong-doings of former incumbents. And because certain Congregationalist leaders suffered much persecution in the sin-offering (sin money) they were promoted in those days following the ascendancy of the Puritans and Independents (it was the priests'). And as long as the Congregationalists continued to enjoy the approval of Jesus (all the days of Jehoiada, ;14), they served in ways that received the manifestation of God's approval in the blessings that He bestowed upon them (offered burnt offerings

... Lord). And Jesus exercised an approving ministry for many years among the Congregationalists, *i.e.*, from 1582 to about 1652 (waxed old ... an hundred and thirty years old, ;15). And during about 60 years of this period, for the most part poor, few and persecuted, they held up the light of Truth as due and lived exemplary lives. But their apostasy, typed further on in this chapter, made Jesus withdraw from them His special favor (died). Nevertheless, the earlier and more holy days of Congregationalism were held in great esteem and reverence as being closely apostolic (buried ... City of David, ;16), even as days in which it enjoyed the privilege of being God's most favored movement (among the kings), because those days were such as contained much good done to God's people (done good in Israel), toward God (God) and the Church (house).

(17) As we saw above, so long as antitypical Joash (the policy of Separatism in its adherents) was loyal to God, Jesus supported it, but after it had proved fully disloyal, He forsook it entirely. This disloyalty was a gradually increasing one; and as it progressed Jesus' abandoning it progressed; and both of them progressed unto their separate completions (after the death of Jehoiada, ;17). Antitypical Joash degenerated proportionately as it increased in popularity with the people and with great ones (; princes of Judah) who became more and more affiliated with it and rendered it subservience (; made obeisance to the king); for the leading men in the English government, *e.g.*, Cromwell, the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth, his leading assistants in parliament, on the bench and in the council, as Congregationalists, did so. The leading men in the army and in commerce were mainly Congregationalists, and as such were also subservient to Separatism for a while. But mainly on account of the majority of Englishmen not being Congregationalists these leaders thought it good politics to blunt the edge of Separatism, and accept all Protestants into

membership in the state church, which, accordingly, they desired to consist of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists, but all holding to their own peculiar views and not engaging in controversy with one another. These leaders sought to persuade Separatism in its members to cooperate as parts of such a unionistic and compromising state church. It in them submitted to such persuasion (; hearkened). In this we see the danger of worldly popularity coming to, and of great ones coming among, God's people. It was an expression of the old Satanic trick repeated from Greek and Roman Catholicism in every Protestant sect, as it became popular, as witness Lutheranism in Germany and Scandinavia, Zwinglianism in Zurich, Calvinism in Switzerland, Holland, England and Scotland, Episcopalianism in England, *etc.* The Church has always been purest when unpopular and persecuted! God's people should avoid worldly popularity and the favor of worldly great ones as evil.

(18) As a result Congregationalists neglected building up God's people (; left the house ... God, v. 18) along the lines of the Congregational principles held from the earliest days of Congregationalism up to that time (; fathers). Thus they entered into a combinationistic alliance, which is symbolic fornication (Rev. 2:20-23; 17:3-6, 15, 16, 18; 18:3, 9; 19:2, 3), with Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism and Baptistism and the English Commonwealth, as the English government, people and country were then called, to all of which it and its members ministered (; served groves,—*Asheraism*, where in the type fornication and adultery were committed as parts of the religious rites of heathenism); and they also served the creed idols of these denominations, as well as made a new one of their own (; idols). *E.g.*, Congregationalists, like John Howe, an exceedingly eloquent and learned man and Cromwell's court preacher, and John Owen and Thomas Goodwin, very able theologians, advocated a corporate union of the four above-mentioned denominations.

And had the Lord not interfered, this purpose would probably have been effected. But this disloyalty aroused God's displeasure (; wrath) against the Congregationalist people (; Judah) and the sphere of Separatism's executiveship (; Jerusalem). This wrath expressed itself in giving them up to various hallucinations, strifes, divisions and losses, thus marring the Spirit of the Lord which had been so richly apparent among them. This strife also affected their connections with other churches and with the arrangements of the state within itself and in its relations to Separatism and these churches, *e.g.*, changes from some to other legislative organizations in the Commonwealth. Thus their disloyalty met with a deserved retribution. But amid wrath God remembers mercy, and, accordingly, raised up preachers who lodged protests against this apostasy (sent prophets ... testified against them, ;19), with entreaties to reformation and a return to truth, righteousness and holiness (; to bring ... Lord). But these were not heeded (; would not give ear).

(19) Only one of these protesting preachers is typed as an individual (Zechariah [*remembrancer, reminder, of Jehovah*, in allusion to his constantly reminding the people of God's relations to them], ;20), though other preachers also protested (; vs. 19, 25). This special protester was George Fox, the Little Flock member who started the Little Flock movement later perverted by crown-lost leaders into the Quaker sect. From early years of youth he sought to come into close fellowship with the Lord, and began as early as 1647, when 23 years of age, to preach and teach consecration and heart religion as opposed to dead formalism, mouth religion and unsanctified living. He traveled as a real pilgrim from place to place, preaching in churches whenever permitted, in open fields, in cemeteries, in the market places of towns and cities and in private homes. His godly life, simple speech and fearlessness amid much persecution attracted consecrated people, mainly of the humbler walks of life,

to his movement, which gained increasing numbers of people. Classes of believers were organized and a new ministry of itinerants like himself arose; and soon the Friends, as they were called, became a great influence for consecrated living; and as their influence increased their persecution, egged on by the clergy, increased. Everywhere jails were filled with these godly confessors of Christ and the life hidden with Christ in God. Fox himself was repeatedly jailed and whipped, experiences undergone by many of his brethren also. They were surely "a sect everywhere spoken against." In general they were persecuted for righteousness, though, as in all Little Flock movements, some fanatics associated themselves with them and by their follies brought upon all of them needless reproach. Everywhere the real Friends were recognized as exemplary Christians. Their conscientious objection to bearing arms, to taking oaths and to indulging in polite forms of speech and in forms of etiquette toward the great, like refusing to address them by their honorary designations, like, Your Worship, My Lord, Your Honor, *etc.*, to take off their hats, kneel and then stand up and remain standing in their presence, made them much reproached, and in not a few cases led to their imprisonment, charged with contempt of court. At one time there were 12,000 of them in prison. They rebuked sin in the high and low alike; they protested against the dearth of true religion, so general at that time; they inveighed against a paid ministry, especially one supported by tithes levied by the state, as was the case then in England. Particularly did they attack union of state and church as symbolic fornication.

(20) In all of this George Fox led the way, as was proper in the case of a star-member; for as such there rested a large measure of the Lord's Spirit upon him (Spirit of God came [literally, *clothed*] upon, ;20). True to the antitype of the meaning of his typical name, he, as Jesus' special representative (; Zechariah the son of Jehoiada), continually kept reminding the

people of Jehovah and the things of Jehovah's Word, as far as he understood that Word, in order to turn them away from their creed idols and their combinationism. In this he occupied high spiritual grounds, far above those occupied by the nominal people of God in those days (; above the people). Many were his Bible grounded expostulations as God's mouthpiece against the evils of his day (; said ... saith God). He reasoned with them against their evil course (; Why transgress ye), proving from Scriptures, reason and facts that they were by their deeds violating God's Word (; commandments of the Lord). He pointed out that because of their creed idolatry and their combinationism they were not prospering, nor could they prosper, in grace, knowledge and fruitfulness in service (cannot prosper). Then he pointed out the facts, that they had forsaken the Lord, in that instead of being faithful to the principles of Separatism they had given these up in the interests of a union of state and church, which was symbolic fornication, and that instead of holding in all simplicity and faithfulness to the teachings of God's Word, as formerly, they had resorted to creedal sectarianism, which was idolatry, and that instead of holding fast to the Lord's people as God's temple and to their services of Truth as such, they were giving their all to building up the nominal people of God in a service that advanced false religion. By these charges repeatedly made and factually, reasonably and Scripturally proven, he charged them with forsaking God (; forsaken the Lord). He then pointed out that because of this forsaking of God by the above-mentioned sins God had forsaken them, which he proved by the facts that God had given them up to ever-increasing sins, errors, false worship, an evil organization and bad practices (; forsaken you).

(21) Unless humble and meek, wrong-doers resent rebuke and correction, however lovingly intended and kindly made. And those wrong-doers with whom Fox had to deal were neither humble nor meek; hence they

greatly resented his rebukes and corrections. Above 1652-1654 were given as the time of the full fall of Separatism; but we are not to understand that it was a sudden thing. It began about 1648, but very subtly, almost imperceptibly, and progressed slowly by increasing compromises, until such compromises were full, during 1652-1654. Its increasing falling progressed with the increasing political power of Congregationalist secular leaders, especially that of Oliver Cromwell. The Spirit of the Lord in Fox perceived varying situations at the beginnings, progress and fulness of this apostasy. And his rebuke and correction of it were also progressively increasing ones, having a very small beginning and gradual progress unto a completion, increasingly accommodating themselves to the progress of the apostasy. In other words, while the type was progressive in fulfilling, the antitype was also progressive and long-drawn-out. Usually while types are quickly enacted, antitypes almost invariably are long-drawn-out matters. Already late in 1648 he mildly began his rebukes and corrections; but as the apostasy increased his rebukes and corrections increased in their vigor and severity, until he was most uncompromising in them. Such has always been the course of God's mouthpieces toward the unfaithful leaders and ledlings among God's nominal people, as we can see in the course of Jesus, Paul, Arius, Claudius of Turin, Marsiglio, Wessel, Luther and the Parousia and Epiphany Messengers. In this they simply reflected God's increasing displeasure of the wrong-doers. And as these rebukes and corrections increased, so did the persecutions with which they were answered. They started with contradictions, proceeded to minor violences at the hands of individuals, later by mobs rioting against him, hurling literal stones, garbage, foul eggs and refuse at him. They came to a head in arresting, trying, sentencing and imprisoning him often, the first time in 1649, at Nottingham. He was also beaten at the order of various officials, especially of magistrates and judges.

(22) Mayors, aldermen, sheriffs, magistrates, judges and army officers were his special accusers and persecutors. Going up and down the country, somewhat after the manner of a pilgrim, except that he traveled by foot, preaching and teaching in rebuke and correction of the above-mentioned sins, errors, formal worship, union of state and church, state tithing for the support of ministers, creed idols, among which he counted churches, called by him "steeple houses," false church organization and discipline, he was very offensive to the church and civil officers. These put their heads together (conspired against him, ;21) to cut him off from his ministry. Not accepting clerical ordination at the hands of any ecclesiastical body, he was considered as a usurper of the clerical office by the adherents of the sects then in more or less power. Hence this, added to his rebukes and corrections, made him a target of every strict sectarian who felt himself wronged by him. Usually "rude fellows of the baser sort" brought charges against him almost everywhere he went. And the civil officials were only too glad to jail him in vile prisons, where he was treated as the worst of criminals with great cruelty and neglect. There was an understanding reached by such civil officers to treat him with rigor wherever they could lay hands on him. They raised against him the worst of charges, *e.g.*, blasphemy, accusing him when he spoke of "the Christ in you," as claiming to be a reincarnation of Jesus. A certain fanatic at that time did claim such for himself, and was worshiped as such; but despite Fox's rejecting, preaching and writing against him as such, he himself was charged with, and sentenced to prison for, that blasphemy. His trials before magistrates and judges were the grossest travesties of justice. He was indeed "crucified without the city."

(23) We are not to understand the antitype of Zechariah's stoning to be a literal stoning, even though a part of it was literal stoning, but rather the hurling of religious, civil and social teachings at him in contradiction

of him, until he was entirely cut off from the fellowship of the nominal people of God—dead in their sight (; stoned him with stones); for the typical stonings charged by Moses represent the Lord's people hurling at wrong teachers and doers Biblical teachings, until the evil ones were cut off from God's people; but the wrong stonings, like that of Naboth, type hurling of false charges, wrong secular and religious teachings and perverted representations of the Truth teachings of the faithful against them. Such was the antitype of the stoning of Zechariah; for it was just such things that were hurled against Fox, until he was entirely cut off from the fellowship of God's nominal people. Accordingly, the death of Zechariah did not type Fox's death, which did not occur until Feb., 1691, 28 years after the antitypical Joash ended; but, as just indicated, his cutting off from all fellowship with the nominal people of God, which made him dead in their sight. A sad feature of this matter is that it was corrupted Separatism, unfaithful to its principles and the principles of the former phases of Congregationalism, that instigated this symbolic martyrdom of Fox, one of the finest characters of the Gospel Age (; at the commandment of the king). And it caused this to happen while he was ministering in the antitypical court—his condition and activities as to matters of justification in relation to the right way of living—duty love to God and man (; court of the house of the Lord). It certainly was an act of gross ingratitude to the Lord Jesus, who spoke through him, for corrupt Separatism to have instigated such persecution against one who reprov'd at the Lord's charge in the gate—publicly before the nominal people of God. It shows how unfaithfulness makes one forget formerly held and practiced principles; for Congregationalism in its faithful days protested against similar sins, errors and wrong practices and suffered persecution thereover and therefore received great blessings from the Lord Jesus (; remembered not ... Jehoiada ... slew his son).

(24) All the while this persecution of Fox and his brethren continued he cautioned the persecutors against their course. He told them that God Almighty was taking note of this persecution; that there was not one feature of its injustice but aroused His attention (; the Lord look upon it). Here is a wrong translation. It should be rendered: The Lord sees it. Certainly this richly developed child of God did not pray that God take a hostile view of his persecutors; for this would be a violation of the Lord's charge that His people wish and pray blessings upon their persecutors (Matt. 5:44). The facts of the case prove that he did not pray vengeance upon his persecutors; for they show that he entreated them to recognize that the Lord could not but take cognizance of such evil, and that He could not but mete out condign punishment therefore (; require it [literally, will require it]). It was Fox's custom lovingly to caution his persecutors that he was a servant of God, who must take note of their mistreating His servant, and who must mete out deserved retribution therefore. This was his course also as to the persecutors of his brethren. Orally and by writings he cautioned persecuting magistrates, judges, mayors, sheriffs and military officers, as well as private persons, that God was speaking through him and his brethren, and that He considered the treatment that they gave His servants as the treatment that they bestowed upon Him, and would react to it accordingly. He even wrote to this effect to Oliver Cromwell, and in his interview with him spoke of the same two things. But while Cromwell gave orders to the officials to cease the persecution, the latter heeded not his charge. Such expostulations and warnings continued for years, even as the cutting off proceeded for years.

(25) The forecast punishment came when the cup of wrath became full (at the end of the year, ;23). Romanism was the agent used by God to bring the punishment (Hazael, 17;). It acted therein through Charles II, who was at heart a Romanist, though

outwardly, for policy's sake, conforming to the Anglican Church, who was also its legal head, who for years pursued a policy of favoring Rome and persecuting its British opponents, and who on his death bed received its sacraments of communion and extreme unction, as shown heretofore in our discussion of antitypical Jehoshaphat and Jeroboam II in their dealings with Charles II. Invited to become England's king by military leaders, especially by Gen. Monk, commander of the army, then mainly Congregationalist, by the Presbyterian Puritans, who were deceived into believing him a Presbyterian, as he professed to be when made king of Scotland, by Episcopalians, who believed him a loyal member of their church, and by parliament, which was disgusted with the inefficiency of Richard Cromwell, the successor in the Protectorship of his very efficient father, Oliver. Charles returned to England from Holland in 1660 as king. His restoration was a matter of prolonged and secret intrigue, engineered initially by Jesuits, Louis XIV of France and the Romanist hierarchy. In this intrigue Gen. Monk took a large share, without, however, suspecting that Rome was its instigator. Hence Charles' return was a real papal victory, though concealed as such from the English people of all non-Romanist parties. Thus secretly Rome conquered England as a country and government (fought against Gath (*winepress*) and took it, ;). Thereupon Romanism, working through Charles II, sets its face against the sphere of the executorship of God's more favored people, the apostate Congregationalists (Hazeel set ... to Jerusalem, ;). At that time apostate Congregationalists were subject to disloyal Separatism, its ruling policy. And against it Romanism in Charles II turned its hostile attention (; Syria came up against him). It invaded the sphere of the apostate more favored people of God, and worked against apostate Separatism (; came to Judah and Jerusalem), in the sense that it planned through Charles II to undermine their influence before the public. This was not hard to

do, because those mainly responsible for bringing Charles II's father, Charles I, to trial for tyranny, dishonesty and treason, and for condemning and beheading him were the Congregationalist lay leaders, and, the Episcopalians and Presbyterians opposing it, the odium for the regicide fell upon the Congregationalists. It was a stipulation of Charles II, as a condition of his accepting the throne of England, that the main ones implicated in the regicide be punished. This was done by exhuming the bodies of the dead leaders, including that of Oliver Cromwell, and hanging and quartering them and giving them infamous burials, by executing the main living regicides and imprisoning and fining less prominent ones (; destroyed all the princes ... the people). All this turned the sycophantic public against disloyal Congregationalists and their disloyal policy of Separatism and made them very unpopular.

(26) Their spirit of disloyalty in the face of the popular disfavor, of the rule of the restored Charles II taking the place of the rule of the Commonwealth that had favored them, of the manipulation of his determined Romanist mother and brother, of his own secret Romanist leanings and obligations making disloyal Separatism its special object of attack, and of the opposition of the restored Episcopate and of the Puritan Presbyterians, moved Separatism in its disloyal adherents to retire to seclusion from all public activities. Its leaders, like Owen, (Thomas) Goodwin, Nye, Howe and the rest of their formerly influential brethren, bereft of the support of its political leaders, who had their hands full with their efforts to preserve their own personal safety, and deprived of their positions, sank into obscurity. There were none of disloyal Separatism's leaders who would venture in public to defend its principles held from 1582 until the period of 1652-1654. Hence the principles of the pure Congregationalism of antitypical Jehoshaphat (hallowed things that Jehoshaphat ... dedicated, 18;), the slightly tarnished Congregationalism of antitypical Jehoram

(Jehoram ... dedicated), the largely tarnished Congregationalism of antitypical Ahaziah (Ahaziah ... dedicated), and the partly restored pure Congregationalism of antitypical Joash's faithful days (his own hallowed things), were all given up, so far as defending them in public was concerned, which were the things required to be given up, in their yielding to antitypical Hazael as represented in Charles II (sent to Hazael). Moreover, it in disloyal Congregationalists, in the face of the above-mentioned obstacles, by ceasing to advocate the Divine principles belonging to God's people as His temple, *i.e.*, the principles of freedom of conscience, assembly and propaganda and separation of state and church, gave these up to plunder-seeking Romanism, which in Charles II suppressed these for it (gold ... house of the Lord ... sent it to Hazael;). Finally, it in the disloyal Congregationalists, in the face of the same obstacles, gave up the Divine principles belonging to the state, *e.g.*, democracy, the independence, coordination and cooperation of the executive, legislative and judicial departments of the state (gold ... in the king's house ... Hazael; sent all the spoil unto the king of Damascus). Having thus despoiled the antitypical Joash of all that was distinctively its, as well as of Divine principles applicable to the Church as God's temple and to the state to be enjoyed by it in its most highly developed form, according to God's highest ideal for the state under conditions of the curse, Romanism in Charles II left Congregationalism alone as it was thus reduced to impotency. Thus by default unfaithful Separatism surrendered the above-mentioned principles to what was really Romanism.

(27) Those who invited him to return to England and to mount England's throne made a great mistake in not putting him under the stringent conditions necessary to preserve the democratic gains of the struggle between parliament and Charles I. They should have known the statecraft of the house of Stuart enough to distrust it for its tyrannical and arbitrary propensities.

Doubtless the confusion and disorder then existing in England made them think that haste to bring him back was the one indispensable thing to secure the order for which the English people as a whole then longed. The result was that Charles II and family with a small retinue of supporters, as more or less conscious representatives of Romanism, made an invasion into the sphere of Congregationalism's domain and of its executiveship (the Syrians came with a small company, ;24); and because of their disloyalty to the principles of Separatism the millions of English Congregationalists, including the army, which in its bulk was Congregationalist, were by God delivered over to what was actually Romanism masking under the person of Charles II, his mother, brother and a few supporters, who were aware of the secret Romanist purposes of these (; delivered a very great host into their hand). This all befell apostate Separatism and its apostate supporters, because they had in their unfaithfulness forsaken the Lord in the particulars of the stewardship of doctrine and practice that God had committed to the preceding phases of Congregationalism (; forsaken the Lord God of their fathers). How terrible the judgments of the Lord upon unfaithful individuals and churches are, can be seen, not only in the case under study, but even more impressively in the case of the entire nominal church: Greek, Romanist and Protestant, both of great and little Babylons. The case under study is certainly one of Divine judgment, as shown above (; executed judgment against Joash).

(28) Certainly, when the executors of these judgments left unfaithful Separatism, it in its adherents was afflicted with many spiritual diseases (left ... diseases, ;25); for impenitence, indecision, cowardice, discouragement, inactivity, shame, over-reticence and supineness characterized it in its leaders and ledlings. Not only so, but former supporters turned against it in its supporters (his servants arose, 20;) and then among themselves conspired to cut the unfaithful

Separatists off from fellowship with the rest of the real and nominal people of God (made a conspiracy; conspired against him), a thing that God sent as a punishment for their mistreatment and disfellowshipment of Fox and his brethren (; blood of the sons of Jehoiada); and they did cut them off from such fellowship (slew Joash; slew him ... died), as they rested on their creed bed (on his bed ;), while they were engaged in the work of bringing their full number (Millo [*filling*] ;) in a public way (goeth down to Silla [*highway*] ;) unto endorsing their newly made creed. Those that conspired against them and cut them off from the aforesaid fellowship were of two classes: those liberty loving Presbyterian Puritan clericalists that had formerly kept them in mind, supported them and given them public favor (Jozachar [*Jehovah remembers*], Shimeath [*fame*], 21; Zabad [*endower*] ... Ammonitess, 26) and Romanizing autocratic Episcopalians that had also formerly supported and carefully guarded them (Jehozabad [*Jehovah is endower*], Shomer [*guarding*], Shimrith [*careful*], a Moabitess). Because of its former good course it was held in respectful memory as having had apostolic teachings and practices (buried him with his fathers in the city of David, 25), but because of its later unfaithfulness none hold this phase of Congregationalism in the respect due to a movement of God's more favored people (; not in the sepulchres of the kings). Other details concerning this movement than those brought out as the antitypes given above are given in the writings of Congregationalists (rest of the acts ... written in ... Chronicles ... Judah); and the movements that it set into action (sons, ;27) and its great work in developing God's people as His temple (; burden ... repairing the house of God) are described in the writings of both Congregationalist and Puritan Presbyterian histories and biographies (; book of the kings). The end of this movement is also the end of Congregationalists as in the most favored movement of God's people. The

Friends, nicknamed Quakers, operated as the next movement of God's more favored people (; Amaziah ... reigned in his stead). Our study of antitypical Joash should teach us to imitate it in its faithfulness, and to avoid imitating it in its unfaithfulness.

(29) In discussing antitypical Joash we made some comments on the Friends, nicknamed Quakers, first by a judge who threatened to make a certain fearless Friend quake, after the latter had told him to quake before God's Word, and then by others. These comments were necessitated by the fact that George Fox, their leader, was the antitype of Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, and his followers were the antitype of Jehoiada's other sons, all slain by apostate Israelites at Joash's command. As we saw, the apostasy of the final phase of the Congregational movement, the antitype of Joash as God's more favored movement, caused God to cast it off as such and to accept the Friends' movement as such (reigned Amaziah [*strength of Jehovah*] ... Judah, 2 Kings 14:1;). It was by God accepted as such, before crown-lost leaders had succeeded in perverting it fully into a sect. Its period of ascendancy as the more favored movement of God's people was from 1663 to 1692 A.D., corresponding to the 29 years of Amaziah's reign, 858-829 B.C. (twenty and nine years, 2; 2 Chro. 25:1). Born of pious parents, 1624, and pious from his earliest childhood, George Fox consecrated probably in 1638, 25 years (twenty and five years old ... reign, 2; 1) before his movement became God's more favored movement in the sphere of its executiveship (Jerusalem, 2; 1). The doctrine of the joyousness of fellowship with God mothered this movement (Jehoaddan [*Jehovah is delightful*], 2; 1). Generally speaking, this movement acted righteously (right, 3; 2), but not completely so (not with a perfect heart, ;2); for it did not fully follow Apostolic example and practice, *e.g.*, it would not practice water baptism, the Lord's Supper and the Apostolic organization of an ecclesia with elders and deacons as the

servants of the ecclesia (not like David his father, 3;). Rather, it followed a course similar to that of antitypical Joash, the last phase of the Congregational movement (according ... Joash, 3;), in sectarianism (high places ... away, 3;) and more or less of combinationism (sacrifice and burnt incense ... places, 4;). As this movement became firm (kingdom was confirmed ... established, 5; 3), it thoroughly refuted those Presbyterian Puritan and liberal Anglican supporters who gave the death blow to antitypical Joash's ascendancy (slew ... the king, 5; 3). But innocent movements founded by these traitors it did not include in these refutations (children ... slew not, 6; 4), even as Jesus in the New Testament charged that a good work even of evil-doers be not set aside because done by evil-doers (law of Moses ... Lord commanded, 6; 4; Mark 9:38, 39; Phil. 1:15-18). He likewise charged that the innocent or weak maker of an evil movement or action be not, with it, destroyed (father shall not ... for the children, 6; 4; Matt. 12:31, 32); for it is for personal totally wilful sins that one goes into the second death (every man ... own sin, 6; 4; Heb. 6:4-6; 10:26-29). Antitypical Korah's movement in its children, the Levite movements under bad leaders and textbookistic movements under good but mistaken leaders illustrate this principle.

(30) The Friends' movement was surrounded by enemies that attacked it on all hands; particularly did civil and Anglican Church authorities so do. These attacked it and its supporters with legal and ecclesiastical charges, almost without exception unjustly and falsely. This moved it to take defensive measures, by which it assembled (gathered Judah, ;5) and trained its adherents to war against their attackers in their legal and religious arguments, making the ablest of these warriors the leaders of large numbers (captains over thousands) and able leaders, but less able than the former of these warriors, the leaders of smaller numbers (captains over hundreds), brethren like Fox,

Barclay, Fell, Pennington, Keith, Penn, *etc.*, among the former and their itinerary speakers among the latter. All were organized as such warriors according to their spirit of consecration, talents and providential situations (according ... fathers). This was done as to the mightier (Judah) and the weaker (Benjamin) among all of antitypical Amaziah's adherents (throughout). These truth warriors included the unconsecrated (twenty years) and the consecrated (upward); and the zeal of the Friends aroused practically every one of them to be warriors of truth, righteousness and holiness and to corresponding action (choice men able ... war). They were trained to aggressive (handle spear) and defensive warfare (shield). The Friends' movement worked on the hearts as distinct from the heads with little of heart. They insisted on entire consecration, not merely expressed by words, but lived first in heart, and then in words and acts. The bulk of the Anglicans were dead formalists and rigid ritualists; and the bulk of the Presbyterian Puritans had degenerated into head religion; but there were many consecrated ones among the Presbyterian Puritans who sought to live out their consecration; and these, persecuted, like the Friends, and by the same enemies, were favorably disposed toward the Friends' spirit of consecration. The latter's movement, to attract these more closely to itself, made slight compromises in the way of treading softly on their toes. These were along the lines of a small sectarianism and combinationism (He hired, ;6); and thus it enlisted in its defense numerous of such consecrated and persecuted Presbyterian Puritans (hundred thousand). Such Presbyterians were, as a rule, better educated secularly and Biblically and thus, as a rule, were abler controversialists than the Friends, who, as a rule, went to an extreme in neglecting secular and religious education (mighty men of valor). Thus they drew to themselves numerous brethren who were adherents of the less favored movement of God's people. Their small compromises gave up, at least, advocacy

of teachings that were unacceptable to these from antitypical Israel (hundred talents of silver).

(31) But George Fox, who would not in the least compromise what he held to be true, disapproved of support coming from anyone who sanctioned the sectarianism and clericalism of the less favored movement of God's people (man of God, ;7). He, therefore, declared to the Friends' movement (saying, O king) that these Presbyterian Puritans, though able warriors against their enemies, should not be given a joint share in the warfare of the Friends' movement (not ... Israel go with thee), giving as his reason that Jehovah did not give His special favor and help to the sectarian and clericalistic Presbyterian Puritans (not with Israel ... Ephraim). George Fox did not seek to overpersuade the Friends' movement to do as he thought was the Lord's will, but cautioned against its purposed course, warning it that, if it was determined to go (if thou wilt go, ;8), let it do so (do it); let it be ever so strong for battle (strong for battle), God would cast it down in defeat before its adversaries (fall before the enemy), since the omnipotent Jehovah had the ability to help unto victory (help) and cast down unto defeat (cast down). Thinking of the small compromises of Truth that it had made to enlist the support of the consecrated Presbyterian Puritan warriors, the Friends' movement (Amaziah, ;9) asked Bro. Fox (the man of God) what its adherents should do as to the concealed truths, which were concerned with matters pertinent to natures lower than the Divine nature (one hundred talents [of silver, v. 6]), yielded up by the movement to the Presbyterian Puritan warriors (given ... Israel). Bro. Fox assured the Friends' movement that the Lord by His forgiving grace would more than make up the loss, on repentance being experienced for the wrong; for Fox knew that it was done in human weakness, which on repentance and faith would be made good for by Jesus' merit (much more than this). Thereupon the Friends as a movement

renounced their compromises and advocated the teachings before compromised, which drove away from the Friends the consecrated Presbyterian Puritans (separated them ... come ... Ephraim, ;10). These went to the sphere of their fellow Presbyterian Puritans (go home again). But they were highly displeased at their being thus cut off from the warfare with the Friends against the adversaries of both (anger was greatly kindled against Judah); and they persevered in this anger, not only until they reached their own sphere (returned ... anger), but long afterward.

(32) The Friends' movement then thoroughly drilled and thus strengthened its adherents for the controversy against the civil and ecclesiastical tyrants who persecuted them so relentlessly that, all told, over 14,000 Friends had been imprisoned, 369 of them dying in jail from hunger, cold and neglect; 10,000 of them at one time were in prison, in 1689, when a general indulgence from William III freed all prisoners who were held for religion's sake (strengthened himself, ;11). The movement directed them in this conflict (led, ;11), which was waged in the sphere of the desolation where the civil and (Anglo-) ecclesiastical tyrants held sway (valley of salt, 7; 11). Charles II, to overthrow all dissenters (Presbyterian Puritans, Congregationalists, Baptists and Friends), caused the Conventicler Law to be passed, forbidding all assemblies of five persons or more above 16 years of age, except the household amid which the meetings were held, outside of Anglican churches, where, of course, these dissenters as such were not allowed to meet. While the dissenters, except the Friends, held very secret meetings of a few, very carefully guarded by their own sentinels, the Friends held their meetings openly, protesting vigorously against the tyrannous law; and in the ensuing arguments thereover they from legal, Biblical, factual and reasonable arguments refuted the civil and ecclesiastical tyrants who oppressed them. Some of the Friends, like Fell, were judges and used their legal

knowledge triumphantly to defend their oppressed brethren. George Fox wrote many a letter to judges and magistrates in protest against their evil course. But the controversy was not only one on legal questions, but also one on religious grounds, and that from two standpoints: (1) religious arguments in favor of freedom of speech, conscience, assembly and propaganda against the laws that denied these and imprisoned their practicers and (2) religious arguments against the dead formalism and ritualism of the Anglican Church, which favored and, in their bishops in the House of Lords, voted for the persecuting laws. In this way they refuted both the legal tyrants (slew of Edom [*red*], 7; smote ... Seir [*hair*], ;11) in their legal secular totality (ten thousand, 7; 11), and in time by this controversy (war, 7;) won over both parliament and the king (Selah [*rock*, the capital and fortress of Edom], 7;), and subdued them into making just laws (called ... Joktheel [*subdued of God*], 7;), which laws hold them in subjection even to the present (unto this day). The clerical tyrants in their entirety as thoroughly secularized men (the other ten thousand) in their full vigor (alive, ;12) by the Friends' controversialists (children of Judah, ;12) were through their arguments bound hand and foot as captives (carried away captive, ;12); and these brought them as such to the highest part of England as a church state, which highest part was the Anglican Church (brought them unto the top of the rock, ;12) and from the hierarchy downward to the lowest of the laity cast them down unto complete disruption as the alleged true church (broken into pieces, ;12).

(33) While the Friends were engaged in their controversy with the tyrannical English civil and Anglican Church rulers, the Presbyterian Puritans, who for a while cooperated with, and were later dismissed by the Friends' movement from cooperation in the contemplated controversy with the antitypical Edomites (soldiers ... sent back ... battle, ;13), enraged at such

dismissal, made inroads upon the Friends' ecclesias (fell upon the cities of Judah), starting out from church politics (Samaria) and proceeding to take up the ill-founded views (Beth-horon [*house of hollowness*]) of the Friends on political, social and religious subjects, and wrought much devastation thereon. The Friends as a fanatical sect cherished many vagaries; and these, kept compromisingly by them in abeyance, for the sake of said cooperation, were the ones that those Presbyterian Puritans attacked. They refuted their anti-oath-before-courts view, by pointing out that Jesus (Matt. 5:33-37) and James (5:12) referred not to oaths before courts, but to oaths in private conversations, which prevailed very widely among the Orientals in those days. They refuted their view that respect should not be shown judges and magistrates by standing in their presence with their hats off and addressing them as, Your honor, *etc.*, by pointing out that the Bible teaches that respect and honor be given civil officials (1 Pet. 2:13-17; Rom. 13:1-7), citing the respect given with Divine approval to Joseph, David, Solomon, *etc.*, and by Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah to kings, by Jacob to Pharaoh, by Israel to Moses, *etc.* They also refuted their conscientious objection when urged as binding on the unconsecrated. In justification of social civilities, like addressing single individuals with the plural personal pronoun *you*, instead of the singular *thou*, and using polite language and conduct socially, all of which the Friends refused to engage in, they quoted St. Paul's statement that all things be done decently and in order (1 Cor. 14:40) and cited his example in making himself all things to all men, in order to win some (1 Cor. 9:19-22) and in his addressing Festus as most noble, which was a title (Acts 26:25). They especially refuted the Friends' claim that the light of nature, particularly conscience, which was in fallen man as a vestige of God's image surviving the fall, was Jesus Christ in them enlightening every man that entereth the world, as Friends interpreted John 1:9

to mean, which was a view entertained by some of the church fathers and evidently invented to evade the support that it gives to future probation, when this passage will be fulfilled in the Millennial universal enlightenment of the race, dead and living. But the refutation that they gave was not the application of this passage to future probation, but from the standpoint of man's depravity and God's leaving the race as such in darkness under the curse unhelped by Him with enlightenment (John 1:5; 3:19, 20; Acts 26:18; Rom. 1:21; 2 Cor. 4:4, 6; Eph. 5:8, 11; 1 Thes. 5:4, 5; 1 Pet. 2:9; 1 John 2:8-11). They from Christ's command and the Apostolic practice refuted the Friends' denial of the obligatoriness of water baptism and the Lord's Supper. These arguments refuted all Friends against whom they were used (smote three thousand of them) and resulted in influencing great numbers of them to give up their refuted views and to join the Presbyterian Puritans (took much spoil).

(34) While the Friends' movement was victorious in its theory-controversy with the tyrannous civil and ecclesiastical rulers, despite the physical power used against it in whipping and imprisoning its members, it received more or less injury as a result of it (come from ... Edomites, ;14). It was by its success perverted into a sect, into which its crown-lost leaders misled it and which blunted the edge of its rebukes of sectarianism. It also led it into compromising its principles of separatism into a measure of combinationism, and thus it fell into the evils into which antitypical Joash had fallen, as we read in 3, 4; (brought the gods ... Seir). These two evils were given a more or less strong position amongst the Friends (set them up to be his gods). Henceforth they served these two evils (bowed himself before them) and used more or less of their choice human powers in advancing them, their party consciousness as fellow laborers and sufferers strengthening their sectarian spirit, and the desire of support from the other persecuted non-conformists

strengthening their combinationism, and thus enlisting their choice human powers in advancing these two evils (burned incense unto them). These evils, though not so gross as antitypical Joash's commission of them, displeased God (anger ... against Amaziah, ;15). But in His displeasure God remembered mercy, and therefrom sent George Fox (sent ... prophet) to rebuke and remonstrate with the Friends' movement for these sins (Why ... after the gods). He gave them a good reason against their course: these evils were not able to save the antitypical Edomites out of its hands (not deliver ... out of thine hand?). Thus did this godly star-member reason with the former Little Flock movement now perverted into a sect; and he received an answer like that which other star-members received from their movements after they were perverted into sects—a rebuke (as he talked with him, ;16). Like them he was interrupted amid his expostulations with an impudent rejoinder, in the form of a question: "Have we made thee of the king's counsel?"—A.R.V. Thus he was charged with officiously arrogating to himself powers that were not his by right (Art thou made of the king's counsel?). He was as impudently commanded to cease, even as proud wrongdoers usually charge those who rebuke at the gate (forbear). We can easily imagine how candid George Fox felt at this impudent and ungrateful charge. But the now sectarianized movement did not stop at impudence and ingratitude. It threatened to cut him off from fellowship as it argued against his course (why shouldst thou be smitten?) Seeing the uselessness of further efforts at dissuading the evil-doing movement from its course, he desisted from further remonstrance (Then the prophet forbare). This was perhaps the beginning of this star-member's being made a captive as a part of the large antitypical Samson by the antitypical Philistines (sectarians) of his movement. But as he ceased remonstrating, he uttered a warning to the effect that it was a matter of knowledge with him that

God purposed to destroy the Friends' movement as that of God's more favored people (know ... determined to destroy thee). He gave two reasons for this course on God's part: (1) because it had sectarianized and compromised its separatism, and (2) because it would not follow the advice that he had given it (not ... counsel).

(35) Perhaps the dismissed Presbyterian Puritans' attacks on various teachings of the Friends' movement and its resultant loss of many members moved it to take counsel on whether it should enter into a controversy with the reviving Presbyterian Puritan movement. We do not know this of a certainty, the Bible being silent thereon. But whether this or some other reason impelled it so to do, it nevertheless discussed among its leaders the question of whether it should enter into this attack (Amaziah ... took advice, ;17) and it sent messengers to that phase of the Presbyterian Puritan movement (sent ... messengers to Joash, 8; 17). This revived movement had succeeded the weak and discouraged Presbyterian Puritan movement (son of Jehoahaz, 8; 17), which in turn had succeeded the energetic revolutionary Presbyterian Puritan movement (son of Jehu, 8; 17), all three of which were movements of the less favored people of God (king of Israel, 8; 17). The antitypical messengers were controversialists whose controversial tactics were a challenge to engage in a controversy (see ... look one another in the face, 8; 17). This was indeed a presumptuous thing for the Friends' movement to do, since they had only four real scholarly men: Barclay, Keith, Pennington and Penn, on their side, while the reviving Presbyterian Puritan movement had many of such, including the redoubtable Richard Baxter, who was one of the most able and prolific authors of the whole Gospel Age, not only on controversial and theoretical, but also on practical theology, a man who was as eminent in practical piety as he was in theoretical learning. Having its hands quite full in its controversy with Romanism disguised in the person of Charles II, the reviving Presbyterian

Puritan movement, knowing its superior equipment in controversialists, sought to restrain the controversial aims of the Friends' movement (Joash ... sent to Amaziah ... saying, 9; 18). This it did by comparisons and contrasts. It called attention to the fact that it was the Friends' movement (the thistle that was in Lebanon, 9; 18) that asked the army of antitypical Israel (cedar that was in Lebanon) to send it some of its warriors to become united with the army of antitypical Judah (thy daughter to my son to wife, 9; 18). And after this was done they were unceremoniously dismissed, which was an affront to the army of antitypical Israel. Then the reviving Presbyterian Puritan movement showed what the result of the controversy would be upon the Friends' movement—full defeat (wild beast ... trod down the thistle, 9; 18).

(36) Then the reviving Presbyterian Puritan movement read the falling Friends' movement a much needed rebuke and lesson. The former reminded the latter of its victory over the civil and ecclesiastical tyrants in England (hast smitten Edom, 10; 19), and then charged the latter with becoming puffed up over its victory, which charge was true (heart lifted thee up ... to boast, 10; 19). The former gave the latter the much needed advice to be contented with attending to its own affairs (abide now ... tarry at home, 10; 19). Expostulatingly the former reasoned with the latter to abstain from a course that would surely result in its injury (why ... meddle to thine hurt, 10; 19); for that course would result in the Friends' movement's complete defeat (shouldst fall, 10; 19) and in the Friends' as supporters of that movement going down to defeat (and Judah with thee, 10; 19). It is written: "Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall" (Prov. 16:18). And this, as seen in many other cases, we see exemplified in this case. Few, indeed, can bear prosperity and retain humility and meekness. Those inclined or addicted to fanaticism are especially inclined or addicted to pride and stubbornness;

and the Friends, the chief sect of the fanatical sects, were exposed to these two evil qualities; and this was the case with the Friends' movement at the particular time now under study (Amaziah would not hear, 11; 20). This attitude, as well as its sins of sectarianism and combinationism, moved God to adjust its circumstances in a way that its pride and stubbornness would incline it to a course that would bring retribution upon it for its aforesaid sins at the hands of the Presbyterian Puritans (enemies ... gods of Edom, ;20).

(37) As indicated in the meaning of the name Bethshemesh, *house of the sun*, God as the indweller of the Bible is a symbolic sun, the controversy was over the question of the God-indwelt source and rule of faith and practice, between the Presbyterian Puritans' movement and the Friends' movement. The correct way of presenting the Bible in its relation to the God-indwelt source and rule of faith and practice is this: The Scriptures are the sole source of faith and usually the sole source of practice and always the main rule of practice, with the Spirit and the providences of God as subordinate rules thereof, *i.e.*, the true Christian faith always and practice usually are to be derived from the Bible alone; and while the Christian's conduct should usually be derived from the Bible principles and examples alone, there are special times and circumstances in which he from those principles and examples alone cannot decide which one applies to those times and circumstances; for two or more apparently conflicting Bible principles and examples seem equally to apply to them. In such cases usually the Spirit of God in him, *i.e.*, the New Creature, God's holy mind, heart and will in him, will enable him to decide which ones of two or more apparently conflicting Bible principles and examples apply to the case at hand. And in this sense of its assisting him to a proper recognition of the applicable Biblical principles and examples the Spirit of God is as God's disposition in him a secondary rule of practice. But there are cases in which the Christian

cannot by the Spirit alone decide on apparently conflicting duties and privileges from Bible principles and examples. In such cases he must, if he would learn to know the applicable ones, wait upon the Lord to reveal these to him by His *providences*, which in due time the Lord will so exercise as to clarify the applicable ones to the waiting child of God. And in this sense God's providences are a tertiary rule of practice. Moreover, when no Bible principle or example seems to apply, the Spirit and providence can be a source of practice, *e.g.*, what, when or how we shall do as to matters of whether we should eat rolled oats, shredded wheat for breakfast, *etc.*, arise at 5 or 7 A.M., eat at 12 noon, or earlier or later, *etc.* In the controversy under study each side went to an extreme, the Friends' movement to the more evil of the two extremes. The extreme of the Presbyterian Puritan movement was this: While the Bible is the sole *source* of faith (which is entirely true) and sole source of practice (which is not entirely true), it is also the sole *rule of practice* (which is an error; for it denies the secondary and tertiary rules of practice, as interpretative rules helping one to judge in complicated cases what Bible principles and examples apply to the case, and when no Bible principle or example applies). But, except in very rare cases as to at times the what, when and how, it will be seen that the Spirit and providences do not furnish the applicable principles and examples; they simply assist us to understand usually which are the applicable ones, because usually the Bible furnishes the principles and examples that determine or rule the case. It is the main rule of practice, the other two being as interpreters respectively the secondary and tertiary rules of faith. We should here remark that examples from secular and religious experience that at times help us to decide are to be considered as belonging under the providences of God in others' lives.

(38) God often uses some of His children to draw back others of them from an extreme; and frequently

this is accompanied by the former themselves going into the opposite extreme. The Friends were used by God to emphasize the fact that the Bible is not the sole rule of practice, but that the Spirit is also a rule of practice. The Presbyterian Puritans got their one-sided rule from Calvin, while the Friends' view was somewhat akin to Luther's, who taught that while the Bible is the sole source of faith and the main source of practice, and usually is the sole one, it, the Spirit and God's providences are rules of practice, the Bible being its main rule. However, the Friends up to the time of the controversy stressed the Spirit in this matter to such an extreme as to set aside the Bible both as the sole source of faith, the main source of practice and the main rule of practice, alleging that the Spirit is now to the children of God the primary source of faith and rule of practice, the Bible being merely a revelation of what the Spirit gave to God's people in former ages. The following is a brief view of their understanding of the matter: While they mistook the vestiges of God's image in fallen man to be Christ in the fallen man, they understood this to be something quite different from the Christ in the consecrated. Their thought on the latter point was that this was the same Spirit as animated the Prophets and Apostles to write inspiredly the Bible. Thus they confounded the Spirit as God's power that inspired the writing of the Bible with the New Creature that enables one to understand, appreciate and be conformed to, the Holy Bible. Of course, if these two Spirits were the same, the Friends' depreciating the Bible as the dead letter and esteeming the present enlightenment of the Spirit, as opposed to the letter, a better thing, a more up-to-date thing, than the Bible, whose highest use to them was an instruction on how ancient generations of God's people experienced the Spirit's enlightenment, their view would be nearly right; but, as it was, their view of the identity of the two was wrong, and in the hands of unbalanced brethren made them think that their strong impressions and

high-strung feelings were the thoughts and affections of the Spirit. It moved them, not only to fanaticism, but also to ascribe infallibility to these impressions and feelings as being the expressions of God's Spirit. From this arose all sorts of vagarious notions and false views, to which they ascribed infallibility. Thus their second ablest controversialist, Isaac Pennington, speaking of the Spirit in the consecrated, says: "Every way of it is infallible and every step of the creature after it is infallible." And Barclay, their ablest scholar and controversialist, said that "the Spirit in the consecrated is the primary rule of faith and practice," which, of course, would make one by "one's own inward and therefore private and individual illumination, so far as he follows the Spirit, an infallible oracle of Divine Truth."

(39) Handicapped by such a palpable error, and by the fact that they despised sacred learning, which only a few of them, *e.g.*, Barclay, Penn, Keith, *etc.*, had to any fair degree, and by the fact that they had no regular local ministry, they were no match for pious, able and learned men like Richard Baxter and John Bunyan, the Baptist author of *Pilgrim's Progress*, who joined the Presbyterian Puritans in the controversy. Seeing that they entered the controversy with such handicaps, they knew not what to do with the many Scriptures, reasons and facts that proved the Bible to be the sole source of faith and usually the sole source of practice and the main rule of practice (though their antagonists were not clear on this latter point, nor on the Bible as the main source of practice). Their opponents were particularly trenchant on forcing the issue into questions like this, What shall decide the question as to who is right when two claiming the Spirit's illumination teach directly contrary to each other on the same question? This question forced Barclay to give up the Friends' position on such (alleged) Spirit's illumination as infallible; and it also forced him to give up the position that the Spirit in the consecrated is the sole source of faith and practice and to accept the thought

that the Bible would have to decide questions of faith and practice. Thus he surrendered the three chief involved errors of the Friends. Had the Friends had the full pertinent light, which became clearly due only in the Harvest, though Luther saw it clearly to some degree, they would have won out in the controversy; but having only a part of it, and that pushed to a mischievous extreme, and being in error on the chief features of the controversy, on which the Presbyterian Puritans were largely right, the Friends went down to a disastrous defeat in the controversy, as the type forecast of them. The foregoing explanations will make the correspondence between type and antitype easier to understand. We now proceed to a discussion of them.

(40) Not waiting to be attacked, the Presbyterian Puritans advanced to the attack (Joash ... went up, 11; 21), and both sides joined the battle (saw ... looked ... face, 11; 21), even both of them in sharp contrast (he and Amaziah, 11; 21). Be it noted that it was the viewpoint of the Friends on the office of the Bible, a dwelling place of God, the symbolic Sun, as to faith and life that was attacked (Beth-shemesh, which belongeth to Judah [not Israel], 11; 21). And the outcome of the controversy was a great victory for the Presbyterian Puritans and a crushing defeat for the Friends as a movement and as individual warriors (Judah ... worse before Israel, 12; 22). So great was the defeat that the Friends as individuals fled from the field of controversy (fled every man, 12; 22) and disbanded in disunion as a fighting group on the subject at controversy (to his tent, 12; 22). The Presbyterian Puritan movement got control of the Friends' movement, so far as the questions at controversy (at Beth-shemesh, 13; 23) were concerned (Joash ... Jehoash ... took Amaziah, 13; 23), the latter in its capacity of being the successor movement (son, 13; 23) of the Separatist Congregational movement, faithful and unfaithful (Jehoash ... Joash, 13; 23), which succeeded (son, 13;) the autocratic Congregational movement

(Ahaziah, 13;), the former in its capacity of succeeding the weak Puritan movement (son of Jehoahaz, ;23). It brought captive the Friends' movement to the latter's sphere of executiveship (came ... brought him to Jerusalem, 13; 23), and overthrew the powers, the chief exponents and defenders, that supported the sphere of the Friends' movement (brake down the wall of Jerusalem, 13; 23). Its refutation of the above-described views of the Friends' movement was the means of destroying in large measure the influence of its leaders and changing certain of its pertinent practices as to the Bible. This included the overthrow of its drawing by its leaders to itself followers from the ten-tribed kingdom of the north (gate of Ephraim, 13; 23) and of its keeping by its leaders for itself those who were on the verge of apostasy (corner gate, 13; 23; this gate was close to Gehenna), exceedingly trialsome and weakening things to the involved crown-lost leaders (four hundred cubits, 13; 23; 40 being the symbol of trial and 10 of natures lower than the Divine $40 \times 10 = 400$). The Presbyterian Puritan movement appropriated to itself whatever was good in the religious teachings of the Friends, *e.g.*, their Divine truths on consecration and character building (gold and silver, 14; 24), together with their pertinent doctrinal, refutational, correctional and ethical teachings, as these were in charge of the pertinent Gospel-Age Levites (vessels ... with Obed-edom [*servant of Edam*], 14; 24), and the good principles of executorship prevailing in the Friends' movement, like the emphasis on the priesthood of all the consecrated as against clericalism, testimony meetings and zeal in propaganda (treasures of the king's house, 14; 24). It required of the Friends' movement guarantees of submission to the demands implied in what it took from it (hostages, 14; 24), and worked on its own affairs (Samaria, 14; 24).

(41) The controversy between the Presbyterian Puritan movement and the Friends' movement was waged for several years and came to its climax in 1675.

George Fox took almost no part in it, being absent in Barbados and America from about its beginning until May, 1673. While he had much insight into the practical religion of the heart, he was no theologian in the sense of having scholarly reasoning equipment for controversy. Moreover, God's enlightening him against and on it, he abstained from participating therein (;15, 16). He, therefore, even after his return to England, about May 1, 1673, abstained from it and let the four Friends' theologians: Barclay, Pennington, Keith and Penn, do the arduous work of defending the Friends' position, which defense, as we have seen, resulted in defeat. Even Barclay, their ablest theologian, whose Apology is considered the ablest exposition and defense of their position, was in the controversy forced to give up the main position of the Friends, that the ideas, impressions and views that they had from what they called the Spirit were infallible and were the primary source and rule of faith, and not the Scriptures, to accept the position that the Bible is the final source of faith, and to approximate their opponents' error on its being the sole rule of practice, instead of taking it to be the usual sole source and main rule of practice. This controversy hardened the Friends' movement into a real sect, to which they had been approaching for a number of years. Henceforth George Fox as a part of blind antitypical Samson, like the rest of the Philadelphia star-members from Luther onward, became a slave of the antitypical Philistines (sectarians), grinding out the flour from the wheat of the Word for these antitypical Philistines. In their interests he continued to travel, preach, converse and teach throughout Britain. In 1674 he was imprisoned [in Worcester], the tenth time that he had such an experience. He suffered much in his imprisonments, and while they prevented his preaching, he could nevertheless edify his visitors and keep his pen busy in writing. He did considerable writing, the chief of which was his journal. His other writings were collected into a large Quarto. Indeed,

the last two things that for him the Friends' movement did before it ceased to be in the ascendancy as antitypical Amaziah was to publish, 1692, his journal, which in its eighth edition appeared in 1891 in two octavo volumes, at the 200th anniversary of his death, March, 1691, and to begin arranging to collect his other writings in the above-mentioned Quarto, which appeared in 1706, fifteen years after his death. In 1692, it also through Penn published the works of Barclay, its ablest exponent, as its last work.

(42) In 1677, and again in 1684, Fox visited the Friends in Holland. The following are brief characterizations given of him by various Friends: "Graceful in countenance, manly in personage, grave in gesture, courteous in conversation" (Elwood, Milton's friend); "civil beyond all forms of breeding" (Penn). It has been said of him that he was "plain and powerful in preaching, fervent in prayer," "a discerner of other men's spirits and very much master of his own," skillful to "speak a word in due season to the conditions and capacities of most, especially to them that were weary and wanted soul's rest," "valiant in asserting the Truth, bold in defending it, patient in suffering for it, immovable as a rock." He was the mainstay of even the sectarianized Friends' movement as the more favored one of God's people. And small wonder that it ceased to be such a year after his death, its last year being largely devoted to the work described in the last part of the preceding paragraph. The movement dragged on a prosaic existence for 17 years after the climax of its controversy with the Presbyterian Puritan movement and 15 years after the latter ceased to be predominant in its Jehoash (Joash) aspect (Amaziah ... lived after ... Jehoash ... Joash ... fifteen years, 17; 25). The history of this phase of the more favored people of God is given in greater detail in the writings of the Friends' historians than in those of others' writings (acts of Amaziah ... written ... Chronicles ... Judah, 18:); yet they are also

described, though less detailedly, in the writings of non-Friends' historians (acts of Amaziah ... written ... kings of Judah and Israel, ;26). After this movement became thoroughly sectarian, *i.e.*, some time after 1675, more and more disgruntlement set in against it, which it for years sought to avert, and which broke out in efforts to hinder it in its sphere of executiveship (after ... did turn ... conspiracy ... Jerusalem, 19; 27). It set itself against this stubbornly (fled to Lachish [*obstinate*], 19; 27). But the conspirators, 1692, led by George Keith, then in America, joined by numerous British co-conspirators, pursued it even unto exercising similar stubbornness (sent to Lachish, 19; 27) and overthrew its controllership in Friends' affairs (slew him there, 19; 27). By their teachings they did this (brought him on ... upon horses, 20; 28). Nevertheless, this movement has been kept in respect as to its executiveship (Jerusalem ... city of David ... city of Judah, 20; 28), like the former ones of God's more favored people (with his fathers, 20; 28).

(9) Of what did our previous study treat? For what are we now ready? What was its period of time? Paralleling what? Where is it typically described? Into how many parts was its preeminence divided? Of what did each part consist? Where typed in each case? What did it then exercise? How typed? How did it begin? How typed? What mothered it? How typed? How long did it do right? How typed? What did Jesus give it as supports? How typed? What did it thereby develop? How typed? Yet what two things did it without remonstrance permit to flourish? How typed? What are marked illustrations of this?

(10) What was it determined to do? When? How typed? By whom was the damage done? As what? How are we to understand her sons here mentioned? Why? How proved? How are these things typed? What perversions did they make? How typed? What did this movement do? How typed? For what work? How typed? Gathered from whom? How typed in each case? What were the things desired? What were also included among these? How typed? When were they to do this? How typed? What

were these things? How typed? Expressly what were they? How typed? According to what? How typed? What should prompt it? How typed? Who were to take them in charge? How typed? From whom? How typed? For what use? How typed? Regardless of what? How typed? What were the subordinate leaders charged to do? How typed? What did they do as to the charge? How typed? How long and until what two events did the work drag on?

(11) Giving each in turn, what were the five reasons for the delay in repairing the Church?

(12) How did the delay affect antitypical Joash? How typed? What did it move it to do? How typed? What did it ask? How typed? Especially of Jesus? How typed? From whom particularly? How typed in each case? What things? How typed? By whom charged? When? For what? How typed in each case? How proved? What had the main Congregationalist leaders done? What did antitypical Joash do as to this? How typed? What did he charge? How typed? How did these leaders react to this? How typed? What exception was made therein? How typed? What correction in translation is here made? What was thereupon done? How typed? By whose endorsement? How typed in each case? For what suitable? How typed? For what purpose? How typed? For what was this arrangement made? How typed? What are the details? How typed? By what were these committees to be dominated? How typed? How is this proved as to the type and antitype? What was planned as to the main evangelistic leaders? How typed? Like what were these schools of the prophets?

(13) Following this decision what was widely advocated? Where? How typed? For whose service? How typed? According to whose personal and instrumental instruction? How typed? By whom was this advocacy heard? How typed? With what effect first? How typed? Secondly? How typed? What two things did many do? How typed in each case? With what result? How typed? Who even took up this work? With what results? Even with whom? What did they become? Of whom else was this true? In what did this propaganda result?

(14) What was brought to the administrative attention of the Separatist movement? How typed? By whom ministered? How typed? What two things were as a result

done? By whom? How are these two things typed? What did they do with the available talents? How typed? In what respect? How typed? What did they do with the talents' possessors? How typed? How was this done? When? How typed? What did the schools of the prophets prove to be? How typed? Who assigned the possessors of the described talents to their positions of service? How typed? In charge of whom? How typed? To whom did these assign them? For what two works? How are these things typed? For what purpose? How typed? Why was this done? How typed? Why especially was this done? How typed? What did they by these measures seek to do? How typed?

(15) Who, accordingly, worked on the Church? How typed? What, according to Congregational views of the ecclesia's organizations, were the kinds of officers of the Congregational ecclesias? What three mistakes did they make as to an ecclesia's officers? Why in each case were these mistakes made? From among whom were the secretary and treasurer usually taken? Into what did they develop the Church? Along what three lines? How typed? What did they then do? How typed? What five things had they not, up to this stage of the work, prepared? How typed in each case? From what? How typed? Why not? How typed? What characteristic did the works' and workers' supervisors exercise? How typed? With what result on antitypical Joash and Jesus? How typed? What was finally done with this work? How typed? What did they do after completing the repairs? How typed? Before whom? How typed? What did they make therewith? How typed? For what? How typed? What three purposes did these teachings further? How typed in each case? Of what did they consist? How typed? Who were the main workers on these teachings? Especially who as authors?

(16) What two kinds of advantages did not accrue to the generality of Congregationalists? How typed? Who obtained these? What did the wrong-doers have to forfeit? How typed? To whom did the first kind of advantages fall? What examples illustrate this as to Oxford University executive offices? In what other positions did this also occur? To whom did the second kind of advantages fall? How are these things typed? How long were the Congregationalists favored by Jesus? How

typed? What did they receive? How typed? How long did Jesus exercise an approving ministry on the Congregationalists? How typed? What was their condition during most of the 70 involved years? Despite these conditions what did they do? What effect did their apostacy have on Jesus? How typed? Where typed? How were the first 60 years of Congregationalism conducted? As a result how regarded? How typed? As what? How typed? Why? Toward what three sets of persons was this good done? How typed in each case?

(17) How long did Jesus support Separatism? How typed? After it proved entirely disloyal what did He do? How typed? What kind of a disloyalty and abandonment were they? How typed? In what two proportions did its disloyalty increase? How typed in the second feature? What did these render it? How typed? For example in government circles? In what other circles? What two things did these leaders do? Why? Of what did they make the state church consist? Under what conditions? What did the leaders seek to do? What response did it in them make? How typed? What danger is here seen? Of what was such yielding an example? What examples further manifest it? When has the Church always been purest? What in this respect should God's people avoid?

(18) What resulted from this practice? How typed? Along what lines? How typed? Into what did they enter? How proved? What did they serve? With what four things? How are these things typed? What else did they serve? How typed? Who advocated this evil course? What prevented the realization of their purpose? How did this disloyalty affect God? How typed? Against whom? How typed? Against what? How typed? How did this wrath express itself? What did these evils effect? What did the accompanying strife effect? In what relations? What did their disloyalty meet? What did God do to win them back? How typed? With what did they mingle their protests? How typed? What was the response thereto? How typed?

(19) What is typed as an individual? By whom and in what respect is he typed? Despite what fact? Who was he? What marked him from early youth onward? When and at what age did he begin to preach? What was the main burden of his preaching and teaching? Opposed to what? As a real pilgrim what did he do?

Where? By what did he attract consecrated people? Mainly from what walks of life? What did his movement do? In what ways? As they grew what increased? What everywhere was filled with them? What in three ways happened to Fox? Who shared with him in this? What things in them brought much reproach upon them? To what in many cases did their course in court lead? At one time above what number were in jail? In whom did they rebuke sin? Against what did they protest? Inveigh? Especially under what condition? Against what did they particularly protest?

(20) Who was the leader therein? Why? For this what rested upon him? How typed? What did he do as antitypical of the name of his type? As what? How typed? Why did he do this? In this what did he occupy? How typed? As God's mouthpiece what were his expostulations? How typed? What did he do with them? How typed? What did he prove? How? How typed? What, did he point out? Why was this so? How are these things typed? What three facts did he then point out? Wherein? In contrast with what? What did he thereby prove? What did he then point out? By what facts did he prove this charge?

(21) What will wrong-doers usually do with rebuke and correction? Unless what? Despite what? What qualities did those wrong-doers lack with whom Fox had to do? What did they, accordingly, do? What was the period of the full fall of Separatism? What are we not to understand as to it? When did its fall begin? How? Proceed? Culminate? With what did its increasing fall keep pace? Especially whose? What did the Lord's Spirit in Fox perceive? With what did his rebukes and corrections keep pace? How? How can the matter be stated otherwise as to type and antitype? How does this contrast with the usual enactment of type and antitype? When did Fox begin his pertinent rebukes and corrections? How? How did he proceed? Come to a full? With whom is this the usual course? What cases illustrate this? In it what did they reflect? What kept pace with the rebukes and corrections? How did they start? Proceed? Come to the full? When and where was he first imprisoned? What else was done to him? At whose orders?

(22) What officials were his special accusers and persecutors? Like whom did he travel and serve? With what

exception? For what evils did he rebuke and correct? How did his course affect church and civil officials? What as a result did they do? How typed? What was their intention? Why and in what was he considered a usurper? By whom? What three things made him a target? At whose hands? What was the character of his accusers? Where? How did the civil officials react to these charges? How was he there treated? What understanding was reached by these officials? What did they raise up against him? What particular one? What did a fanatic then do and receive? What did Fox do as to him? Despite this what did his accusers do to him? What was the character of his trials? What did he undergo?

(23) What is not the antitype of Zechariah's stoning? Despite what? What was it? How typed? Why so? What would wrong stoning type? As shown in what case? What then was the antitype of Zechariah's stoning? Why so? Accordingly, what did Zechariah's death not type? What proves this? What did it type? What was a sad feature of his cutting off? How typed? When did it cause this to happen? In what respects was he then serving? How typed? What is the character of the act? What does it show? Why? How are these typed?

(24) Simultaneously with this persecution what did Fox do? What two things did he tell them? What error in translation is here pointed out? What is the correct translation? For what would Fox not have prayed? Why not? How proved? What do the facts prove? Why so? What was Fox's pertinent custom? In what else was this his course? What did he do to persecuting officials and private individuals? In what two ways? On what lines of thought? To whom even did he write and speak to this effect? Thereupon what did Cromwell do? How did the officials react to it? How long did such expostulations continue? Apace with what?

(25) When did the forecast punishment come? How typed? What was its agent? How typed? Through whom did it act therein? What were his attitude, office, years' long policy and course? Where was this shown? By whom was he invited to become England's king? When and from where did he return to England? As what? Of what was his restoration? Engineered by whom? Who took a large part in this intrigue? Without suspecting what? What was his return? Unsuspected by whom?

What did Rome thereby do? How typed? What did Romanism through Charles II then do? How typed? At that time to what were apostate Congregationalists subject? What did Romanists then do? Through whom? How typed? What did it invade? How typed in each case? In what sense did they do this? Why was this not hard to do? Who opposed their course? On whom consequently did the odium for these acts fall? What stipulation did Charles II make as conditional for his accepting the kingship of England? In what three ways was this punishment meted out? How typed? What resulted?

(26) What five things acted hostilely toward their spirit of disloyalty? What did they move it to do in its unfaithful adherents? Who were its main leaders then? Why could they not overcome these five things? What did they do? What could they not venture to do? What resulted as to the four sets of their principles? How typed in each case? In what sense were they given up? By whom required? How typed? What first set of principles did it cease to advocate? How typed? Second? How typed? In summary, of what did antitypical Hazeel despoil it? Thereafter what did Romanism in Charles II do to it? Why? What did it do by default?

(27) What great mistake did those make who invited Charles to mount England's throne? In the face of what was this mistake made? What occasioned the mistake? What was the result? How typed? What resultantly did the disloyalty of the multitudinous Congregationalists undergo? At whose decision? Why had all this befallen them? How typed? How can the terribleness of God's judgments on the unfaithful be seen? In what three cases particularly? Of what was the case under study? How typed?

(28) How did the executors of these judgments leave Separatism? How typed? What were some of these diseases? What other evil fell to its lot? How typed? What else did they do? How typed? In punishment of what did God send this? How typed? What was the punishment? How typed? While it did what in its adherents? How typed in these particulars? Of how many classes were these conspirators and assassins? Who were they? How typed in the details of each class? What was done to it because of its former good? As being what? How typed? What was withheld from it because of its later evil?

How typed? Where are details other than the above-given antitype to be found? How typed? Its movements? How typed? Its great work of developing God's people as His temple? How typed? What end did the end of the Joash phase mark? What movement next became that of God's more favored people? How typed? What two lessons should our study of antitypical Joash teach us?

(29) What was done as to the Friends while discussing antitypical Joash? How did they get the nickname Quakers? Why were these comments necessitated? What two things did antitypical Joash's apostasy move God to do? How typed? In what condition was it when so accepted by God? What was the period of its ascendancy? Corresponding to what? How typed? What marked his early life? Probably at what age did he consecrate? Typed probably by what? How long before what? How typed? What doctrine mothered him? How typed? How did this movement act? How typed? With what qualification? How typed? Why so? What example proves this? How typed? What course did it follow? How typed? In what first respect? How typed? Second respect? How typed? How did it become? How typed? What did it then do? How typed? What did it exclude from this course? How typed? According to what charge of Jesus? How typed and proved? What likewise did Jesus charge? How typed and proved? Why so? What illustrate these principles?

(30) By whom was the movement attacked? Particularly by whom? With what and how did they attack? With what result? How typed? What did it do with its leaders? Who were the five main ones? Into how many kinds were they divided? How typed in each case? How were they organized? How typed? How were the warriors differentiated? How typed in each case? How as to members? How typed? As to maturity? How typed? To what did their zeal arouse them? How typed? In what two ways were they trained? How typed in each case? On what did the Friends work? As distinct from what? On what did they insist? How not merely expressed? How expressed? What was the condition of the bulk of Anglicans? Into what had the bulk of the Presbyterian Puritans degenerated? Many of whom were among them? How did these stand toward the Friends? What was a common experience of these two groups of believers? What did

the Friends' movement do to these? Why? Along what lines? To what degree? How typed? With what result? How typed? How did these compare with the Friends as to qualifications for controversy? How typed? To what pertinent extreme did the Friends go? What did they thus draw to themselves? To what degree did their small compromises go? How typed?

(31) What was George Fox's attitude toward these compromises? What made him so? How typed? To what did he speak thereon? How typed? What did he say? How typed? What reason did he give? How typed? What did he not seek? What caution did he give? What warning did he give, if it was determined on its course? How typed? Despite what would the evil come? How typed? What issues, said he, remained with God? How typed? Of what did the Friends' movement think and thereon ask? How typed? Whom did it ask this? How typed? To what did the concealed truths pertain? How typed? To whom yielded up? How typed? What assurance did Bro. Fox give? Why did he give it? How typed? What did the Friends do? As what? With what effect? How typed? Where did the rejected ones go? How typed? In what mood? How typed? How long did they keep this anger? How typed?

(32) What did the Friends' movement then do? To what degree did their enemies persecute them? How typed? What directed them in the conflict? How typed? Where was it waged? How typed? What special law was enacted by Charles II? Why? What did it forbid? How did the dissenters, except the Friends, react to this law? The Friends? What did they do in the ensuing arguments? What did some, like judge Fell, do? What did George Fox do therein? On what other grounds than legal was the controversy carried on? In what two respects? With what two effects? How typed in each case? What did they in time accomplish? How are these things typed? How long have these laws prevailed? How typed? What happened first to the clerical tyrants? How are the details typed in each case? Second? How are its details typed?

(33) What had the Friends' movement done to certain former cooperators? How typed? What in anger did these do? How typed? Whence did they start out? How typed? To what did they proceed? How typed? On what kind of subjects? With what effect? As a fanatical sect

what did the Friends cherish? What had they done with these? Why? What did the Presbyterian Puritans do with these? What was their position on court oaths? How did the former refute these from the passages supposed by the Friends to teach their thought? Their views on respect given to the great? How did these refute them? One of their views on conscientious objection? How did these refute them? Their views on social amenities and polite forms? How did these refute them? What special doctrine of the Friends did they refute? When was this view first entertained? Why? How did these not refute the pertinent Friends' view? How did they refute it? What Scriptures did they cite? What ordinances did the Friends refuse to practice? How did these refute them thereon? What did these arguments do to the Friends? How typed? With what results? How typed?

(34) Despite their victory over their oppressing tyrants, what did they also get from it? How typed? What did their success first effect in them? Who misled them thereinto? What did this effect? What was the second evil into which they were led? After whose example? Where read? How are these things typed? What kind of a position was given these two things? How typed? What two things did they do to them? How typed in each case? How did their course therein compare with that of antitypical Joash? How did it affect God? How typed? Though displeased, what did God yet do? Through whom did He offer it? How typed? In what ways was it offered? How typed? What good reason did he give against their course? How typed? What in fact was the pertinent course of George Fox? What answer did he get? Like whom else? Like them to what was he subjected? When? How typed? In what form was the rebuke given? What was the question? With what was he charged? How typed? What was then done to him? After what usual course? How typed? What can we easily imagine? At what did the sectarian movement not stop? To what did it proceed? How typed? What did Fox see? What as a result did he do? How typed? Of what was this perhaps the beginning as to Bro. Fox? What warning did he utter? How typed? What two reasons on God's part did he give? How typed?

(35) What were perhaps the motives that prompted the Friends' movement to seek a controversy with the reviving Presbyterian Puritan movement? Why are we uncertain

thereon? Nevertheless, what was discussed among its leaders? How typed? What consequently did they do? How typed? What were the two preceding Presbyterian Puritan movements? What was the relation and the characteristic of the third as to these? How is each typed? Whose movements were all three of them? How typed? What were the antitypical messengers and their tactics? How typed? What was the character of the challenge? Why? Who was the main controversialist on the side of the Presbyterian Puritans? What kind of a man was he? How was the Presbyterian Puritan movement occupied? What in addition to this moved it to decline the challenge? How typed? How did it decline it? To what did it call attention first? Second? Third? How typed in each case?

(36) Then what did it do? How typed? Of what did it remind the Friends' movement? What did it then truly charge? How typed? What needed advice did it give? How typed? What reasoning did it give? How typed? Why did it so reason first? Secondly? How typed in each case? Upon what Scripture did such reasoning argue? How has this proven true? What can few stand? What is a special propensity of the fanatical? As such to what were the Friends exposed? Why? With whom was this proneness then present? How typed? How did God react to the conditions? Why? How typed?

(37) What as a type does Beth-shemesh mean and type? Over what, therefore, was the controversy? What is the correct way of presenting the Bible as to the source of faith? Practice? What is the secondary rule of practice? The tertiary one? What is meant by the Bible being the sole source of faith? Main rule of practice? What at times arises in special times and circumstances? Why? What usually enables him to decide them? In what sense is the Spirit a secondary rule of practice? What other cases sometimes arise? What should the Christian do at such times? Why? What does this make of providences at such times? When do we find the Spirit and providences to be a source of practice? As to what things? What in this controversy did each side do? Which went to the worse extreme? What were the right view and the extreme view of the Presbyterian Puritan movement? Why was its view on the rule of practice wrong? Why is the Bible the main rule of practice? The Spirit and providences respectively the secondary and tertiary ones? What

will sometimes give assistance in these matters? As what in such cases are they to be considered?

(38) What does God often do? With what is this often accompanied in the used agents? What did God use the Friends to emphasize on this matter? From whom did the Presbyterian Puritans get their one-sided view? Somewhat akin to whose view was that of the Friends? What was Luther's pertinent rule? To what extreme did the Friends up to the time of this controversy go? What did they allege? What is a brief view of their understanding? What was their thought on the relation of the Spirit as Inspirer of Prophets and Apostles and the Spirit in the consecrated? What error did they thereby commit? What followed in the Friends the adoption of this error? What to them was the Bible's highest use? What did this view effect in unbalanced brethren? To what two evils did it move them? Appositely, what did Pennington hold? What did Barclay appositely hold? What conclusion did another draw from this?

(39) Under what three handicaps did they labor? For whom did this make them no match? With what were they unable to cope? Despite what two errors in their adversaries' view on the source and rule of practice? On what were their opponents particularly trenchant on forcing? What did this force Barclay to do? To accept contrary to the Friends' position? What did he thus surrender? Under what conditions would the Friends have won in this controversy? Who before the Harvest saw the matter fairly clearly? What was the cause of their defeat? What will the foregoing explanation do?

(40) How did the Presbyterian Puritan movement act as to the attack? How typed? What did both sides do? How typed? How contrasted? How typed? What should be noted? How typed? What was the outcome of the battle? How typed? What was the battle's double effect on the defeated? How typed in each case? Of what did the victors get control? How typed? The defeated in what capacity? How typed as to the three features? The victor in what capacity? How typed in two features? What did the victor do to the defeated? How typed? What did they do there? How typed? By what means was this done? To what effect? What did this first include? How typed? Secondly? How typed? How are those near apostasy typed? How did this affect the crown-lost leaders?

How typed? What did the Presbyterian Puritan movement appropriate to itself? How typed? Together with what? In whose charge? How typed? What else in detail? How typed? What did it finally require? How typed? What did it then do? How typed?

(41) How long was this controversy waged? When did it come to a climax? What was George Fox's relation to it? During a large part of it where was he? What other two things also account for his non-participation? Even after what did he abstain from it? Whom did he let partake therein? With what result? Even who was forced to give up the main position? What was his and the Friends' chief exposition and defense? What were the three main surrendered positions? What two positions of their opponents did they accept? What final effect did this controversy have on the Friends' movement? What resulted therefrom to George Fox? Like the rest of what from Luther onward? What did he continue to do for them? When and where for the tenth time was he imprisoned? With what effect? What did it prevent? What did it not prevent? What was the chief of his much writing? What sized book did his other writings make? What were the last two things that the movement did for him? What facts are here given on his journal? On his other writings? What was the last thing it did? Through whom?

(42) What did Fox do in 1677 and 1684? What is the comment on him of Milton's friend, Elwood? That of Penn? What other things were said of him? Of what was he the mainstay? Even when? What should cause small wonder? For what was its last year mainly devoted? What else did it do that last year? How long did it drag out a prosaic existence after its controversy with antitypical Joash How long after the latter ceased? How typed? Where are its acts mainly described? How typed? Less described? How typed? What set in after antitypical Amaziah became thoroughly sectarianized? Sometime after what year? How did it react thereto? Into what did it break out? How typed? How did it set itself against this conspiracy? How typed? What did the conspirators then do? Led by whom? Where? Joined by whom else? How typed? What did they accomplish? How typed? By what did they do this? Nevertheless, what has been accorded it? How typed? Like what? How typed?

CHAPTER VII

LATER PARALLELS.

2 Kings 14:21–17:41; 18:9-12; 2 Chron. 26:1–28:27.

UZZIAH. JOTHAM. AHAZ. SHALLUM. MENAHEM. PEKAHIAH. PEKAH.
AHAZ. HOSHEA.

WITH THE passing away, in 1692, as shown above, of the Friends' movement from being that of God's more favored people's movement, what has been called the Pietism movement took its place as such a movement. It had its main field of work in Germany, but overflowed its bounds and gave refreshment to God's consecrated people in England, Holland, Switzerland, Russia and Denmark, as well as encouraged the later Quietist movement in France and Belgium. All the more faithful consecrated people of God, first in Germany, then in the rest of these countries, united in spirit, not organizationally, to support this as the more favored movement of God's people in successorship of the Friend's movement (all ... Judah took Azariah [*help of Jehovah*] ... Uzziah [*strength of Jehovah*] ... made him King ... father, 14:21; 2 Chro. 26:1). This occurred after this movement had been active in Germany in the work of its leader, Philip Jacob Spener, which had its special beginning as the nicknamed movement of Pietism in 1676, just 16 years before this movement became the successor of the Friends' movement (sixteen years old, 21; 1). In order to understand the circumstances of its rise it is necessary to take a short look at the condition of the Lutheran Church somewhat before and during the time of Pietism's rise and progress. A dead orthodoxy then reigned in the Lutheran Church, whose almost exclusive activities consisted of setting forth dry dogmatics, of engaging in constant controversies on most minute points and of a formalistic partaking in lifeless church

services, its clergy being largely worldly and in not a few cases drunkards and adulterers, and its laity in vast bulk being like their clergy.

(2) The Lutheran Church from shortly after the reformation onward had undergone a course of misdevelopment along the same general lines as the Church from shortly after the Apostolic times to the times of the reformation had undergone. The Apostles' times and Luther's times from 1512 to 1525 were periods of intense productivity. From 100 to 325 A.D. was a period of the rise of sectarianism and fundamental error, including union of state and church in the Catholic Church; and from 1525 to 1530 sectarianism and error, including union of state and church, arose in the Lutheran Church. From 325 to 799 increase of error, creedism, sectarianism, headship of the pope in the church and his temporal power and great controversies arose in the nominal Catholic Church; and from 1530 to 1580 more error, creedism and sectarianism, great controversies, the practical obliteration of the priesthood of all consecrated Christians in favor of a graded hierarchy (called prelates and superintendents, the latter really bishops), with the church yielded temporal power in the secular rulers as chief bishops or superintendents, arose in the Lutheran Church. From 799 to 1215 was the Antichrist period of great error, creedism and persecution in a worse form than previously, with the pope ruling in all things; and in the Lutheran Church from 1580 to 1610 the Book of Concord, the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, became in reality a paper pope, and dissenters were unfrocked, banished and imprisoned as peace-disturbers. Next came the cut-and-dried scholastic period of Romanism, which reduced theology to almost mathematical formulas and which continued until the reformation, 1215-1500; and from 1610, when John Gerhard published his great dogmatical and polemical work, *Common Theological Topics*, to 1692 the scholastic period, with dead formalism marking its later years, prevailed. But as

mysticism accompanied the period of scholastics in the Romanist Church from 1215 to 1500, so there was a mysticism (culture of the emotions, often in more or less unhealthy ways, of ecstatic excitement, quietism and self-satisfaction, amid much of good feeling and piety by contemplation of God, Christ, the Spirit, oneself, *etc.*) in the Lutheran Church accompanying the scholastic period, represented in its more or less questionable forms by Jacob Boehme and in its best forms by John Arndt, while John Gerhard united both the mystical and scholastic in his character and writings.

(3) Spener, who was born in 1635 in upper Alsace and died in Berlin in 1707, united in his character a strong intellect and a pious heart. Pious parents by heredity and training gave him a good start in religion; and his pious godmother, Agathe von Rappolstein, added to this good start. Good books, like Arndt's *True Christianity*, written in German, and Bayly's *Practice of Piety*, translated from English into German, deepened this good start. Good pastors and theological professors also contributed toward it. He became a very learned scholar and prolific author, and had to engage in much controversy in defense of consecrated living, which he championed. His real work as the leader of Pietism, after preliminary activities stretching over years of earnest efforts to cultivate Christian living in his parishioners in various pastorates, began in 1676, a year after he published his epoch-making work entitled, *Pious Desires*, in which reformatively he depicted the spiritual deadness of the then Lutheran Church, set forth the hope for better times, recommended more earnest Bible study on the part of the people under the guidance of their pastors, advocated a revival of the doctrine of the priesthood of all the consecrated, as against the idea that the clergy were the priesthood, and of Christlikeness as the mark of such priests, combated the idea that knowledge of doctrine was the whole sum of piety, advocated a change in university teaching to make its chief object

the cultivation of true Christianity in those preparing to be pastors, and called for a change in sermons to make their main object be the cultivation of godliness in the hearers. In about a year, 1676, these ideas sinking in, Spener was accepted as the leader of those who favored the reformation that he advocated. His reiterated stress in this book on prayer, praise, testimony and study meetings, whose attendants he would restrict to the consecrated, made a deep impression, and in 1676 these were introduced into many churches. This was the date of the start of the Pietist movement proper, though it did not become the more favored movement of God's people until 16 years later, 1692 (sixteen, 21; 1). In 1691, as we have shown in EJ, 276, 1, Spener brought out the long forgotten doctrine of the Millennium (he built Elath [*palm grove*], in allusion to the Millennium's being the period of righteousness' flourishing, Ps. 72:7; 92:12); and by the next year this doctrine was accepted by the Pietist movement (restored ... king [Amaziah] slept, 22; 2). True enough, as these texts indicate, the doctrine was developed prior to the end of antitypical Amaziah's demise as the more favored movement of God's people, but became generally accepted by the antitypical Uzziah, or Azariah, very soon after the latter started as such to be the more favored movement of God's people. This movement was the longest-drawn-out executive movement in antitypical Judah (52 years in Jerusalem, 15:2; 3) and began to operate during the longest reign in antitypical Israel; for antitypical Jeroboam II's reign also lasted 52 years, 1678-1730 (Jeroboam, 1;). The planning and founding of the Halle University by Spener and Franke began its symbolic reign. The parallel years were, accordingly, 829-777 B.C. and 1692-1744 A.D.—2520 years apart. The doctrine that mothered this movement is that of Jehovah's ability in executive matters (Jecholiah [*Jehovah is able*] of Jerusalem, 2; 3).

(4) The character of this movement's ideal and acts was righteous in matters pertaining to the Lord (did

... right ... Lord, 3; 4), in imitation of that of the good in the Friends' movement; but it did not do according to the latter's evils (according ... Amaziah did, 3; 4). Indeed, the main course of this movement was among the most righteous of antitypical Judah's symbolic kings. It sought to know and do God's will (sought God, ;5) during the entire period of its leaders' remaining faithful (Zechariah [*remembrancer of Jehovah*]). These were Spener, Franke, Breithaupt, Anton, Lange (Halleians), Jaeger, Bengel (Wuerttembergers), Zinzendorf, David (Herrnhuters), *etc.* And as long as they remained faithful they were gifted with a deep understanding of matters pertaining to justice and love—reverence for the Lord (understanding in the visions [the better reading is reverence; the two words are spelled much alike; thus the misreading arose] of the Lord). Of these, Zinzendorf later went wrong and was the main one to partake of the evils typed in vs. 16-21. Of these undoubtedly Spener and Franke, as the foremost, were the ablest and most developed in head and heart, as they were also the most fruitful in their ministries. And as long as the movement sought earnestly to know and faithfully to do the Lord's will, God prospered it in its undertakings, which is especially manifest in the life and work of Spener and Franke (sought the Lord, God made him to prosper). But during its entire period of preeminence as the more favored movement of God's people sectarian denominations were not by it removed (high places were not removed, 4;) and the nominal people of God consecrated themselves to, and served sectarianism (sacrificed) and used up their choice human powers in its service (burnt incense still on the high places); for even the leaders attached themselves to sectarian systems, though opposing the sectarian spirit and work, Spener, Franke and their colaborers maintaining that they were true to the Lutheran creed and church, only were seeking to reform Christian life in that church.

(5) But they had to maintain a continual controversy

with the dyed-in-the-wool sectarians. Of these there were very many among the Lutheran theological professors and pastors, who for the most part, through their worldly and sinful lives, felt the stings of the Pietist leaders' reproofs for sin, righteousness and judgment to come, and greatly resented the reformation that they advocated in clergy and laity (warred against the Philistines, ;6). They refuted the formalistic theories and practices of Romanists' sectarianism as its powers (brake down the wall of Gath, *winepress*), the formalistic theories and practices of Calvinistic sectarianism (Jabneh, *he builds*) and the formalistic theories and practices of Lutheran sectarianism (Ashdod, *fortress*), and set up prayer, praise and testimony meetings, catechetical classes and sermons and adult Bible classes throughout the Lutheran churches (built cities about Ashdod) and among the sectarians of the Calvinistic and even among Romanist churches (among the Philistines). In the years' long controversies with such sectarians God helped the Pietist movement (God helped him against the Philistines, ;7) and against the treachery (Arabians, *desert, wasters*) of power-graspers (Gur [*sojourn*]-baal [*lord*]) and autocrats in state and church (Mehunims, *dwellers*). Under the anti-clericalist blows that this movement gave the clergy by its emphasis on the sole priesthood of the consecrated, the clericalists (Ammonites [*from one's people*], ;8) gave manifestation of subjection to it by introducing the called-for reforms (gave gifts to Uzziah). By the fruits of righteousness developed by their preaching, teaching and writings, and the benevolent institutions in the form of the Halle University, colleges, schools, meetings for edification, orphanages, old folks' homes and missionary activities that they founded, this movement's fame (his name) was broadcast, not only among Christians, but also among the nobility, rulers of the present evil world (even to the entering in of Egypt); for its activities made it very strong (strengthened himself exceedingly).

(6) This movement did much to strengthen its executive powers (built towers in Jerusalem, ;9). This was particularly done as to those who had an evangelistic, a conversionist, work to do toward outsiders (corner gate [the same as the gate of Ephraim, Neh. 12:39, implied in Neh. 3:7, EJ, 154, 155]), for whom special schools and schooling as strengtheners were conducted as symbolic towers, fortifications, as it also strengthened those powers of its executiveness that were occupied with second-deathers (valley gate, Neh. 3:13, EJ, 156, 1); and it likewise strengthened its executive powers on lines of turning from evil to good (turning); and it made all these activities and arrangements strong (fortified them). This movement made many strong arrangements for foreign missionary work, through the Halleians' sending out laborers to India, where Schwartz and Ziegenbalg worked very fruitfully, and to America and South Africa, where especially the Pietists of Herrnhut, the Moravian missionaries, labored fruitfully. Moreover, the Halle Pietists sent forth missionaries who worked in Denmark, Switzerland, Russia, *etc.* They even did Jewish missionary work, for which they had a special training institute (built towers in the desert, ;10). The Halleians founded beneficent homes, schools, colleges and one university, that of Halle, which were veritable fountains sending out the waters of Truth from their midst. The Wuerttembergers got control of the Tuebingen University and founded colleges and schools and made them a fountain of Truth for Wuerttemberg, *etc.* (dugged many wells). By these they gave the Truth, not only to their inmates and students, but through the graduates of these colleges and these universities they sent forth over 5,000 Truth servants, who watered God's numerous flock (had much cattle), both among the lower classes and the middle classes (low country ... plains). It had many who planted and watered the seed of the Word (Husbandmen) and many who gave special attention to developing the fruits of the Spirit

(vine dressers), scattered throughout various kingdoms, *e.g.*, Germany, Denmark, Russia, Holland and Britain (mountains) and many other fruitful fields of labor in heathen countries (Carmel, *fruitful field*); for this movement delighted in the works of God's husbandry, in bringing forth the Truth and the Spirit of the Truth (loved husbandry).

(7) The Pietist movement had to fight for every inch of territory that it gained and had to fight to keep it. Therefore it had to have and train many warriors to fight the Lord's battles, in which they zealously took part (Uzziah had an host ... to war, ;11). They were divided into various kinds of fighters (by bands). There were especially three groups of such warriors, who corresponded to the three great groups of the Pietists: (1) those who were trained at the Halle University and at its various institutes, schools and colleges and who constituted the largest part of the warriors (Jeiel [*removed by God*, in allusion to their separation from the spirit of Lutheran formalism]), their leaders being the scholars of this movement (the scribe); (2) the Wuerttemberg Pietists, who were more conservative and less aggressive in controversy and practical measures for the advancement of Pietism, for which reason it was more favored by the civil and church rulers; nevertheless they did effective work as a distinct group of Pietists (Maaseiah [*work of Jehovah*] the ruler [literally, officer]); and (3) the Herrnhut, or Moravian Brethren, whose leader was Count Zinzendorf, these, like the Halle section, being eminent for their missionary activities at home and abroad; while these were the least aggressive of the three groups in controversy they produced some very able hymn writers, *e.g.*, in English, Montgomery, and in German, Zinzendorf; and these are aptly typed by Hananiah (*Jehovah is gracious*). These groups had able controversialist leaders. The main ones of the Halle wing of the Pietists were Spener, Franke, Breithaupt, Baier, Anton, Mechaelis, Lange and Henschmied. The main

controversialists of the Wuerttemberg wing of the Pietists were Jaeger, Hochstetter, Reuchlin, Weismann, Rieger. The ablest representative of this section of Pietism as text critic, commentator and student of Prophecy (Dan. 12:5) was J. A. Bengel. Zinzendorf was almost the only outstanding controversialist of the Moravian Brethren wing of the Pietists (chief of the fathers of the mighty men, ;12); yet the great and his great main controversialists were no inconsiderable number (number ... two thousand and six hundred). But under their leadership (under their hand, ;13) there was an unusually large number of ledlings who were armed controversially and fit to fight in defense of the principles of Pietism and in attack on the dead orthodoxy against which Pietism was an energetic protest (an army, three hundred thousand ... five hundred). These fought continually with strong and victorious power in defense of the principles of the movement (made war with mighty power) as they advanced its interests (to help the king) against its many foes (against the enemy).

(8) The movement, especially in its Halle and Wuerttemberg adherents, through their educational institutions, prepared for its warriors every kind of thorough armor for their warfare (prepared ... all the host, ;14). This armor consisted of arguments that defended the warriors from their enemies' attacks (shields), that, contained in controversial writings, made them strong to attack their enemies (spears), that defended their intellectual grasp of the controversial truths (helmets), that defended every vital part of their teachings (habergeons; literally, coats of mail), that gave them the proofs which enabled them to shoot sharp teachings at their enemies (bows) and that equipped them to cast controversial questions with deadly effect at their opponents (slings to cast stones), thus equipping them thoroughly for defensive and aggressive warfare. Moreover, in executive respects (in Jerusalem, ;15) this movement made armorial weapons

of war (engines) as a defense of its fortifications (towers) and its strong points (bulwarks). These were constructed by brethren, like Spener, Franke, Canstein, *etc.*, as able developers of the practical means of defense against attack (invented by cunning men). The chief of these armorial weapons were the Halle publishing house, the Halle and Tuebingen theological faculties, which by lectures and publications mightily defended this movement, the Canstein Institute, which saw to the publication of Bibles, defenses of Christianity in the form of tracts, *etc.*, the Home Missionary Institute, the Foreign Missionary Institute and the Jewish Missionary Institute. All of these combined did a marvelous work in defense of this movement and in attack of error and wrong. Particularly did its short attacks in the form of tracts (to shoot arrows) and its larger publications in the form of aggressive and defensive questions and answers (great stones) deal hard blows at its enemies. The many institutions of practical usefulness that the Halle Pietists operated wonderfully helped it to success (marvelously helped), until on all sides it was strong in itself and in the influence that it exerted (till he was strong).

(9) As can be inferred from the above, its two greatest and most influential exponents were Spener and Franke, men of the fullest spirit of consecration, the former giving it mainly its theoretical form, the latter cooperating therein, giving it mainly its practical form, the former dying 15 years (1707) after it became the more favored movement of God's people, and the latter dying 35 years (1727) thereafter. Much like our Pastor, Franke was a marvel of theoretic knowledge, high organizing powers, tireless activity and practical executiveness, and was the all-influential spirit in the Halle form of Pietism up to the time of his death; and for nearly ten years afterward his works were carried on much in his spirit and forms by able adjutants. But about ten years after his death pride, especially in the form of arrogance, conceit, and

self-sufficiency, began to set in, in small part in the Halle and Wuertemberg wings of Pietism, and in large part in the Herrnhut, or Moravian Brethren, wing of Pietism. Count Zinzendorf, a zealous and philanthropic spirit, ran well for years; but later his place as the main leader of these, the natural arbitrariness of his hereditary aristocracy, his dictatorial use of power and the conceit that his success brought increasingly manifested themselves, until he became a liability to the movement and was mainly responsible for its decline in real usefulness. Especially was this true of the last six years of the movement's preeminence, his followers supporting him unquestioningly (his heart was lifted up, ;16); and the final outcome was its setting aside as the more favored movement of God's people (to his destruction). The following is the way that he wrote of himself: "We, Lewis, by Divine providence, Bishop, Liturgist and Ordinary [executive] of the churches known by the name of the Brethren, and under the auspices of the same, Advocate during life, with full power over the hierarchy of the Slavonic Unity, Guardian of the circuits and President both of the General Synod and of the teaching leadership, by these presents declare, *etc.*" Spangenberg, his biographer, enumerates the titles that Zinzendorf appended to his name on certain papers, as follows: Count and Lord of Zinzendorf and Pottendorf, Lord of the baronies of Freydeck, Schoeneck, and Thurstein and of the vale of Wachovia, Lord of the Manor of the Upper, Middle and Lower Bertholdsdorf, Hereditary Warden of the Chase to his Imperial Roman majesty, in the Duchy of Austria, below the Ens, and at one time Aulic [courtier] and Justicial Counsellor to the Elector of Saxony." Enough said!

(10) The evil of busybodying in priestly matters that Uzziah did is typical of the busybodying that the Moravian brethren, especially Count Zinzendorf, exercised in the priestly work of our Lord and the consecrated brethren in the Wesleyan movement. A few

explanations are necessary to clarify the situation. John and Charles Wesley and a few kindred spirits already in their under-graduate days at Oxford University were nicknamed Methodists, because of their strict and methodical practice of religion. Both Wesleys had for years been consecrated before in 1738 they met Peter Bohler, a Moravian preacher, who conducted a fruitful ministry in London. He led them to "conversion," as they called it; but we believe, so far as John and Charles Wesley were concerned, it was their quickening as 2 of the 70. John, deeply interested in the Moravians' religiousness, desired to become better acquainted with them, and, therefore, journeyed to Germany, where he met Count Zinzendorf, who, to test his humility and simplicity, set him to work in a garden. To ease his work Wesley removed his coat and vest and worked at his task. After a while Zinzendorf suggested that the former go with him to visit a neighboring count. Wesley acceded, asking for a short delay to wash his muddy hands and perspiring face and put on his coat and vest. The count demurred, saying that he should go exactly as he was, as a proof of his sincerity and simplicity, to which Wesley also consented. This occurred in Marienborn, Germany. Thence Wesley journeyed 350 miles eastward to the Moravian headquarters at Herrnhut where he spent a few weeks and learned to appreciate the Moravians more and more, though he saw some things that met his disapproval, which, being minor matters, did not disturb his fellowship with them. Returning to England, he shortly began what is called the Evangelistic Revival, in which he greatly stressed repentance toward God, faith in the Lord Jesus unto justification and a life of entire consecration or sanctification. The matter of "conversion," as beginning in a series of great mental perturbations and outward groanings for sin, and culminating in a sudden outburst of the full assurance of faith that one's sins are forgiven and of resultant peace and joy, often accompanied with outbursts of

intense excitement and exultation, was stressed in this evangelistic work. This they called the first blessing.

(11) They called the experience of entire consecration or sanctification, which they identified with Christian perfection, the second blessing. These teachings brought Wesley and his collaborators into collision with the Moravians, especially with Zinzendorf, all of whom identified justification and sanctification, and so stressed justification by faith as to claim entire freedom from obligations to the moral law, they claiming that Christ's imputed righteousness was the only righteousness needed and had by the Christian. They did not believe that Christ imputed only so much of His merit as brought one up to perfection. Hence they tended to antinomianism, literally, against legalism, *i.e.*, opposition to the thought that the moral law had any rule over the justified, while Wesley properly insisted that the justified are to obey the Divine Law, not thereby to be justified, but to evidence their justification as genuine. Moreover, he insisted that in consecration one seek to fulfill the law of disinterested love, while in justification he seek to fulfill the law of duty love, the former as an evidence of the genuineness of consecration. These two opposing views led to a head-on collision between the Evangelical Revival movement and the Pietist movement as represented in the Moravians and championed by Zinzendorf. The fellowship between the Evangelistic Revivalists and the Moravians had been so close before this controversy broke out that they all met and worked together, especially at London, where the latter had a number of able and influential preachers. Zinzendorf and his preachers began to attack the Revivalists on their differences above mentioned and excluded the Wesleys and their collaborators from the meetings at Feters Lane, London, after the debate had assumed large and decided proportions. This led Wesley to read a paper on the subject at the London Church, and he followed that reading by inviting those who held with him to withdraw from the

London Church. About 75 arose and followed Wesley out of the meeting. Similar actions occurred elsewhere, the Moravians excluding Wesley's collaborators, and they resultantly withdrawing those agreeing with them. This greatly enraged the Moravians, especially Zinzendorf, who strove to subjugate the Wesleyans to his and their sway, alleging that they were right, but the Wesleyans proving them to be wrong. The result was division where before there had been unity. It is this situation that is the antitype of ;16-20.

(12) Now will be traced the connection between the type and antitype of these verses. The course of the Moravians under Zinzendorf's leading was a gross impingement against the priestly work of the Evangelical Revival, or the Methodist movement, as it is more popularly called; for Moravianism was in reality a sectarianizing of the priestly Pietist movement; hence it was a crown-lost leaders' movement; and for it to attempt priestly work was a sin against God's order (transgressed ... God, ;16). This in God's sight made that movement busybody in the priestly work of the Evangelical Revival; for the latter was led by John Wesley, a star-member, and by Charles Wesley, his special helper as such. It means that the Pietist movement, no more a priestly movement, was attempting to offer the choice human powers of a no-longer priestly movement as antitypical incense (to burn incense ... of incense); for it actually entered into the priestly condition, where it had no right to be (went into the temple of the Lord). Jesus (Azariah), followed first by John Wesley, then by Charles Wesley and then by their now increasing number of priests, followed after them in the ensuing controversy (the [high, ;20] priest went after him ... fourscore priests ... valiant men, ;17), and opposed their usurpations and power-grasping, whereby they sought to subject the priesthood to themselves; for they sought to set aside the Scriptural work of the Evangelical Revival and put their mistaken work, their antinomian work, in its

place. Their busybodying was just like that of that evil servant's busybodying in the priestly work of the Epiphany messenger and his colaborers in England in the small parallel (EJ, 385-390). And certainly Jesus and the valiant Wesleyans withstood the Moravians, led by Zinzendorf, to their face in vigorous protest at their usurpation (withstood ... the king, ;18). By their proofs of the erroneousness of the Moravian teachings involved in the controversy, *i.e.*, by act, they remonstrated with them (not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense). And by their right teaching on the subject in controversy, *i.e.*, by act, they declared that the Moravians were busybodying in a priestly function (to the priests, the sons of Aaron). Their act of teaching the pertinent Truth also showed that they were the consecrated priesthood (consecrated to burn incense). By act, *i.e.*, their controversy, they also charged them to go out from the priestly condition (go out of the sanctuary). Furthermore, by their proving the erroneousness of the Moravians' and the truth of their view, they charged them of being guilty of sin (thou hast trespassed) and that they would not be honored by the Lord for it (neither ... thine honor ... God).

(13) This course of the Lord Jesus through Wesley and his colaborers greatly incensed the Moravians, particularly Zinzendorf, who said of the obligatoriness of the Divine Law, "I trample upon it." He said the same of Wesley's doctrine of entire sanctification, Christian perfection. They, especially he, became very angry, yea, full of wrath at the opposition of the faithful priests, as though the latter were the intruders (Uzziah was wroth, ;19). Zinzendorf became furious over Wesley's doctrine of entire sanctification, exclaiming, "This is the error of errors. I pursue it through the world with fire and sword. I trample upon it. I devote it to utter destruction. Christ is our sole perfection. Whoever follows inherent perfection denies Christ. All Christian perfection is faith in the blood of Christ, and is wholly imputed, not inherent [he here confused sanctification

with justification]." In the debate Wesley forced him to make the following admission: "A believer is altogether holy in heart and life ... he loves God with all his heart, and serves Him with all his powers." To this Wesley replied, "I mean nothing else by perfection, or Christian holiness." To this Zinzendorf rejoined: "But this is not the Christian's holiness. He is not more holy, if he loves more, or less holy if he loves less. In the moment he is justified, he is sanctified wholly; and from that time he is neither more, nor less holy, even unto death [here, again, he confused sanctification with justification; what he said is true of our reckoned perfection in justification; it certainly is false as to sanctification]. Our whole justification and sanctification are in the same instant. From the moment any one is justified, his heart is as pure as it ever will be." Thereupon Wesley asked, "Do we not, while we deny ourselves, die more and more to [self and] the world and live to God?" Zinzendorf answered, "We reject all self-denial. We trample upon it. We do, as believers, whatsoever we will, and nothing more. We laugh at all mortification. No purification precedes perfect love." An unclean crown-loser, of course, he could not see the pertinent truth. Speaking of St. James' epistle, he said: "If it were thrown out of the canon [Bible], I would not restore it." His popish autocracy aroused much opposition among some of his English followers, which made him furious. He expressed his wrath as follows: "I will have nothing more to do with those English brothers ... I disapprove of the absolution that is given to such Korah spirits. I laugh at the English national self-righteousness ... I desire to be erased from the list of English laborers, and not to be named among them until ... [they] make acknowledgment in writing of their being deceived."

(14) Such teachings, arrogance and wrath were manifest while the Moravian movement was using Bible passages to justify its errors (a censer in his hand, ;19), in an attempt to use all their choice human powers

in a religious service (to burn incense). How could it have been otherwise than that their wrath, arrogance and the popish spirit of Zinzendorf made apparent crown-losing errors in their views (leprosy ... forehead), which appeared before these priests in God's house (priests ... Lord), as they were standing beside the Church in its capacity of comforting, strengthening, encouraging, warning, correcting, *etc.*, their brethren (beside the incense altar)? Jesus and the cooperating underpriests attentively viewed these (Azariah, and all the priests, looked upon him, ;20) and recognized that they were afflicted with a spiritual error indicative of their having as individuals lost their crowns, and of the sectarian, crown-lost, teaching condition of their movement (behold, he was leprous in his forehead). By their Truth opposition these priests quickly cast the crown-losers and their movement out from the true Church, as unclean crown-losers and as a crown-lost movement (thrust him out); and by their defenses of their errors they hastened their exit (hasted also to go out), because the Lord Himself had smitten their evil course with crown-losers' blindness (smote the king ... smitten him, 5; 20). This busybodying began late in 1738, about 5½ years before Pietism ceased to be the more favored movement of God's people, even as J.F.R.'s small parallel's busybodying began about 5½ days before he ceased to be the small antitype of Uzziah. At the same time the Halle and Wuerttemberg wings of the Pietist movement kept deteriorating in sectarianism, antitypical crown-lost leprosy, all three of them remaining in this condition until the movement as a whole ceased being the more favored one (leper unto ... death, 5; 21). They pursued their own separate work (dwelt ... house), severed from the loyal brethren (cut off ... Lord). During these 5½ years the Evangelistic Revival, or Wesleyan movement, presided over the affairs of the Lord's work and of the Lord's people (Jotham [*Jehovah is upright*] ... was over the king's house,

judging). The history of the Pietism movement has been recorded by Church historians and biographers, and particularly by John Wesley (acts of Azariah ... Uzziah ... chronicles ... Isaiah, 6; 22). The memory of this movement is kept as one of the more favored movements of God's people (buried ... fathers in the city of David ... field ... kings, 7; 23). And the Evangelical Revival movement, or the Wesleyan movement, succeeded it as that of the more favored people of God (Jotham ... stead). From this history let us learn to remain humble amid successful and exalted service, if God gives it to us.

(15) In the foregoing, on the basis of 2 Kings 15:7 and 2 Chro. 26:23, it was pointed out, with the assistance of the facts of the fulfilment in the large and small parallels, that Jotham (*Jehovah is upright*) acted as Uzziah's deputy in ruling over the land for about 5½ years before Uzziah's death. These 5½ years' activities of antitypical Jotham should be given more attention than was given them above. The parallel years of typical and antitypical Jotham's reigns were 777-761 B.C. and 1744-1760 A.D., 1845 years apart, as the parallel periods require. Antitypical Jotham was the good Wesleyan Methodist movement (2 Kings 15:32; 2 Chro. 27:1). It began its special individual or separate period of activity later in the same year of our counting, as the Calvinistic Methodist movement (second year of Pekah ... king of Israel, 32;) began its separate course, the latter starting before April 1, hence in an earlier year of God's reckoning, the former after April 1 in the early part of another year, but in the same year as we count years. The harmony of the involved chronologies proves this [P. '40, 182, (6)]. This movement had the germ of its beginning 25 years before, 1719, in John Wesley's beginning to yearn after God, while yet a scholar at the Charter House School or Academy in London, a year before he entered Oxford University. In his later years, from 1729 onward, as a fellow at the university, which he became in

its Lincoln College, 1726, he expanded his spirit of consecration as the leader of a number of consecrated students, who because of their holy lives of loving service to the poor, needy and fallen, and because of their methodical ways of living to fulfill their aspirations for godliness, were in that year, 1729, nicknamed Methodists. In that year he read William Law's epoch-making book on holiness, called, *Serious Call*, and by it his aspirations for holiness were very greatly deepened. In 1732 he visited Law and for six or seven years had fruitful fellowship with him; but the latter then becoming a vagarious mystic and not teaching justification by faith, Wesley broke with him. Ordained in 1725, from 1727 to 1729 he assisted his father as vicar in clerical duties, and in Nov., 1729, he returned to his duties as fellow (teacher, but not professor) in Lincoln College, Oxford University, where he remained until 1735, increasing in grace, knowledge and fruitfulness in service. In 1735 Wesley went to Georgia as minister to the English in the colony and missionary to the Indians. On the voyage to Georgia the calmness and resignation of some Moravians on his ship during a storm that momentarily threatened to sink the ship greatly impressed him. In Georgia his ministry was unsuccessful, due to his too great strictness. He first met the Moravian Peter Bohler, who greatly influenced him toward deeper faith in 1738 in London, beginning the third day after Wesley's return; for he had left Georgia in the fall of 1737 and reached London on Feb. 3, 1738. During the years from 1719 to 1738 Wesley developed more and more, until, May 24, 1738, he experienced what he called his conversion, but what we believe was the quickening of his new creature accompanying his being made a star-member—his beginning to share in that bestowal of the Spirit on the antitypical 70, typed in Num. 11:16, 17, 25-30. Then followed his visit to Germany to see Count Zinzendorf at Marienborn, Southwestern Germany, and the Moravian headquarters at Herrnhut, Southeastern Germany.

(16) In the Fall of 1738, he began to see the first encroachments of Pietism on him, as exemplified in the Moravians; and since it was the beginning of antitypical Uzziah's attempting to offer incense, his resistance was the beginning of antitypical Jotham's judging the people of the land as antitypical Uzziah's regent (15:5; 26:21). Above we traced these busybodying acts, so need not repeat them here. Here we need only to stress the thought that they began about 5½ years before the good Wesleyan movement became the ascendant more favored movement of the people of God; but during these 5½ years the movement did much good. At first its three main leaders were John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield, one of the greatest pulpit orators of all times. The preaching of these three being too trenchant for the dead orthodoxy of the Anglican Church, the Anglican clergy of London and Bristol, their first evangelistic fields, closed their church doors to them, which led them to preach in the fields, where their immense audiences, sometimes reaching 80,000 people, found ample space, whom none of the churches were large enough to accommodate, and where they were free from churchly restrictions. Another important step of Wesley's was to organize the justified into small groups called bands, which served to strengthen them, especially in right living. While Wesley's stewardship doctrine was the teaching, Perfect love is God's ideal for the consecrated, the wickedness of the lower middle and the lower classes in England, to whom the Wesleyan movement primarily appealed, made him lay great stress on repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus for justification by faith. While Whitefield preached eternal torment as the main motive of bringing people to repentance and faith, Wesley made the love of God and Christ for man and the evils of sin and the blessings of righteousness the motive to produce such effects. Whitefield depended mainly on oratory and dramatics to influence his hearers. Wesley used for these effects a friendly, loving

and logical exposition of Biblical doctrines as the substance of his preaching, speaking in an earnest and not loudly pitched voice. So penetrative was his voice that though speaking slightly louder than a conversational voice he could be distinctly heard by 60,000 people. The result was that Wesley influenced his hearers more deeply and lastingly than did Whitefield. In 1740, Whitefield stressing Calvinistic predestinarianism with its particularistic merit of Christ's death, and Wesley stressing Arminianism with its universalistic merit of Christ, a controversy broke out between them, resulting in a division, out of which emerged two kinds of Methodists: Arminian and Calvinian Methodists, the former being the movement of antitypical Jotham, as the more favored movement of God's people, and the latter becoming antitypical Pekah, as the less favored movement of God's people. The former's work increasing, Methodist laymen began to preach; but not being ordained they did not administer baptism and the Lord's supper. Societies of believers began to be formed; and amid these, classes consisting of the consecrated were formed; and thus the good work progressed until the Wesleyan movement became in 1744 the ascendant more favored one of God's people.

(17) The thing that was the inauguration of antitypical Jotham's sole reign was the creation and meeting of the conferences (began to reign, 32; 1). Wesley had a number of clerical supporters from late 1738 onward in his movement; and to these ere long were added the laymen who became qualified and active as evangelistic lay preachers. These to the number of six clergymen and four lay preachers held in June, 1744, for five days the first good Methodist movement's conference. It was here decided to have them annually. Here were discussed doctrinal, ethical and practical matters, and in time these conferences under Wesley's direction became the highest and most authoritative body in the movement. Elaborate minutes of each conference were kept and were published, so that all the

movement's adherents might learn to know of its deliberations and decisions. Wesley's decisions were accepted as the authorized expressions of each conference. It was Wesley's firm but kindly control of this movement that kept it as one of the very best of the more favored movements of God's people. He held the same kind of teaching and executive control over this movement as our Pastor maintained over the Parousia movement. This movement began its ascendancy just 25 years after Wesley began to seek after the Lord in 1719, at the age of 17 years (twenty and five, 33; 1); and it lasted 16 years, 1744-1760, in executorship for God (sixteen years in Jerusalem, 33; 1). The movement was mothered by the possession or heritage of truth, righteousness and holiness with which Wesley was endowed and with which he under God endowed the movement (mother's ... Jerusha[h] [*possession*, or *inheritance*], 33; 1); and this endowment was one begun by the righteousness of faith (daughter of Zadok [*righteous*], 33; 1). This movement in matters pertaining to God (in the sight of the Lord, 34; 2) acted in harmony with the Lord's Word as then due (did ... right, 34; 2), treading the footsteps of the Pietistic movement in all that it did righteously (according ... Uzziah, 34; 2). But it did not do the evil that the Pietistic movement did in seeking to dominate a star member by attempting to undertake priestly functions; for the good Methodist movement did not attempt to subjugate Wesley to its will, as did the Moravian section of antitypical Uzziah, especially in Count Zinzendorf (entered not into the temple, ;2).

(18) However, there were great evils practiced by the people in high, middle and low society; for much unbelief, misbelief, blasphemy, disregard of parental, school and civil authority, murder, robbery, immorality, slander, perjury and political corruption prevailed (people did corruptly, ;1). Moreover, sectarianism in the form of Romanism, Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, Baptistism, Congregationalism, Quakerism and Moravianism,

instead of being set aside, prevailed in sharp rivalry between its sects (the high places were not removed, 35;); and the sectarians in each of these sects served the several interests of these sects by seeking their prosperity, instead of that of the true Church (sacrificed ... high places, 35;), and used up their choice human powers for each one's particular sect (burned incense ... high places, 35;). The good Methodist movement did much work in teaching consecration and entire sanctification, as well as sought to bring the justified to consecration and to carrying it out in holy living, self- and world-denying service and joyful endurance of evil (built the high gate ... Lord, 35; 3). Moreover, it wrought much in its executive powers in the way of building chapels, orphanages and schools and of printing Christian literature and school literature (on the wall of Ophel [*hill*; the ridge in the south-east corner of Jerusalem, where the king's palace from the time of David onward stood, and where the kings ordinarily exercised their executive authority and works] he built much, ;3). The title to these chapels, orphanages, schools and the printed literature was vested in Wesley, until late in his life by the Deed of Declaration he vested it in 100 brethren whom he chose to take over things at his death, even as our Pastor did as to his belongings that he put in the name of the Society. The religious literature that he published was partly his own writings and partly extracts from the writings of the most helpful authors since the Apostolic times, especially those of the best Christian authors of the preceding 150 years, including extracts from German writers, like Luther and Arndt. These books in the second edition consisted of 30 octavo volumes, entitled, The Christian Library. Wesley furnished these extracts to bring to the poor Christian families some of the best pen-products of this Age; for, an able scholar himself, he sought also the spiritual intellectual elevation of the masses among whom chiefly he worked. An admirer of good, secular literature, both in prose and

poetry, he also published, years after the movement ceased being ascendant, in many volumes a library for uneducated Christian families, for their improvement in good secular things, consisting of extracts from some of the best secular literature of the world. He, himself, made these two sets of extracts, at inns, at friends' homes, in his study and on horseback; he read through these books, drawing heavy lines through what he desired omitted, and then handed what was left of the books over to printers to print. The work on The Christian Library was done in his scant spare time from 1749 to 1755. For his schools he wrote most of the textbooks there used, like English, German, French and Spanish Grammars, and textbooks on arithmetic, orthography, psychology, rhetoric, logic, science, *etc.* These books were almost always abridgments of larger works. During this period his notes on the New Testament appeared, mainly extracted from good authors, especially from Bengel's Gnomon (Register), one of the ablest of the short commentaries on the New Testament, which, despite its 200 years' age, is still useful.

(19) This movement gathered and organized what they called societies, actually churches, consisting of its converts and consecrated ones, throughout England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland (built cities in the mountains of Judah, ;4). As developers and strengtheners of its work it organized a series of circuits (built castles, ;4), into which its working districts in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland were divided, ministered to by preachers (forests [trees representing leaders or great ones]) appointed by Wesley, called circuit riders, who usually traveled horseback, an institution something like that of our pilgrims. It also established a local ministry (towers) consisting of laymen called local preachers (forests), who ministered locally and in nearby suburbs and villages, but did not serve circuits. These two sets of helpers were a mighty buttress to the movement. From the outstart this movement's more public work, in 1738, had almost constant

conflicts with the bishops and clergy of the Anglican Church, who complained mainly and bitterly against the movement's spokesmen as busyboding in their dioceses and parishes, as stealing their sheep, and disregarding order in the Church. Especially three of the bishops wrote against the good Wesleyan movement, particularly against Wesley,—Gibson, bishop of London, Lavington, bishop of Exeter and Warburton, bishop of Gloucester. Wesley answered each one of them. Even bishop Butler, author of the *Analogy*, forbade his speaking in his diocese, that of Durham. Numerous clerics wrote against him, especially the Rev. Mr. Thomas Church of London; and he replied. He was too good a logician and Biblicist not to have refuted them well. Against their complaint that he had no right to enter their dioceses or their parishes he replied that the only reason that he had for it was that they neglected the work of evangelizing the people of their dioceses and parishes, and that for a matter of mere order he would not allow souls for whom Christ died to perish, as long as he had the means in his hands for their rescue. It was in this controversy that he answered their charge that he was a busybody in their dioceses and parishes by the epigram that has become a proverb, "The world is my parish," basing it on the great commission of Matt. 28:18-20 and Mark 16:15, 16. The clergy were the main inciters of vicious mobs and great riots against this movement's preachers and adherents. This controversy was a war between clericalism and the good Wesleyan movement (he fought ... Ammonites, ;5). And, certainly, it gained the victory in the warfare; for not only were the bishops and clergymen not able to justify their neglect of the people, which was one of the great causes of the reign of gross wickedness in Britain and Ireland at that time—a neglect that this movement not only rubbed in hard on them, but that was one of the best of justifications for its existence. Its, especially Wesley's use of Scripture, reason and facts, so completely refuted these sticklers

for church order and these neglectors of souls, to the detriment of God's work and of the salvation of many, that in time they had to keep silence and could find no mobs that would riot against the Wesleyan preachers and adherents (prevailed against them).

(20) To evade their arguments the clericalists had to give up to them their doctrine of justification by faith alone, as the truth fitted for justified humans, *i.e.*, a perfect nature lower than the Divine nature (hundred talents of silver), and began to teach justification by faith and works. Indeed, out from among their own number many clergymen embraced the Wesleyan movement. Many more, while remaining in the Anglican Church, imbibed the spirit of this movement and evangelized their parishes and some of them did evangelistic work in circuits of their own, for the Wesleyan movement did much to reform clergy and laity in the Anglican Church. The King, George III, once remarked that Wesley and his associates did more good to the generality of the English people than did the hierarchy and clergy of the entire Anglican Church. Besides Wesley's brother, Charles, and Whitefield, he counted Vincent Perronet and William Grimshaw among some of his best clerical friends, both of them out-and-out Methodists. But best and highest of all, he counted the saintly John Fletcher, incumbent of the parish at Madeley, his best friend and ablest controversialist supporter. He had counted on his mantle falling on Fletcher, who, however, died a few years before Wesley's death. But the most valuable things that the clericalists had to yield the good Methodist movement were the many new creatures who, uncomfortable and out of place in the dead formalism of the Anglican Church, came into the loving and saintly atmosphere of the warm Methodists, who, like the Parousia brethren, were certainly a saintly people during the ascendancy of antitypical Jotham. These new creatures that came into this movement from the Anglican Church were of two classes: crown-retainers (measures of wheat) and

crown-losers (measures of barley). Their justification is also here typed—by the ten thousand, a multiple of ten, in each case typing that perfect natures lower than the Divine were meant, in this case reckonedly perfect men, justified without works by faith alone; and their justified human all was taken away from uses for the Anglican Church (ten thousand). These were the great losses that the bishops and the clergy underwent: (1) the loss of the truth on justification by faith alone without works, and their accepting of the Romanist error of justification by faith and works, at the same time accepting Rome's pertinent error on faith's being merely belief; (2) the loss of new creatures as crown-retainers from their midst; (3) the loss of new creatures as crown-losers from their midst; and (4) the loss of the human all of such new creatures from uses for the benefit of Anglicanism. This certainly impoverished the Church of England. Points (2)-(4) imply that these generally absented themselves from attendance at, and support of the Church of England, despite Wesley's urgent advice to the contrary; for he struggled all his life against his followers' seceding from the Church of England, designing his societies in each parish to be a part of the local Church of England—a church within a church, as it were, and himself remaining a minister of it until death (so much ... pay unto him), to its lasting loss (second year, and the third).

(21) It was because the good Methodist movement was whole-souled in its devotion to the Lord, the Truth, as then due, the brethren and all others with whom it had to do, on the lines of justification by faith alone and entire consecration unto the Lord (prepared his ways before ... God, ;6), that it became stronger and stronger. In these matters it was as faithful to the Lord as any of the other more favored movements of God's people from antitypical Rehoboam's time until its own time, if not more so. The zeal, self-sacrifice and labors of Wesley and his ordained and unordained circuit and local preachers and the generality of the rest of the

adherents of this movement was perhaps unexcelled since the days of the Apostles, up to their time. No wonder that they became as a movement mighty for God, truth, righteousness and holiness (Jotham became mighty). In externals they grew mightily in the number of the societies and membership therein, in the number of classes and members therein, in the number of the local preachers and circuit riders, in the number of ordained ministers, in the number of their chapels and in the attendances thereat, in the number of their schools and pupils therein and in the number and importance of their publications and institutions of benevolence. The bulk of their preachers and ministers were men of such characters as wrought mightily for the spread of truth, righteousness and holiness. Filled with the idea of the priesthood of the consecrated, the bulk of those who professed consecration among the general membership of the movement were burning and shining lights in their own communities and often beyond them. The number of adherents ran into the tens of thousands, and of general and local preachers into the hundreds, by 1760. Their hymnology greatly increased as especially the two Wesleys, particularly Charles, the greatest of hymn-writers, who left behind him between 6,000 and 7,000 hymns, all of good quality, some of supreme quality, *e.g.*, *Jesus, Refuge of My Soul*, poured out their sentiments in fine rhyme and rhythm. Another feature of the strength of this movement was its uplifting effects upon ministers and laymen, not only in the Anglican Church, but also in the Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Baptist, Quaker and Moravian Churches. This was due to the fact that the movement was wholly non-sectarian; for Wesley, though an Anglican clergyman, required no doctrinal or creedal tests from his adherents. All that he required for membership in his societies was repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, with a life in harmony therewith; in his classes, entire consecration reasonably lived out; in local officers, stewards and local

preachers, and in his other preachers and circuit riders and clerical assistants, in addition to clearness in the truth, consecration attested by a life of self- and world-denial, sacrificial zeal and that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord. The strength of character in the leaders and ledlings is evident from their meekly bearing mistreatment at the hands of mobs, as they were taught by Wesley to do. No wonder that it grew strong, since thus it prepared its ways before God.

(22) During this period, apart from repelling the attacks of the bishops, clergy and others that these influenced to attack them, they had no theological controversies. Wesley's experience with his local and circuit preachers, mainly laymen, convinced him of the fact that there was no difference in the office designated by the Scriptural terms, *bishops*, or overseers, and *elders*, or presbyters. He saw this from the facts: (1) that the Greek terms for *elders* and *bishops* mean the same office, the former meaning its honor, the latter its toil; (2) that they are used interchangeably in Acts 20:17, 28, of the leaders of the church at Ephesus, and of leaders in general, in Tit. 1:5, 7; (3) that in addressing the Philippians, not using the Greek word for *elders* at all, he uses instead of it the plural of the Greek word for *overseers*, *i.e.*, *bishops*, and speaks of the officers of the church at Philippi as bishops and deacons [the plural of bishop here, as in Acts 20:28, of course, proves that Paul did not use the word in the modern sense of bishops, of whom there is not a number in one church, but used it in the sense of elders]; and (4) that in 1 Tim. 3:1-13 Paul mentions only two offices in local ecclesias, calling the first bishops and the other deacons. Therefore Wesley, not a bishop in the Anglican sense of the word, had no compunction in appointing lay local and circuit preachers. For a while he did not have them administer baptism and the Lord's supper, but later came to do it. All his life he resisted the increasing pressure to make the Methodist societies churches and to separate them

from the Anglican Church into a Methodist Church. And as long as he lived he succeeded therein; but not long after his death, 1791, this separation was made. Foreseeing such an event he made such arrangement as when the break would come, it would be accomplished with a minimum of disorder and ill-will. The three leaders of the movement, John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield, especially the first, have been the subjects of biographies; for which their journals have been the chief sources. Some lesser lights in this movement have also been made the subjects of biographies, while the movement in its 16 years' duration holds a prominent place in histories of Methodism. These biographers and historians have been Methodists and non-Methodists (acts of Jotham ... written ... chronicles ... Judah ... Israel and Judah, 36; 7). V. ;8, having in substance been explained in our comments on vs. 33; 1, where almost the same words and the same thoughts are given, needs no more comment here. This good movement ceased operating as the ascendant one in 1760 (Jotham slept with his fathers, 38; 9); but it was held in loving remembrance as being quite apostolic in character (was buried ... in the city of David), as worthy of being among the more favored movements of God's people (with his fathers, 38;), to be succeeded by an evil Methodist movement.

(23) There remain for our present study a consideration of 2 Kings 16:1-4; 2 Chro. 28:1-4, on part of the career of Ahaz, the son and successor of Jotham. We will not here discuss the whole of his career, because it touched on that of Pekah of Israel. Hence we will study here only that part of it until Pekah came on the scene. Thereafter we will return to a study of the kings of Israel following Zechariah, the last king of the Jehu dynasty, before resuming with Ahaz. Ahaz represents the bad Methodist movement, which became the more favored movement of God's people from 1760 to 1776, paralleling the reign of Ahaz, 761-745 (Ahaz ... began to reign ... in Jerusalem, 2 Kings 16:1;

2 Chro. 28:1). One of the proofs of human depravity is the rise of corruption after a season of good development in most human movements; and such a procedure we witness in the Methodist movement, a procedure that almost always sets in, in the case of those new creatures who for a time run well and then later lose their crowns. We see this in the Parousia movement, changing in most cases to more or less corrupt Great Company movements during the Epiphany. This is also typed by the good Jotham being followed by the evil Ahaz. The bad Methodist movement was twenty years in existence before it came into the ascendancy as that of the more favored one of God's people. This movement first began to come into existence in 1740, at the occasion of the temporary break between Wesley, who was an Arminian, and Whitefield, who had shortly before become a Calvinist, during his first trip in America, under the influence of Jonathan Edwards. This breach was accompanied by an exchange of controversial pamphlets between the two, in which Whitefield was decidedly defeated; for he was no match for Wesley as a theologian and logician; and to make matters worse, the former descended to personalities. But after a short time he apologized for this; and a reconciliation between them took place; but Wesley did not again take him into the same complete friendly confidence as formerly. They remained friends for life, but differed on election and free grace permanently. And while friendly dispositions existed between Wesley and the good Methodist movement and Whitefield and his movement, which in 1744 became antitypical Pekah of antitypical Israel, the same year, but a little earlier in the year, as the good Methodist movement became antitypical Jotham of antitypical Judah, certain of the adherents of the latter movement began to develop a series of characteristics and do a series of acts in 1740 and onward that by 1760 put them into the ascendancy in the Methodist movement and that made them the bad Methodist movement (twenty years old, 2; 1). This

movement was in the ascendancy of the more favored ones among God's people for 16 years executively (sixteen years in Jerusalem, 2; 1).

(24) But the bad Methodist movement did not do right in matters pertinent to the Lord (not ... right ... Lord, 2; 1); for it disregarded certain of the teachings of the Apostles as set before them by Wesley (not ... like David his father, 2; 1). Instead, this movement acted out the two main sins of the less favored movements of God's people—clericalism and sectarianism, two sins to which God's people, including the Levite movements of the Epiphany, are much tempted and into which most of them have fallen (walked ... kings of Israel, 3; 2). This bad Methodist movement became guilty of sectarianism, not only as over against the older sects in England, but also over against the Whitefield movement, and of clericalism, inasmuch as increasingly certain of the ordained ministers in the movement felt themselves above the lay preachers, and the latter increasingly sought more of the clericalistic powers of the former. These two evil developments gave Wesley much concern and trouble, especially as his brother, Charles, was the leader of the ordained ministers in this unhealthy practice (in the ways, 3; 2). Even worse than this, the bad Methodist movement, both in its ordained and unordained preachers, sought to make forms of offices that without the names sought to grasp for and exercise the powers of the Anglican hierarchy and clergy (molten images for Baalim [*lords*], ;2). His unordained preachers sought long, but in vain, to make Wesley claim and exercise the powers of a hierarchical bishop and ordain them; and these unordained ministers were by Charles Wesley and other bishop-ordained ministers of this movement made to feel that they were of a lower order of Truth servants than the former. These evils grew increasingly, especially from 1760 to 1776. An even worse sin did this movement commit: As we saw above, while Whitefield used the dread horrors of eternal torment

as a cudgel with which to beat men to repentance and faith, Wesley used the love of God and the love of Jesus as expressed in His death as the main motive to lead men to repentance and faith. But many of Wesley's preachers did not follow his, rather they followed Whitefield's example, as to the motive that they offered sinners as the way to salvation. Hence they pictured God as filled with rage against sinners—so enraged as to hold, according to some of these preachers, sinners in great wrath over the yawning abyss of eternal torment, suspended on a hair, and that ready to be singed with torment's fires. This threat they used to drive men by fear to what they called repentance and faith; and they labored long, using up their choice human powers in such a service (burnt incense in the valley ... Hinnom [Gehenna], ;3).

(25) Not only so, but they went even further than this abominable practice. They sought with the same fear to keep their converts in line; yea, whenever they saw any becoming cooled in their fervor they threatened them with their view of hell fire; and in the most lurid colors they described the eternal torture of those who backslid (made his son to pass through the fire ... burnt his children in the fire, 3; 3). Thus the bad Methodist movement worshiped antitypical Moloch, as the antitype of Ahaz, who put his living children in the red hot arms of typical Moloch until they were roasted unto death. The spokesmen of antitypical Ahaz have used eternal torment more perhaps than any other class of preachers as a means of frightening people unto their kinds of repentance and faith and unto keeping them therein. In this they have furnished the antitype of the sorriest of all caricatures of our Heavenly Father, the God of all mercy and of all grace. In this they outdid the greatest of all heathen abominations known in the Old Testament (abominations of the heathen). As Moloch worship was one of the sins for which God drove the seven nations out of Canaan, so is its antitype—the service given to Satan in serving

the doctrine of eternal torment—the great sin of Christendom for which God during the interim, the Parousia and the Epiphany has been driving its cherishers out of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (whom the Lord cast out before the children of Israel). As though these abominations were not a sufficient filling of the bad Methodist movement's cup of iniquity, they added to these sins by using their human all in wrong ways, (sacrificed, 4; 4), even using their reckonedly perfect choice human powers (burned incense), doing all of this in the interests of nominal-church systems (high places), of the civil governments of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales (hills) and of the great ones of this world, the British royalty, nobility and officials (under every green tree). Certainly, antitypical Ahaz committed gross abominations, more of which will be shown later. What a warning lesson he is to us who have followed the good movement of the Parousia to abstain from participation in the evil movements of the Epiphany. Let us be faithful to the teachings and arrangements of that wise and faithful servant, the antitypical small David, and thus we will be immune from the evils of bad movements following in time, but not in spirit, the good Parousia movement, and will be kept in the good movement following the Parousia movement, *i.e.*, the Epiphany movement.

(26) As intimated above, an interruption of our description of the reign of antitypical Ahaz will here set in, in order to discuss the reigns of four of the last five movements of antitypical Israel—antitypical Shallum, Menahem, Pekahiah and Pekah, the last of which reigns was in part contemporaneous with part of antitypical Ahaz's reign. The last king of antitypical Israel studied was antitypical Zechariah, who reigned one year [P '40, 182 (6)], *i.e.*, from April, 1730 to April, 1731 A.D., paralleling Zechariah's reign (791-790 B.C.). With antitypical Zechariah the antitypical Jehu dynasty, Presbyterian Puritan movements, came to an end. Sir Robert Walpole's ministry killed the last phase

of the Presbyterian movements (Shallum ... slew him, 2 Kings 15:10), by refusing their adherents fullest religious liberty as dissenters, free from the few disabilities that the Anglican Church succeeded in putting on them in the settlement following the revolution of 1688. For a full month that ministry through Walpole, the prime minister, in control of parliament, manipulated religious matters in the Anglican Church as a barren political matter (Shallum [*requit*], ... Jabesh [*dry*], 13;) and as an Anglican movement in antitypical Israel (Samaria). But the Anglican hierarchy and higher clergy in a controversial movement designed to comfort (Menahem [*comforter*], 14;) its adherents against infidelistic attacks from without and from within, resented this political interference, and put an end to it so far as concerned the management of that Church's internal affairs; for this movement in the hierarchy and the higher clergy in its good fortune (Gadi, *fortunate*) left its pleasures, ease and delights (Tirzah, *delight*) and gave its attention to executive matters (Samaria, *guard*), and put an end to the Walpole ministry's meddling with the administration of the Anglican Church's internal affairs (smote Shallum). English Church and secular historians (chronicles ... Israel, 15;) have described that ministry's participation in church affairs (acts of Shallum), especially in that part of it wherein they hypocritically denied the Presbyterian Puritans complete freedom from the few disabilities under which they suffered disadvantages as to the Anglican Church (conspiracy which he made).

(27) Typical Menahem reigned from 790 to 779 B.C.; and antitypical Menahem reigned from 1731 to 1742 A.D. (17;). This Anglican movement conducted two great controversies against infidelistic movements, one within the Anglican Church and one outside that Church. The first was with what were called the Latitudinarians, who correspond to the present Broad Church Party in the Anglican Church. Archdeacon

Francis Blackbourne was their most influential leader. At that time, as at the present, they were infidelistically inclined. While contending against certain errors of antitypical Menahem, who opposed full religious and civil liberty, they went to the extreme of denying many partial truths held by that movement, questioning the full inspiration of the Bible, and tolerating almost any denial of its main teachings imperfectly held as they then were. These Latitudinarians despised antitypical Menahem, who sought to maintain the Divine authority of the Scriptures against them. The latter fought it at every turn and refused to submit to its authority as it was exercised by the bishops. They opposed and sought on infidelistic grounds to reduce the bishops to nonentities. They were rationalists, who certainly would give the bishoply and high clericalistic orthodox movement, antitypical Menahem, no access (Tiphseh, *opening*) to them, and as a result antitypical Menahem for the comfort of its adherents entered into a sharp controversy with, and refuted them completely (smote Tiphseh, and all that were therein, 16;), and did this with all who held with them (coasts thereof). To do this antitypical Menahem had to leave the pleasures, ease and delights in which then its hierarchy and higher clerics reveled. It did this refutative work so thoroughly that it utterly overthrew the various companies or groups of the Latitudinarians (women) and destroyed their embryonic movements and powers (with child he ripped up). This controversy occurred in the outstart of antitypical Menahem's reign.

(28) The reign of antitypical Menahem began in 1731 (nine and thirtieth year of Azariah [Uzziah], 17;) and lasted 11 years (P '40, 182 (6); years in Samaria). Despite some good it was as a whole an evil reign, and that because it was a typically hierarchical and higher clerical one. Hence it abounded in the evils of hierarchism and clericalism and sectarianism (did evil, 18;). Despite protests to the contrary, it adhered to the clericalism and sectarianism that the Lutheran

movement as antitypical Jeroboam introduced and used to mislead antitypical Israel (departed not ... Jeroboam ... made Israel to sin). It had a by far more important controversy with Deism than with the Latitudinarians (Pul [*elephant*], 19;). Deism is the belief that, despising the Divine Revelation, the Bible, bases its religion on its view of nature and reason unassisted by revelation. Hence its adherents call it natural religion, or natural theology. Deists are often called freethinkers, another name for infidelity. Its beginner was Lord Herbert of Cherbury (died 1648). Thomas Hobbes (died 1679) gave it a further push into more error, claiming that all religion is the product of fear and of reason reflecting on the universe. Charles Blount (died 1693) fused Herbert's and Hobbes' views. John Toland (died 1722) developed his Deism further, requiring that Revelation to be true must be deduced from reason, which made reason the source of faith. The Bible, rightly understood, certainly is in harmony with sanctified reason, but it, and not reason, is the sole source of faith. Anthony Collins (died 1729) and William Whiston (died 1752) developed their Deism into a theory that claimed that the Old and New Testaments were irreconcilably contradictory, and spent their efforts in seeking to point out such alleged contradictions. They and Thomas Woolston (died 1733) denied that the Old Testament contained prophecies, while the last sought to set aside the miracles of the New Testament. Matthew Tindal produced the standard textbook of Deism. He denied the fall and the curse and claimed that among all nations God revealed Himself, though giving more revelations to Jews and Christians than to heathen.

(29) While up to this time Deists usually held that the Law of Moses and the law of nature were identical, with Thomas Morgan (died 1743) they began to deny this. Peter Annet (died 1769) carried their infidelity further, denying Jesus' resurrection, claiming that Jesus had not died, but had merely swooned away and

recovered from His alleged swoon, which recovery the disciples allegedly set forth as His resurrection. The spear thrust into Jesus' heart thoroughly disproves this swooning theory. He also roundly denied the actuality of miracles. By the time of antitypical Menahem (1731-1742) Deism had shot its full broadside of infidelism into the world. Thus it claimed that only the religion derived from a study of nature by reason could be true. This made it deny the Bible as an inspired Revelation, reject its prophecies, deride its miracles and reject the fall, and consequently the atonement, the virgin birth, ransom sacrifice, resurrection and glorification of Jesus. In a word, everything essential in Christianity Deism denied. The full impact of its attack came in the time of antitypical Menahem against the Truth and its spirit (king of Assyria came against the land). Against this attack the hierarchy and higher clergy of the Anglican Church, acting as antitypical Menahem, rallied their forces and especially by three works ably refuted the main positions of Deism. The first of these works was Bishop Walburton's two-volumed treatise entitled, *The Divine Legation of Moses* (1738), which overthrew Deists' anti-Mosaic and anti-Prophetic views. The second refutative work was really a series of writings by Dr. Waterland, the ablest English theologian of his day, who certainly decimated Deism; and the greatest work of all was Bishop Butler's *Analogy* (1736), which met Deists on their own ground of nature and literally pulverized their viewpoints. To this day, over 200 years later, Deism has attempted no reply to the *Analogy*. There were lesser pen-products sent forth to refute Deism; for the anti-Deistic literature is a vast one. The defeated Deists, like our Higher Critics, kept repeating their refuted arguments long after antitypical Menahem ceased to be the main movement in antitypical Israel; and the controversy dragged on until Paley brought it to an end, early in the 19th century, by a refutation that Deists have not attempted to answer.

(30) But while antitypical Menahem refuted Deism, it did not do it so well, *e.g.*, as antitypical Jotham refuted clericalism; for in two particulars it was somewhat lame against the Deists. In the first place, it defended some erroneous doctrines against the attacks of Deism, *e.g.*, trinity, God-manship, eternal torment, damnation to eternal torment of the heathen, *etc.* This particular feature of the controversy, however, is not typed in vs. 19, 20. The other lameness of antitypical Menahem in this controversy is, however, brought out in these verses: its too much stress on reason. For a hundred years before this controversy there had arisen in the Anglican Church an unhealthy view as to reason in its relation to the Bible as the sole source of faith, for it was held to be a subordinate source and rule of faith. And this view further depraved was one that Deists made the main principle of their system, *i.e.*, that human reason is the sole source of religious belief. This, of course, fitted in with their nature religion—religion derived by reason alone from the study of nature. The Anglican errorists on reason in its relation to faith, of course, did not go so far into error on the subject as the Deists did. Whereas Deists made reason their sole source of faith, the Anglican errorists, particularly Bishop Walburton, made it an almost equal source of faith with the Bible; for these, somewhat as the Romanists make the Bible and tradition the source of faith, made the Bible the main source of faith and reason a subordinate source and rule of faith.

(31) The word, reason, is so ambiguous a term that it actually becomes what each one's views make him think things ought to be, and therefore it means a different thing to each person. It amounts to each one's understanding of things, backed by his rational or irrational intuitions. Hence things that some think reasonable others think unreasonable. Sanctified reason, the holy mind of God in His people, is not a source of faith; it is a vessel that contains the things of faith that the Scriptures as their sole source give; and it is

an interpretative rule of faith. Sanctified reason sees everything Scriptural as reasonable; for it is the understanding of Divine things that God from the Scriptures as their source gives His people. These things never contradict its understanding of things viewed from the standpoint of true rational intuitions, hence never contradict their sanctified reason. So-called Orthodoxy has accepted so many things contradictory of sanctified reason, and contradictory of the reason, one's understanding of things in the light of rational intuitions, of the natural man, that such views are justly counted unreasonable, both to sanctified reason and to the dimly enlightened reason of the natural man, who additionally thinks some Divine truths to be unreasonable to him. The unhealthy view that many Anglicans accepted on reason's being a subordinate source and rule of faith made them concede entirely too much to Deists' claim as to reason's being the sole source and rule of faith. This dangerous concession of these Anglican apologists is what is typed by Menahem giving Pul 1,000 talents of silver, conceding as human truth (1,000, being a multiple of 10, types things belonging to a nature lower than the Divine nature) a part of the claims of Deists on reason being the sole source and rule of faith (a thousand talents of silver, 19;). This evil concession was made in order that antitypical Menahem might get that much of Deism's support as was necessary for antitypical Menahem to keep its power as a dominating movement in antitypical Israel (hand ... confirm the kingdom in his hand).

(32) Antitypical Menahem exacted these concessions as teachings of God's people (money of Israel) from the Anglican controversialists, especially from the ablest among them (mighty men of wealth [teachings being the wealth of teachers], 20;). The concessions of each controversialist were not complete; they were merely partial, which is indicated by the 50 in the shekels. Had the shekels been 100 (10×10), the concessions would have been all-out; but as they

were 50 (5×10) they were only partial (fifty shekels of silver). But as such they were yielded to Deism (give to the king of Assyria). Bishop Walburton was the main sinner in this respect, though as a whole his work, *The Divine Legation of Moses*, ably refuted the main objections of the Deists against the Mosaic Law and prophecy as being against nature. In reading Bishop Butler's *Analogy* one can see that he, too, yielded too much to human reason in its office as a student of nature; for he used reason in studying nature as being a quasi-sourcel prover of faith, whereas he should have used it only as offering corroborations to things of faith. It is very unwise, yea, wrong in a Truth controversialist to yield more to an adversary than the principles involved require. Deism would have been more soundly beaten had these concessions not have been made. As it was, they left the field of battle (turned back) feeling that they had gained a partial victory, though suffering a greater defeat. And they left off the controversy with antitypical Menahem, leaving the field in its hands (stayed not ... land). English church historians especially, though others cooperated therein, have given the record of antitypical Menahem's acts, especially as to its controversies with Latitudinarians and Deists, and have given many of them not typed in the Bible record of Menahem's acts (acts ... book ... kings of Israel, 21;). In the year 1742 antitypical Menahem ceased to be the most prominent movement of the less favored people of God (slept with his fathers, 22;), after following the evils of the Lutheran movement (evil, 18;); and a pleasure- and society-loving movement of the hierarchy and clergy of the Anglican Church, begotten by antitypical Menahem, succeeded it as the most prominent movement of the less favored people of God (Pekahiah [*whom Jehovah exposes*] his son reigned in his stead).

(33) Already before and increasingly during the days of antitypical Menahem the Anglican hierarchy and clergy loved leisure, ease, fashionable society,

learned pursuits, pleasure and worldly occupations and diversions. Of the clergy Archdeacon Blackbourne, the Latitudinarian leader, in a letter to the archbishop of Canterbury said that they were "courtiers, politicians, lawyers, merchants, usurers, civil magistrates, sportsmen, stewards of country squires, tools of men in power." "Nonresidence and disregard of the claims of duty prevailed among the bishops and lower clergy. Watson, Bishop of Llandaff (Wales), lived in the Lake district, and visited Wales once in three years. Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor, never visited his diocese during his six years' occupation of it; Warburton at Gloucester complained of the inconvenience of that public station as hindering his studies; while Secker at Oxford looked upon his summer visit at Cuddesdon as giving him a delightful retirement for his favorite studies. In the view of statesmen some bishoprics were preferments suitable for men of ability and learning, some mere places of ease, suitable for men of family and fashion." The hierarchy and the clergy were pleasure- and society-mad. Hilarious gatherings, social calls and musicals attracted them. Parties were in great favor with them; masquerades were an attraction to them. Some of them loved to follow the hounds in fox hunting; and afternoon teas in wealthy houses were dear to them. They were a pleasure- and money-loving set in very many cases. So much was this mode of life their pursuit that their spirit became characteristic of the most prominent movement among God's less favored people—antitypical Pekahiah, whose reign was from 1742 to 1744, typical Pekahiah reigning from 779 to 777 B.C. (fiftieth year of Azariah ... reigned ... Samaria, and reigned two years, 23;). This movement naturally grew out of antitypical Menahem (son of Menahem) and exercised the place of chief prominence in executorship in antitypical Israel (over Israel in Samaria). In addition to committing the above-mentioned evils, antitypical Pekahiah (evil ... Lord, 24;) was guilty of the sins of sectarianism

and clericalism, which were introduced by the first Lutheran movement, and which became the evils of all the movements of the less favored people of God (Jeroboam ... made Israel to sin).

(34) Calvinistic Methodism, under the lead of George Whitefield, was a party in the Anglican Church (Pekah [*exposer*] ... a captain of his, 25;). It was a party that practiced rigid self-denial and world-denial and naturally was much offended by and opposed to the selfishness and worldliness of the Anglican hierarchy and clergy acting in antitypical Pekahiah, and consequently agitated much against them (conspired against him) and publicly and privately witnessed against antitypical Pekahiah, exposing the selfish and worldly lives of its leaders and their executors neglect of the salvation of Britishers in general and of their church members in particular (smote him in Samaria). Particularly did Calvinistic Methodism excoriate the special evils, those set forth above, of their selfish and worldly lives (palace ... house). In this attack Calvinistic Methodism singled out the earthly minded members of the hierarchy (Argob, *cloddy*) and the most powerful of the higher clergy (Arieh, *lion*) for the special targets of their sharp shafts; and so thoroughly did they do this work that they put an end to antitypical Pekahiah as the most prominent movement among those of God's less favored people (killed him). Calvinistic Methodism was in these attacks supported by tentatively-justified members of the Anglican Church who occupied a rough and hard position on the subject, *e.g.*, many of the outspoken nobility, parliamentarians, judges (fifty ... Gileadites [*rough, hard*, $50 = 10 \times 5$, hence not vitalizedly, but tentatively justified ones. If $100 = 10 \times 10$ had been the number, vitalizedly justified ones would have been meant]). This course met very general approval; for the selfishness and worldliness of antitypical Pekahiah was the greatest obstacle in Britain to godliness in high and low, as it was also indirectly responsible for the

many evils that marred British society in all classes—high, middle and low. As a result of Calvinistic Methodism's pertinent course it became the most prominent movement of God's less favored people (reigned in his room). In the writings of church and secular historians of Britain and other countries are found accurate accounts of the above-described and other acts of antitypical Pekahiah, which certainly were unpastoral (acts ... chronicles ... Israel, 26;).

(35) As in describing antitypical Jotham's reign we devoted some space to a study of the life and work of John Wesley, its chief leader, so now in describing the reign of antitypical Pekah, which became the most prominent movement in antitypical Israel in 1744 (two and fiftieth year of Azariah, 27;) and continued to be such until 1772, the parallel dates being 777-749 B.C. [P '40, 182 (6)], we will devote some space to a study of the life and work of George Whitefield, the main leader of the Calvinistic Methodist movement. He was born in 1714 and died in 1770. He was a son of an inn-keeper, and in adolescence served drinks in the inn to customers to help his mother, who was widowed when he was but two years old. He studied at St. Mary de Crypt and later at Pembroke College, Oxford, where he fell in with John and Charles Wesley, joined the "Holy Club," faithfully kept its rules, professed "conversion" in 1735, was ordained deacon in 1736, spent much time helping prisoners in Oxford, began to preach and became a pulpit orator of the highest order, probably as great a pulpit orator as ever lived. He preached throughout England, Scotland, Wales and Protestant Ireland and visited America on evangelistic work seven times and finally died during his seventh visit there. In 1738 he was ordained an Anglican priest. His pointed preaching occasioned many of the London church doors to close to him, though he was allowed to preach in some others. Like the Wesleys, he worked a while among the Moravians. In 1739, the church doors of Bristol being closed against him, he resorted

to preaching in the open air and soon induced John Wesley to do the same. This gave the Methodists opportunities to reach great multitudes that they never could have reached in churches. Thereupon he began his career as an itinerant evangelist, one of the greatest that ever lived. He sometimes addressed audiences of 80,000. His denouncing leading members of antitypical Pekahiah, calling them, among other things, "blind guides," made the latter oppose him. His association with American Calvinists, particularly Jonathan Edwards, deepened the Calvinism that he had earlier espoused. Above we pointed out his controversy with Wesley on predestination, which led to a temporary alienation between them, but which was soon healed, and they remained friends for life, though their paths diverged, because of their leading different movements.

(36) Whitefield left the work of organizing his movement to others, especially to Lady (Countess) Huntingdon, his most devoted helper, and gave himself to preaching as his specialty, even preaching for two hours at Exeter, Mass., the day before his death, he being accustomed to preach every day, often three and four times daily. Like our pilgrims, he preached his sermons over and over again. His journals, sermons and letters have been published. His success was due to his dramatic delivery; for his published sermons are tame and do not rise above the commonplace. Lady Huntingdon sought through him to interest members of the nobility. On one occasion when he was addressing some of them, his description of the lost sinner as being like one blindfolded and walking toward, and falling over a precipice was so realistic that Lord Chesterfield, of politeness' fame, cried out, in great excitement, "Why! he has fallen over the precipice!" Benjamin Franklin describes the effect of one of his appeals for a charitable fund as moving him from a determination to give only a penny to successive determinations to give ever-increasing amounts, until finally he emptied his entire purse into the collection basket!

Whitefield and Wesley undoubtedly excel all other non-apostolic evangelists, not even excepting Moody. Like the Wesleyan Methodists, the Calvinistic Methodists built chapels, founded schools and even instituted a theological seminary at Trevecca, Wales. The movement failed to achieve the same degree of fruitage as the Wesleyan movement, and that largely because the former did not preach Biblical doctrines as much as the latter, nor did it seek to indoctrinate its adherents as much as did the latter. Most contemporaries placed Whitefield above Wesley, because of his greater oratorical abilities. Wesley's greater scholarly and organizing ability, his greater pastoral character and his star-membership made his movement a far better one than Whitefield's. However, under the antitypical Ahaz phase of the Wesleyan movement matters were almost as bad in it as in antitypical Pekah. Doubtless Countess Huntingdon's great influence in antitypical Pekah imparted to it an aristocratic savor that did not give it the popular appeal that the Wesleyan movement exerted.

(37) Note the difference in the expressions characterizing antitypical Ahaz, which, though a Wesleyan movement, was much degenerated from antitypical Jotham, the Wesleyan movement at its best, and antitypical Pekah: "did not that which was right" (;28:1) and "did that which was evil" (15:28). Even evil antitypical Ahaz was not so bad as antitypical Pekah! Some of the latter's evils will come out when its controversies with antitypical Ahaz are described. It was certainly a more contentious movement than the former, having all its faults and lacking some of its virtues. It was a very sectarian movement, seen in its strict Calvinism and in its taking away temporarily from antitypical Ahaz many of its followers. It, too, was a decidedly clericalistic movement, since it stressed clericalistic powers decidedly more than did antitypical Ahaz. These two faults are typed by the Scripture statement made of all but one, antitypical Hoshea (17:2;), of the movements of the less favored people of

God: "He departed not from the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin" (28;). Certainly, the first Lutheran movement wrought much mischief in its establishing clericalism and sectarianism. Nor was God's punishment slack as to antitypical Pekah; for though Whitefield had wrought very much and effectively in the American colonies, having visited and evangelized all eight of them, as these were in his days organized, the preliminary acts of the American revolutionists, 1764-1772 (days of Pekah ... Tiglath-pileser [*mighty lion of the Tigris*], 29;), took from antitypical Pekah in Britain almost all that Whitefield had accomplished for it during his seven evangelistic trips in America (and took). In his days the American colonies were from certain standpoints organized into eight groups: (1) New England, (2) New York and New Jersey, (3) Pennsylvania and Delaware, (4) Maryland, (5) Virginia, (6) North Carolina, (7) South Carolina and (8) Georgia (Ijon [*ruin*], and Abel [*mourning*]-beth [*house*]-maachah [*oppression*], and Janoah [*he rests*], and Kedesh [*holy*], and Hazor [*court, village*], and Gilead [*rough, hard*], and Galilee [*circuit*] ... Naphtali [*wrestling*]. From another standpoint there were, of course, 13 colonies. Henceforth the American revolutionists in their strength took over the fruitage and members of these colonies as theirs from antitypical Pekah, carried them captive to Assyria [*step, going*]). The British state-church, deliberately pursuing an anti-Calvinistic policy, worked against the Calvinistic Methodists as the most prominent movement of God's less favored people (Hoshea [*deliverance*] ... Elah [*oak, strength*] made a conspiracy, 30;); and in spite of this movement's having much riches of grace from God (Remaliah, *wealth of Jehovah*), attacked its Calvinism and refuted it (smote him and slew him) and took its place as the most prominent movement of the less favored people of God, in 1772 (17:1; reigned in his stead). The acts of this movement are described in the writings of

church historians, especially those written by Britons, Americans and Germans (acts of Pekah ... written ... chronicles ... Israel, 31;).

(38) We now return to antitypical Ahaz, whose acts as described in 16:1-4; and ;28:1-4 we have already studied. For its wickedness the Lord aroused the so-called Evangelical [Calvinistic] Party in the Church of England to attack it on the subject of election (Rezin [*firm*] ... Syria [*highland*] ... delivered ... smote him, 16:5; 28:5); and by this controversy these Anglicans won many Wesleyan Methodists back to the Anglican Church (carried ... multitude of them captive ... Damascus). Antitypical Rezin's leading representatives (not all taking part in the controversy about to be described) were James Hervey, William Grimshaw, William Romaine, Henry Venn, John Newton, Thomas Scott, Richard Cecil, Joseph Milner, Isaac Milner, Samuel Walker, Thomas Adam, Thomas Robinson and William Richardson, men of great piety and zeal, and some of them of considerable learning. At that time antitypical Rezin attacked the Methodist Millennial doctrine [blessings for the then living only] and moved the Wesleyan Methodists, who for a while held it in the form just stated in brackets, to give it up, and a false nominal-church view of the Millennium as a reign of the Church before Christ's Return was by it given to this doctrine (drove the Jews from Elath, 6;), and this has been accepted since by the so-called Evangelical Anglicans (Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day). The main Anglican evangelical controversialists against the Wesleyan Methodists on predestination and the Millennium as a time of blessing the then living only, were Henry Venn, John Newton, Thomas Scott, Richard Cecil and Joseph Milner. Others, whose names will be omitted because of their bitterness, were very rude in their treatment of the Wesleyan Methodists in this controversy. But by far more bitter than antitypical Rezin in this controversy against antitypical Ahaz was

antitypical Pekah (delivered into ... Israel, ;5); but both of them sought to overthrow the former in its executiveness (came up to Jerusalem to war, 5;); and while they did it much injury, especially did antitypical Pekah so do (great slaughter, ;5), they were unable to conquer it (could not overcome him, 5;). The chief controversialists of antitypical Pekah were Augustus Toplady, author of the hymn, *Rock of Ages*, John Berridge and the brothers, Sir Richard and Roland Hill; and the chief warriors of antitypical Ahaz were John Fletcher, Thomas Olivers and Walter Sellon. Wesley did very little writing in this controversy, being too busy with more important matters. The four above-named warriors of antitypical Pekah were most bitter in the abusive epithets that they, especially Toplady, hurled at Wesley, who in a truly Little Flock spirit bore it, without answering in kind, in a most sweet spirit, Toplady's spirit being far from that of our Lord, especially considering that he was only 30 years old, while Wesley was 70. The same sweet spirit marked the saintly John Fletcher's pertinent writings. But Thomas Olivers descended to almost the same depth of abuse as the four antitypical Pekahites. Sellon's part was in spirit midway between Wesley's and Fletcher's spirit and that of Olivers.

(39) The main questions at issue were those of election and free grace. The Bible teaches both, election operative pre-Millennially and free grace operative Millennially. The result of the controversy was that each side presented many Biblical arguments in its favor, and neither was able to refute the main arguments of the other. Antitypical Ahaz labored under the difficulty of having the facts of the Church's and the world's experience up to the present against it; for both the Bible and the Church's and the world's experience prove that up to the present election, and not free grace, has been operating savingly. Antitypical Ahaz, denying future probation, was in great difficulty in maintaining free grace as now operating savingly.

Antitypical Rezin and Pekah had the greatest difficulty with the passages that prove free grace—God's love for all, Christ's death for all and the Spirit's work for all for salvation. Both sides were thus greatly hampered in the controversy; but the predestinarians won many more proselytes from antitypical Ahaz than the latter won from the former. Involved in the main question at issue were questions like the following: What is the relation of good works to justification by faith? Are certain ones predestinated to eternal life? Are all others destined to eternal torment? Have all a chance to gain life? Is justification a result of sanctification, or does it precede it, or are the two identical? Is Christ's righteousness imputed or imparted to the believer, or both? Is it possible to attain a state of sinlessness in this life? Is grace irresistible and unloseable? Are there two justifications, one in this life by faith, and one by the evidence of works at Christ's judgment seat? Do we work for life or from life? Does the expression, a finished salvation, mean more than a finished redemption? Is the liberty of will compatible with Divine grace? Did Christ die for the elect only, or for the whole world? Is God's saving love limited to the elect, or does it extend to the whole world? Is the Spirit's work limited to the elect, or will it operate to the whole world? Other questions were also involved, which we will here pass by. From the viewpoint of the Divine plan we may say, in summarizing the controversy, that both sides had much of truth and much of error, but all in all antitypical Ahaz had more of truth and less of error than antitypical Rezin and Pekah, as we should expect of the movement of the more favored people of God. Neither side understanding future probation, the high calling as distinct from justification and the difference between tentative and vitalized justification, they could not conclusively refute each other, a stalemate resulting.

(40) However, because of the apostasy (forsaken the Lord, ;6) of antitypical Ahaz, it lost refutatively

to the other side decidedly more, and brave, crown-retainers and crown-losers than it gained from that side (Pekah slew ... one hundred and twenty thousand [12,000, a Little Flock number, a multiple of 10 fitting the Great Company] ... all valiant men, ;6). Toplady, the ablest but most vituperative warrior of antitypical Pekah (Zichri [*memorable*]), on certain lines of argument refuted John Fletcher, a very great favorite of antitypical Ahaz (Maaseiah [*work of Jehovah*]), Walter Sellon, one of antitypical Ahaz's leaders (Azrikam [*help arises*]) and Thomas Olivers, one in very high place with antitypical Ahaz (Elkanah [*God is maker*], ;7). Antitypical Pekah won over to his side very many of the less informed adherents of antitypical Ahaz (captive ... two hundred thousand women, sons and daughters, ;8); additionally they took over from the other side not a few lines of thought, *e.g.*, they would not say that anyone is predestinated to eternal torment (much spoil ... Samaria). But there were some teachers in the domain of antitypical Pekah who disapproved of the unbrotherly course of antitypical Pekah (Oded, *setter up*, ;9). They appeared in the sphere of antitypical Pekah's executorship (Samaria) in public before the warriors as they were returning from the field of controversy (before the host), severely blaming them for the unbrotherly way the Divine wrath against antitypical Ahaz had permitted them to war with their brethren (Lord ... wroth ... your hand ... slain). They pointed out that their rage was heaven-crying for vengeance (rage ... heaven). Then they blamed them for their proselyting purpose whereby they sought to enslave their brethren (purpose ... children ... bondmen and bondwomen, ;10), charging that there were sins in them against God (sins). Therefore they exhorted the warriors to return their winlings to their own brethren (deliver ... brethren, ;11), threatening them with special wrath from the Lord (wrath ... upon you). Thereupon the leading brethren of

antitypical Israel (heads of Ephraim, ;12), those of England (Azariah [*help of Jehovah*] ... Johanan [*Jehovah is gracious*]), of Scotland (Berechiah [*blessed of Jehovah*] ... Meshillemoth [*retributions*]), of Wales (Jehizkiah [*Jehovah strengthens*] ... Shallum [*peaceable, requital*]) and of Ireland (Amasa [*burden*] ... Hadlai [*forbearing*]), set themselves in opposition to the course of the warriors (stood up against ... war), declaring that the warriors should not retain these pertinent captives (not bring ... hither, ;13), asserting that what they had already done was offensive to God (offended) and that what they further purposed would be adding to the sin of all Israel (add ... trespass) and that Israel's sin was already great (sin ... great), and was bringing special wrath upon Israel (wrath against Israel).

(41) This remonstrance led to the warriors' giving up their prey to the will of the protesters (left ... spoil ... congregation, ;14). Thereupon certain Israelites were elected (expressed by name, ;15) to see to the supplying of the needs of these winlings. They put upon them as garments the bootied truths (rose up ... clothed ... naked ... shod), set truths before them as symbolic food (gave them to eat and drink), aroused them to exercise their good qualities (anointed them). Then, secondly, they supported the feeble among them with suitable helps (carried ... asses) and led all of them back as crown-losers to their proper condition as such (Jericho ... palm trees), to the antitypical Judahites (to their brethren). Those who had treated them in brotherliness then returned to the sphere of executorship of God's less favored people (returned to Samaria). In its extremity antitypical Ahaz betook itself for succor to the revolutionists in America and to those who favored them in the United Kingdom (messengers to ... Assyria ... help, 7; 16). The protests of the American colonies against the tyrannies of George III, his ministers and parliament aroused much sympathy in Britain, and,

among others, the Wesleyan Methodists favored their cause. Indeed, there were kindred thoughts and spirit among them (thy servant and thy son, 7); for antitypical Ahaz, standing for universal redemption and the freedom of man's will as against Calvinistic coercion of the human will in "conversion," found itself in sympathy with the freedom-advocating Americans. Hence both mutually sought each other's support, especially was this the case with antitypical Ahaz (save me ... hand ... Syria ... Israel, which rise up against me). Not only was antitypical Ahaz attacked by antitypical Rezin and Pekah, but the civil magistrates mistreated it at the instigation of the clergy and clergy-raised mobs and frightened weak ones into leaving the movement and into becoming captives of secularists (Edomites ... mitten ... captive, ;17). Moreover, sectarians made inroads (Philistines also had invaded, ;18) among their weaker members (low ... south), in America (Bethshemesh, *house of the sun*), in Ireland (Ajalon, *oakland*), in England (Gederoth, *fortress*), in Scotland (Shocho, *hedging*), in Wales (Timnah, *portion*) and in the West Indies (Gimzo, *sycamore plantation*). They also made inroads in the subordinate classes in these countries (villages ... villages ... villages). Thus the Lord abased His more favored people (brought Judah low, ;19), because of antitypical Ahaz's sins; for it stripped the more favored people of God of their real adornment of graces (naked) and, sinning greatly against the Lord, alienated Him (transgressed sore). But the sum total of the efforts of the secular liberty-lovers was of no real help to antitypical Ahaz, rather it added to its distress (Tilgath-pilneser [a euphonic change in the spelling] ... distressed him, but strengthened him not ... helped him not, ;20, 21).

(42) To gain the support of the secular liberty-lovers antitypical Ahaz gave up to them some of its Divine religious teachings (silver and gold ... house of the Lord), *e.g.*, the right of subjects to resist, and even

to rebel against religious (hierarchical) tyranny, some of its civil teachings (in the treasures of the King's house ... portion), *e.g.*, the right of subjects to resist and rebel against civil tyranny, and some of its aristocrats' teachings (of the princes), *e.g.*, "all men created equal," "taxation without representation is tyranny," "consent of the governed, *etc.*," for their comforting and supporting (sent ... Assyria, 8; 21). This induced the secular liberty-lovers to take its side (hearkened unto him, 9;) and they attacked the Anglican Church in its Evangelical Party for supporting the secular powers in their tyranny (went up against Damascus) and captured its theories on subjects' obeying the civil powers in all things and being subject to aristocratic powers (took it) and changed the opinions of their supporters into accepting their own (captive to Kir [*city*]) and refuted antitypical Rezin's pertinent views (slew Rezin). Above we showed how these liberty-lovers took away from Britain the American colonies in eight divisions as to giving them their, as against Britain's theory on liberty. Antitypical Ahaz gave his attention to the executorship of antitypical Rezin (went to Damascus, 10;), in order to fellowship with the British and American liberty-lovers (meet ... Assyria), and, considering the Anglican Church as an organization, as set forth by antitypical Rezin in its executorship (saw an altar ... Damascus), commended it to the leading consecrated ones in its movement (sent Urijah [*light of Jehovah*]) as a model for the Wesleyan Church as an organization (fashion ... pattern) in its various details (workmanship). These leading consecrated ones, including both Wesleys and John Fletcher, began from then on to develop the Methodist Church as an organization according to the theory of the Anglican Church as an organization. This development was one that took years to complete; in fact it was not completed until after the Ahaz phase ceased to be the most prominent one in antitypical Judah; yet, as it is usual in prophecy and prophetic

types to fix as to time the forecast events at their beginnings, since it was begun and developed in part during the Ahaz phase, it is set forth as made during it (Urijah ... built an altar according ... Ahaz ... Damascus, 11;), and that by the time antitypical Ahaz ceased giving special attention to the matters of antitypical Rezin's executorship (Ahaz came from Damascus), and attended to matters at home.

(43) After ceasing such attention antitypical Ahaz made a careful study of the thus developing Methodist Church as an organization (saw the altar, 12;), and made its sacrifice in the interests of, and according to that Church (approached ... offered). Thus in its critical situation it added to its past sins by starting to build a sect as the true Church, after the model of the Anglican Church, as set forth by its Evangelical Party (distress did he trespass, ;22). Its pertinent ministries were a sacrifice in the interests of sectarianism and clericalism (sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus, ;23), despite their having hitherto attacked it (smote him), it thinking that, as the various parties of the Anglican Church had gotten help from sectarianism and clericalism (gods ... Syria help them), by thus serving them they would help it, too, (help me). Instead of these helping it, they brought ruin upon what once had been a priestly movement (ruin of him ... Israel). It presumed to give in sacrifice to this developing sect ministries that it had formerly given the Church for God (burnt, 13;), sacrifices allegedly manifesting God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice (burnt offering), in the form of preaching, teaching and writing on the deep (meat offering) and surface things of the Word (drink offering), and all this as a counterfeit fulfilment of consecration vows made to the Lord (peace offerings, upon the altar). The next great evil that antitypical Ahaz did was to displace the true Church in the Methodist movement, brethren like the Wesleys, Fletcher and those of the same spirit, from its position as the true Church, as

viewed by the justified, in its capacity of comforting, strengthening, *etc.*, the sacrificers (brought also the brazen altar ... Lord, 14;), from its place of prominence before God's house (forefront of the house), and gave it a position inferior to the sectarian Church that it was developing (north ... altar). It charged the prominent consecrated ones (commanded Urijah, 15;), thus taking the two Wesleys as parts of antitypical Samson into captivity after blinding them, to do their sacrificing, from the viewpoint of the justified, in the interest of the developing Methodist sect (upon the great altar [the counterfeit altar]), those sacrifices of Jesus in manifesting God's acceptance of it (morning burnt offering), those of the Church in the form of giving out the deep things (evening meat offering), the movement's sacrifices to God as manifesting that it was acceptable by Jesus' merit (king's burnt sacrifice), in the form of its giving out the deep things (his meat offering), and the same features, plus the giving out of surface things, in the common people's sacrifices (burnt offering ... people ... meat offering, and their drink offerings), and to make a public use of such sacrifices as manifesting God's acceptance and as made for the developing sect (sprinkle ... burnt offering ... blood of the sacrifice). It further charged that the true Church in its midst be used only for it to learn God's will (brazen altar ... me to enquire by). The leading consecrated ones did accordingly (thus did Urijah ... Ahaz commanded, 16;), a bad example.

(44) Antitypical Ahaz added still another evil: it gathered the doctrinal, refutational, cleansing and ethical teachings that the Lord's people had and defiled every one of them by its false teaching of sinless perfection of the most advanced of the consecrated, calling this error Entire Sanctification. By this error it undermined overtly or covertly every doctrinal, refutational, cleansing and ethical teaching of the Word (vessels ... God and cut in pieces the vessels ... God, ;24). This teaching and practice (1) in its estimation closed

the entrance into the true Church to those who did not profess sinless perfection; and (2) it actually closed it to those who made such profession (shut up the doors ... Lord); and at the same time it changed the societies of the Church of England, as the local groups of the Methodists were called, and made churches of them wherever its executiveship extended (altars ... Jerusalem). This had the effect of making all these churches of God's more favored people sectarian churches (city ... high places, ;25), where the consecrated choice human powers were sacrificed to sectarianism and clericalism (burn incense unto other gods), which, of course, increased God's displeasure with antitypical Ahaz (anger the Lord God). These evils, set forth in ;24, are described typically in another way in 17, 18;. By its teaching of the sinless perfection of the sanctified it severed the connection between the doctrine of man's fall and the Bible (cut off the borders of the bases, 17;) and thus overthrew the basic necessity of the Bible (removed the laver) and removed from the Old Testament as the basis the New Testament (took down the sea ... brazen oxen) and left the New Testament standing on justification without a real basic necessity (put ... stones), all of which grossly militated against the fall and the ransom and was very untrue (1 John 1:8). And the proven doctrine of reckoned and actual justification as the antitypical rest (covert [place] for the sabbath, 18;) and the teaching that effected the entrance of the movements of God's more favored people into the antitypical court it gave up (turned ... house), because of its fellowship with the secular liberty-lovers (king of Assyria). The acts of antitypical Ahaz are described in the histories of the movements of God's more and less favored people (acts ... written in the book ... kings of Judah and Israel, 19; 26). The movement finally ceased to be the most prominent of the more favored people of God (slept, 20; 27). It has been honored as such a movement (buried ... in the city); but not as worthy of

the respect given to other more favored movements of God's people—by an effigy burial with the movements of God's less favored people (not into sepulchres ... Israel, ;27), because the movement was evil.

(45) We now come to the study of Israel's last king, Hoshea (*deliverance*) son of Elah (*oak*), as the parallel of the last movement of God's less favored people. The parallel years were 749-739 B.C. and 1772-1782 A.D. For the proof of this please see P '40, 180 (6). The date of the end of antitypical Hoshea was April, 1782, as will be shown when we come to study the end of the last movement of God's less favored people. As we saw above, antitypical Pekah, the Calvinistic Methodist movement, was displaced as such by the combined British state-church movement, April, 1772, because of the latter's disapproval of the former's Calvinism and of its more or less approval of the Wesleyan Methodist movement by contrast in their controversy with each other. Antitypical Hoshea was the British state-church movement in its capacity of seeking to enforce absolutism, especially in the state, and particularly in relation to the 13 American Colonies, claiming that absolutism was a matter of Divine right; and it began its reign in 1772, in its requiring the Colonies to pay the tea tax, all other taxes being by it at that time remitted, at the insistence of the secular liberty-lovers (reign ... Israel, 2 Kings 17:1). It was an evil reign (did evil, 2). While sectarianism and clericalism were present, they were not so prominent in this movement as in the former movements of God's less favored people (not as the kings ... before him). Its main sin was absolutism by alleged Divine right, especially in the king, George III; and this led to its tyrannizing over the secular liberty-lovers in the Colonies and in Britain. In Britain these liberty-lovers restrained somewhat the autocrats who sought to tax the Colonies without representation, a thing that secular liberty-lovers everywhere denounced as against the British constitution (against him came up Shalmaneser, 3).

Tea shipped to America was not by these liberty-lovers allowed to be landed in Boston, New York and Philadelphia; and in Charleston, S. C., it was purposely stored in musty cellars and was thus ruined, while in Boston the Boston Tea Party, disguised as Indians, cast overboard the contents of 340 chests of tea.

(46) Thereupon antitypical Hoshea redoubled his efforts at oppression and was met by such determined resistance as forced on the War of Independence on the part of the Colonies against Britain; and Britain's concessions to liberty-lovers in Britain and America and its heavy expenditures were the price that it paid to the secular liberty-lovers to stall off matters' coming to a climax (became his servant ... presents). The secular liberty-lovers in Britain and America as the War of Independence in America continued faulted the absolutist movement (found conspiracy in Hoshea, 4), because it sought to hire time-serving mercenary troops from other European nations, especially from the Hessians (sent ... So [*devoted to Chronos*]), to fight against the 13 Colonies. In view of such help, actual and anticipated, it made no further concessions to the secular liberty-lovers in Britain and America (no present ... Assyria), but waged relentless war on them. Of course, these fought back, those in Britain by arguments and efforts to block antitypical Hoshea's plans and measures, and those in America by battles and campaigns. Success fluctuated from one side to the other, with these liberty-lovers restraining the oppressors more and more (Assyria shut him up ... prison), until April, 1780, when the war turned more and more in favor of the secular liberty-lovers, both in Britain and America (Assyria ... all the land ... besieged it, 17:5; fourth year of the king Hezekiah ... year ... Israel, 18:9), when the secular liberty-lovers began to press hard the autocratic movement in its executorship.

(47) This turn of affairs came about by the secular liberty-lovers in Britain, especially in parliament, waging a more vigorous and successful opposition to the

autocratic movement, and by the liberty-lovers in America waging a vigorous and successful campaign against Cornwallis' army in South Carolina and North Carolina. And by 1781 they forced him to leave the Carolinas and to advance northward into Virginia, whence he planned to go to New York and join forces with the British there. But the Americans and their French allies under Washington's command besieged him at Yorktown, Va., and compelled him to surrender, Oct. 19, 1781. After the news of this defeat reached England and was digested by the English, the autocratic ministry of Lord North resigned, March 20, 1782, and was succeeded by a secular liberty-lovers' ministry, which forthwith set into operation measures calculated to bring about a treaty of peace. Thus by April, 1782 (sixth year of Hezekiah, 18:10) the state-church autocratic movement received its death-blow (king ... Samaria, 17:6; they took it, 18:10). This proved to be the end of movements of God's less favored people (carried Israel away into Assyria, 17:6; unto Assyria, 18:11). The less favored people of God were thus made captives of the secular liberty-lovers, who from 1782 to the present have required them to favor and work for liberty movements (Assyria). Henceforth the less favored people of God, especially in Britain, mentally dwelt, busied themselves, in such movements (placed them; put them).

(48) These liberty movements were of three kinds: (1) Political liberty movements (Halah, *strength*), which liberated America, Southern Ireland, withdrew oppressions from dominions and colonies, established freedom of the press, especially to criticize the government, of assembly, of free speech and conscience, gave universal suffrage, including that of Romanists and Jews, with power to hold political office, stripped the crown's autocratic power unto its becoming a mere symbol of power, took away from the House of Lords the power to abrogate the decisions of the Commons, made the ministry subject, not to the king, but to

Commons, gave the right of discussion of political subjects to all, granted equality of all before the courts, gave dominion status to colony after colony, softened the penalties of the law, *e.g.*, no more imprisonment for debts, no more capital punishment, except for murder and treason, whereas before they hanged even chicken thieves, *etc., etc.* (2) Social freedom (Habor [*union*], Gozan [*refuge*]). Class distinctions were made much less rigid, and are becoming yearly more fluid, so that the masses mingle more and more with the classes in Britain. It is now possible for royalty and nobility to wed with commonality, which before 1782 was almost an impossibility. All social distinctions based on race, color and religion are more and more being abrogated. Slavery has been abolished throughout the empire, *etc., etc.* (3) Economic liberty (cities of the Medes, *midland*). These liberties include for all the privilege of getting an education, wages sufficient to support self and family, living conditions suitable for comfort, working conditions free from extreme exactions, privilege of belonging to unions, cooperative bargaining and the right to strike. In our times this kind of liberty is bringing a mild socialism into vogue in Britain. Certainly, since 1782 these three kinds of liberty have been on the increase, and they prove that a degradation set in for the less favored people of God from religious to secular privileges.

(49) Thus from great religious privileges the less favored people of God have become captives serving these three forms of secular liberty instead of religious privileges as formerly, all of this resulting in their becoming very much secularized—worldly. This is because they did not live out the principles of God's Word (obeyed not ... God, 18:12), but violated the principles of justice, the law of the New Covenant, whose blessings with the obligation of justice were reckoned to them in justification, and the principles of the covenant of sacrifice and the Oath-bound Covenant, under which they were (sinned ... God, 17:7;

transgressed his covenant, 18:12). Jesus' charges they disregarded and disobeyed (Moses ... commanded ... hear them, nor do them). And they so acted despite God's delivering them from the present evil world and Satan's control as the god of this present evil world into the Kingdom of God's dear Son (Egypt ... Pharaoh king of Egypt) and revered creeds, rulers, sectarianism, clericalism, movements, *etc.* (feared other gods). Instead of following the Divine principles of justice and love they conducted themselves after the examples of worldlings in the various forms of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness that they committed (walked ... heathen, 17:8), after God had enabled them to drive out of their hearts and minds such evils (whom the Lord cast out from before ... Israel). They also conducted themselves in the ways of living that were pursued by the movements that the less favored people of God had made (of the kings ... had made). When we consider the evils of the various Lutheran, Calvinistic, Anglican, Puritan Presbyterian movements and the five succeeding movements of God's less favored people, we will have to admit that they were guilty of following in the ways of these evil movements. They were guilty of secret sins, *i.e.*, in hypocrisy they hid from others the evils that they in secrecy practiced, all of which God's all-seeing eye beheld (did secretly ... against ... God, 9). In every denomination they developed sects (high places ... cities). They did this in turning Little Flock movements (tower of the watchmen) into denominationalism (to the fenced city). They developed creeds, *e.g.*, the various Lutheran, Calvinistic, Anglican, Presbyterian Puritan, *etc.*, creeds (set them up images, 10), formed unions of state and church with every great state (groves) and served under the energetic work of great sectarian leaders, especially crown-lost leaders (every green tree). In and for these sects they offered up their choice human powers in service (burnt incense ... high places, 11), after the example of the evil characteristics

which God had purged out of their heads and hearts (heathen ... carried away before them), and did so evilly as to arouse God's displeasure against them (wrought ... provoke ... anger).

(50) They gave themselves up to serve the idols of various forms of sin, error, self and the world (served idols, 12). In the Bible time and again God forbids such idolatry to His people (said ... not do this thing). God sent teachers among them, testifying against these deeds, *e.g.*, he sent to the Lutherans Hubmaier by writings and lectures, Bucer in his lectures, sermons, Spener in sermons and writings, and John Arndt in his book, True Christianity; He sent Michael Servetus in his Restitution of True Christianity and Gisbert Voet in his Exercise of Piety, to the Calvinists; Jeremiah Taylor to the Anglicans in his Holy Living and Holy Dying, and Robert Browne, George Fox and John Wesley in their preaching and writings to the Anglicans and Presbyterians. John Bunyan in Pilgrim's Progress, William Law in his Serious Call, George Whitefield in sermons and John Wesley in sermons and writings, *etc.*, testified against the evils of all of these denominations. Many others took part in such testifying (testified against Israel ... prophets ... seers, 13), exhorting the apostates in the less and more favored movements of God's people to reform and keep their covenant vows as to faith and practice (turn ... evil ways, and keep ... statutes) accordingly as God had given His Word to their predecessors by His mouthpieces (law ... fathers ... sent ... prophets). Despite all of these they did not give heed, but became very wilful, like their ancestors (not hear, but hardened ... fathers, 14), who were unbelieving and consequently disobedient (not believed in ... God). Thereby they cast off God's precepts (rejected his statutes, 15) and abandoned the reckoned covenant of justification by faith and its implications of righteous living, and the actual covenant of sacrifice and the actual Oath-bound Covenant (his covenant), made by

Him with their predecessors (made with their fathers), and gave up the protesting antitypes (testimonies ... against them). Instead they followed error, an empty and unprofitable thing (vanity), and as a result became empty and unprofitable (became vain) and imitated the teachings and practices of the neighboring worldlings (heathen ... about them), concerning imitating whom God had warned them (charged ... not do like them). They forsook all of God's teachings (left all the commandments, 16), generally speaking, instituting for themselves wicked practices (made them molten images), specifically speaking, even the two main evils of God's apostate less favored people, clericalism and sectarianism (two calves), entered a union of state and church, symbolic fornication (grove), and served all the evil qualities typed by the heathen personifications of the heavenly bodies, singly and as constellations, to which the heathen had given the names of their gods (host of heaven), especially power-grasping and lording, the symbolic sun (served Baal, *lord*).

(51) Additionally they taught the God-blaspheming doctrine of eternal torment (caused their sons and daughters to pass through the fire, 17,—an allusion to Moloch worship), taught false prophecies (used divination) and deceitful doctrines, especially in the form of ununderstandable doctrines, like trinity, absolute predestination, the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, the omnipresence of Christ's humanity, *etc., etc.* (enchantments), and gave themselves unto spiritual slavery as the wages of indulgence in sin (sold themselves to do evil), and that in matters pertinent to the Lord (sight of the Lord), which, of course, resulted in displeasing Him (provoke him to anger). As a result God became highly displeased with His less favored people (very angry with Israel, 18) and cast them off entirely from being His less favored people (removed ... sight), with the result that He had no other favored people than His most favored people alone (none left ... Judah only). Moreover, His more

avored people (Judah, 19) were not true to God's teachings (kept not the commandments ... God), but at times followed the example of His less favored people in clericalism and sectarianism, which the latter had arranged for themselves (which they made). Hence God rejected the whole of God's less favored people (rejected all ... Israel, 20), sent from time to time various punishments upon them (afflicted them) and allowed them to fall into the power of plundering nations (delivered ... spoilers), which, not resulting in their reformation, came to a climax in His casting them entirely from His favor (cast them out of His sight). His wrath against antitypical Israel was a gradually rising one in which much forbearance was exercised. It began at the time that the less favored people of God were by Him broken away in revolution from the more favored people of God in the Zwinglian movement (sent Israel from ... David, 21) and at the time when they made the Lutheran movement the less favored movement of God's people (made Jeroboam ... king), which movement drove the less favored people of God into apostacy from the Lord (Jeroboam drave ... Lord) and made them sin greatly, especially in clericalism and sectarianism (sin a great sin), since they conducted themselves as the Lutheran movement directed, not only in clericalism and sectarianism, but also in creedism, unbrethrenliness, unjustified disfellowshipment, secularism, persecution of dissenters, union of state and church, *etc.* (walked ... sins of Jeroboam, 22); neither did they give these up (departed not from them). So strongly and long did they adhere to these evils that finally God cast them off entirely from His favor (removed ... sight, 23), even as He had threatened by all His messengers to them (said ... prophets). Thus were the less favored people of God taken out of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit into the teachings and sphere of secular liberty (carried ... land to Assyria), where they remain until now and will continue until this Age ends (unto this

day). These effects were wrought out in all European Protestant countries, additionally to Britain.

(52) The secular liberty-lovers aroused adherents of five movements to make the hearts and minds of God's less favored people, which hearts and minds were once the sphere of a measure of the Truth and its Spirit in their various denominations, their sphere of teaching and spirit (king of Assyria ... placed them ... Samaria, 24). And the adherents of these movements in their teachings and spirit filled such hearts and minds, formerly the sphere where new creatures were, moved and had their being (instead ... Israel), and made such hearts and minds the sphere of their teachings and spirit (possessed Samaria). The adherents of these five movements that filled such minds and hearts were those of: (1) the Combinationist movement (Babylon, *mixture, confusion*), (2) the Contradictionism movement (Cuthah, *hiding place*), (3) the Reformism movement (Ava, *ruin*), (4) the Infidelistic movement (Hamath, *fortress*) and (5) the No-ransomism movement (Sepharvaim, *borderers*). These occupied the various denominations of God's less favored people in all European Protestant countries (dwelt in the cities thereof). These movements' adherents, as one after another was set into activity, in the beginning of each (at the beginning, 25), several years intervening after one started before the next started, had no reverence for Jehovah (feared not the Lord). As punishment God opened the way for Romanism and Anglo-Catholicism in Britain and Romanism and elsewhere a revived Lutheran and Calvinistic orthodoxism which continued (sent lions) to make inroads upon them (among them); and these refuted them as such and won some of them over to their views (slew some of them). These adherents by their attitudes apprized the secular liberty-lovers (spake ... Assyria, 26) of the fact that they who were put by them into the sphere of a measure of the Truth and its Spirit (removed ... cities of Samaria) were without a proper knowledge

of the way that Jehovah was to be served (know not ... God of the land), which resulted in God's loosing Romanism and Anglo-Catholicism upon them (sent lions among them), to the continued overthrow of some of them (slay them). All this, their conduct showed, was due to their not knowing how they were to serve Jehovah (know not ... God). The secular liberty-lovers by their attitude opened the way for prominent Protestant sectarians (Assyria ... thither one of the priests, 27) made captives by the secular liberty-lovers (brought from thence) to help these adherents, requiring by their attitude that the adherents of the five movements continue where they had been transplanted (dwell there) and receive Protestant sectarian teachings from the prominent Protestant sectarians as to how they should serve Jehovah (God of the land).

(53) These teachers certainly occupied themselves with Protestant sectarianism, as against Romanism and Anglo-Catholicism and revived Lutheran and Calvinistic orthodoxism (dwelt in Bethel—as the counterfeit *House of God*, *i.e.*, sectarianism, 28), as the literature of the times shows; for they republished the main English and continental Reformation attacks on Rome, *e.g.*, the Parker Society republished the controversial writings of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Jewel, Parker, *etc.* Others republished Foxe's Acts and Monuments of the Martyrs, Chillingworth's Religion of the Protestants, Barrowe's The Pope's Supremacy, *etc., etc., etc.* Moreover, many new anti-Romanist and anti-Anglo-Catholic and pro-Protestant works of great ability were published by these Protestant sectarians. Public debates were held between them and Romanists, *e.g.*, that held at Hammersmith, England, between John Cummings, D. D. (Protestant) and Daniel French, Esq., Barrister-At-Law (Romanist) (taught them ... fear the Lord). In Continental Europe similar pertinent literature was republished and pertinent new literature was published. The five movements typed in v. 24 were reduplications of the five Gospel-Age forms of No-ransomism,

Infidelism, Combinationism, Reformism and Contradictionism, and not the five forms of the two Harvests' sifting movements, *e.g.*, their No-ransomism was not a verbal, but a logical denial of the ransom; for in their teaching human immortality, eternal torment and the trinity they logically, not verbally, contradicted the ransom, even as the No-ransomers of the Smyrna period did. And so with the others; for the Infidelism of that time consisted in displacing God's plan by the plans of the creedists and others; their Combinationism consisted in a union of state and church; their Reformism consisted in an effort to rid their sects of certain evils in state, church, aristocracy, labor and society, and construct in their stead a reformation in these spheres of action; and their Contradictionism consisted in their fighting unfolded reformation truths. Their contradictions were their creedal disagreements with the stewardship truths of other Protestant bodies, they making creeds their creed-gods (every nation [the five of v. 24] made gods of their own, 29) and establishing them in the bodies or groups of their own sects (put them in ... high places) which these five movements constructed (Samaritans had made) in each denomination; for there have been the following Protestant denominations in Britain since 1782: Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, Quaker and Methodist Churches, besides numerous sectlets and religious movements and on the Continent the Lutheran, Calvinistic, Unitarian denominations and many sects (cities ... dwelt).

(54) It is from names of the gods set forth in vs. 30 and 31 that we were able to see the antitypes of the peoples of the five parties that according to v. 24 were settled in the territory of the ten-tribed kingdom. It will be noted that neither in v. 24 nor in vs. 30, 31 are the five movements given in the order of the parallel movements of the Harvests and the Interim. The Combinationists made the union of state and church their creed-god (Babylon [*mixture, confusion*, in allusion to their combining things that should have

been kept separate], Succoth [*tents*], benoth [*daughters*, in allusion to symbolic fornication, implied in combinationism], 30). The Contradictionists made theological strife their creed-god (Cuth [*strength*, in allusion to the power of these contradictionists], Nergal [*Mars*, the god of war, in allusion to the controversialist activities of these]). The Infidelists, who consisted in part of the Broad Church party in the Anglican Church and of deists, rationalists and higher critics in all the churches, made their theories their god (Ashima [*high, heavenly*, in allusion to their high theories on God, virtue and the hereafter, in which they showed strength], Hamath [*fortress*, in allusion to the strong rationalistic arguments by which especially the deists and higher critics buttressed their views]). The rationalistic Reformers, who consisted of critics of evil conditions and of erectors of alleged cures of the evils (Avites [*ruin*, in allusion to their working ruin instead of reformation]) made a god of their destructive (Nibhaz [*barker*, in allusion to their barking at, *i.e.*, criticizing, evil conditions]) and constructive measures of reform (Tartak [*binder*, in allusion to their seeking to unite into one whole their constructive measures of reform]). The No-ransomers (Sepharvaim [*borderers*, in allusion to their standing just outside the borders of Christianity]) constructed their ransom-denying theories of human immortality and eternal torment into their creed-gods, which were a logical not verbal denial of the ransom (Adrammelech [*king's majesty*, in allusion to the No-ransomers' king doctrine of human immortality, which they considered a very honorable teaching], Anammelech [*woe's king*, in allusion to their No-ransomer king doctrine of eternal torment]). These logically not verbally denying no-ransom teachings they made their king errors (gods of the Sepharvaim).

(55) Thus these practiced a form of reverence for God (feared the Lord, 32). They also appointed in their sects as their clergy those who were, generally speaking, time-servers, popularity-lovers, ease-lovers,

money-lovers, power-lovers, *etc.*, and thus the lowest of themselves (made ... lowest ... priests of the high places). These ministered on their behalf in the offices of their sects (sacrificed ... high places). They were a double-minded set, showing on the one hand a kind of reverence for God yet exercising a ministry on behalf of their creed-gods (feared ... served, 33). This service was performed in the same way as the depravity that had reigned in the natural hearts, and that had been driven out by the new creatures of God's people (manner ... whom ... from thence). Even to the present time these apostates live as they lived before they became justified, and especially before they became new creatures (do after the former manners, 34): They neither really reverence God (fear not the Lord), nor do they live as their predecessors did as sectarians as to precepts and arrangements from 1521 to 1782 (after their statutes ... ordinances), nor do they live according to the Oath-bound Covenant (the law), nor the covenant of sacrifice (commandment) that God gave to those who were produced by the star-members and their special helpers (commanded the children of Jacob [*supplanter*]), whose two final Parousia representatives God turned into the special warriors of God (named Israel—in allusion to these two being made special warriors for God). With these consecrated ones individually God had made a covenant, the Oath-bound Covenant (made a covenant, 35), with the implications of the covenant of sacrifice as binding them not to reverence the gods of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness in their various forms (fear other gods), nor to honor them (nor bow yourselves to them), nor to yield themselves up to further them (nor serve them), nor to yield up their human all in their interests (nor sacrifice to them). But they should give Him supreme duty and disinterested love (him shall ye fear, 36) and further His interests (him shall ye worship) and yield up in service to Him their human all (to him ... sacrifice). This is fitting because He

had delivered them from the present evil world of Satan's empire into the Kingdom of God's dear Son (brought you ... Egypt), through justification and consecration, which God had operated toward them by the great power of His Word (great power) and the efficient ministry of Jesus (stretched out arm).

(56) God had set forth for these very clearly (he wrote for you, 37) precepts (statutes), arrangements (ordinances), the Oath-bound Covenant (the law), with its implication, the covenant of sacrifice (the commandment). These He charged His consecrated people carefully to heed in practice always (observe to do for evermore) and prohibited them to give supreme duty and disinterested love to the various gods of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness in any of their forms (not fear other gods). God emphasized these thoughts, particularizing that they forget not the Oath-bound Covenant, which, given by God to them, implies that they had made the covenant of sacrifice (covenant ... made ... not forget, 38); and He stressed by repetition their not giving supreme duty and disinterested love to the gods of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, in any or all their forms (fear other gods). He charged them to give supreme duty and disinterested love to God, the self-existent One of perfect wisdom, power, justice and love (God ye shall fear, 39), which if they would do, He would give them victory over every power of every form of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, as these would be manipulated against them by the devil, the world and the flesh (deliver ... hand ... enemies). But the unfaithful less favored people of God would not obey the Lord as He thus charged them (not hearken, 40), but lived after the depravities according to which they lived before their justification, consecration and Spirit-begettal (did after their former manner). Hence the tribes of God's less favored people (these nations, 41) continued to live double-mindedly, giving God some reverence and yielding service to No-ransomism, Infidelism, Combinationism, Reformism and

Contradictionism (served their graven images), in all the successions of those whom they produced in their apostate condition (children ... children). In this they have been close imitators of those who produced and developed them (as did their fathers, so do they), and this has continued up to this time and will continue unto the end of the extreme limit of this Age (this day).

(1) What took the place of the Friends' movement? When? Where was its main field of work? To whom did it overflow and give refreshment? What did all the more faithful people of God do as to it? How typed? How do its two typical names apply to it? What preceded its start? Where? In whose activity? How was it nicknamed? When did it have its special start? How typed? What will help to understand its rise? What reigned then in the Lutheran Church? What three evils marked its activities? A part of its clergy and laity?

(2) From shortly after the reformation what had it undergone? Along the same general lines as what? How do the Apostles' times and Luther's earlier times as reformer compare? What characterized the periods 100-325 A.D. and 1525-1530? 325-799 and 1530-1580? 799-1215 and 1580-1610? 1215-1500 and 1610-1692? What accompanied these two scholastic periods? What is mysticism? By whom were its better forms represented? Who combined mysticism and scholasticism?

(3) When and where were Spener's birth and death? What did he unite in his character? What four agencies helped him to good starts? What two things did he become? In what did he engage? Why? After what preliminary activities did his real work begin? As what? When? A year after what? What was the title of an epochal book of his? What seven points did it stress reformatoryly? How long after its publication was it when its lessons sank in? With what result? What effect did its stressing devotional and study meetings restricted to the consecrated have? What did this effect start? How much later was it before this became the more favored movement of God's people? What did Spener bring forth in 1691? Where shown? How typed? How long before this doctrine was accepted? How typed? Before what occurred was it developed? After what was it accepted? How long did antitypical Uzziah (Azariah) last? What

did this make it in antitypical Judah? How typed? In this how does it compare with the length of antitypical Jeroboam II's reign? What activity began its reign? What were the involved parallel years? How long apart were they? What mothered it? How typed?

(4) What was its character? How typed? In imitation of what? In what not? How typed? What can be said of its course? What did it seek? How typed? During what period? How typed? Who were these leaders, the Halleians, Wuerttembergers and Herrnhuters? As long as faithful with what were they gifted? How typed by the better reading? Of these leaders which one later went wrong? What bad eminence did he achieve? Where typed? How did Spener and Franke stand among these? In what way did each excel? What did God do to this movement? Especially in whom? How long? How typed? What three things did it not prevent? How typed in each case? Even who failed in this? What did they maintain?

(5) What did they have to maintain? With whom? Who and what kind of men were their main opponents? Why? What did such resent? How are these things typed? Among such sectarians whom did they first refute? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Thirdly? How typed? What did they set up in the last one? How typed? Even among whom? How typed? What did God in these long controversies do? How typed? Against whom else? How typed? And still against whom else? How typed? What effect did these blows have upon the clericalists? By what were these blows given? How are these things typed? By what means was its fame spread abroad? How typed? Among what two classes? How typed?

(6) What did it strengthen? How typed? In what three directions? How typed in each case? What did it do as to these things? How typed? What else did it strengthen? Into what country did the Halleians send missionaries? What two in particular? In what countries did the Herrnhuters work? Where else did the Halleians work? Even for whom? What university came into the control of the Wuerttemberg Pietists? What did they make of it? How are these things typed? What did it do with these institutions? How typed? Among what classes? How typed? What two kinds of laborers did it have? How typed in each case? In what two classes of countries? How typed in each case? What did it love? How typed?

(7) For what did it have to fight? What did this move it to do? How did they fight the Lord's battles? How are these things typed? Into what were they divided? How typed? How many special groups of these warriors were there? Which was and what is said of the first? How typed? The second? How typed? The third? How typed? What did these three groups have? Who were the main Halleian controversialists? Wuerttembergers? Herrnhuters? How are these typed? What can be said of these, great and less great, as to numbers and fighting power? How typed? Who fought under them? For what were they fit? How are these things typed? How did they fight? How typed? For and against whom? How typed?

(8) What did the movement do for its warriors? How typed? With what six kinds of armor did it equip them? What was the use of each one? How typed in each case? What else did it make? Why? How typed? By whom made? How are these things typed? In detail, what were these armorial weapons and the ways that they defended it? What kind of a work did they do in general? In particular? How are these particulars typed? What did the many Halle institutions effect for the Pietists? How typed? To what degree? How typed?

(9) What can be inferred from the above? What did each mainly contribute to this movement? When did each die? In relation to the movement's age? How was Franke much like our Pastor? What did these qualities make him in the Halle wing of this movement? To what two periods did this influence extend? What began to set in about ten years after his death? Where in small part? In large part? What characteristics marked Zinzendorf at first? Later? For what was he mainly responsible? Especially during what period? How typed? With what final outcome? How typed? What are two written illustrations of his pride and immodesty?

(10) Of what is the busyboding of Uzziah typical? What will clarify the situation? Who already at Oxford were nicknamed Methodists? Why? What was their standing before meeting Peter Bohler in 1738? Who was he? To what did he lead them? What really was it? What prompted John Wesley to investigate Moravianism? Where? Whom did he there meet? By what things did he test Wesley's humility and simplicity? How did the latter respond? Where did this occur? Whither did Wesley

then go? What did he learn at Herrnhut? Shortly after returning to England what did he begin? What were the chief points stressed by it? How was "conversion" stressed therein? What was this process called?

(11) What did they call consecration, or sanctification? What was effected by these teachings? Especially with whom? How did they view and stress justification? What did they give as the basis of their claim? What did they not believe as to the imputed merit? To what, therefore, did they tend? What is antinomianism? How did Wesley stand on it? How did he view duty and disinterested love? To what did these opposing views lead? Before this what was the character of the fellowship between the Moravians and Wesleyans? What did Zinzendorf and his preachers resultantly begin to do? What else did they do? After what? How did Wesley meet the exclusion act? With what effect in London? What occurred elsewhere? How did this affect the Moravians, especially Zinzendorf? What did he seek to do? What did he allege? They prove? What was the result? Where is this situation typed?

(12) What will now be traced? What was the Moravians' course as to the priestly work of the Evangelical Revival? What in reality was Moravianism? Accordingly, what kind of a movement was it? What was its attempt to do priestly work? How typed? In God's sight what was the character of such an attempt? Why so? What did the Moravians' pertinent course mean? How typed? Why so? How typed? What followed? How typed? What did they do as to such busybodying? What did the busybodies actually seek to do? Like what was their busybodying? In what in each case? What did Jesus and the underpriests do to the Moravians? How typed? How did they make their remonstrances? How typed? By what did they declare that the Moravians were busybodying? How typed? What else did their acts show? By act what did they charge? How typed? How did they prove them guilty of sin and dishonor? How typed in each case?

(13) What effect did Jesus' course through the underpriests have on the Moravians, especially Zinzendorf? What did he say of obligatoriness of the Divine Law and Wesley's doctrine of entire sanctification? With what did they and he become full? As if what were the case? How typed? How did the furious Zinzendorf characterize Wesley's doctrine of entire sanctification? In the debate

what admission did Wesley wring from Zinzendorf? What was Wesley's reply? What did Zinzendorf answer? What comment belongs here on Zinzendorf's view? What did the latter add? Thereupon what did Wesley ask? Zinzendorf answer? Why did he not see the truth at issue? How did he express himself on James' epistle? How did he in fury express himself as to certain English Moravians who rejected his popishly lording tactics?

(14) What was thus manifest? While what was done by the Moravians? How typed? While attempting what? How typed? Under these conditions what became apparent? How typed? In whose presence? Where? How typed? While the crown-lost ones were doing what? How typed? What did Jesus and the underpriests do? How typed? What did they recognize? How typed? What did they then do? How typed? How did they hasten their own exit? How typed? How did they come to make such poor defense of their position? How typed? When did this busyboding commence? In likeness to what? At the same time what was happening to the Halle and Wuerttemberg wings of Pietism? How long did this condition last? How typed? As such what did they do? How typed? How were they related to the faithful? How typed? During this time what did the Evangelical Revival movement do? How typed? Who have given a history of this movement? Who particularly? How typed? As what is its memory kept? How typed? What succeeded it? What should we learn from this history?

(15) What was pointed out above? On what grounds? How long? What should be given them? What are the parallel years? Why so? What was antitypical Jotham? How typed? When relatively to the Calvinistic Methodist movement did it come into ascendancy? How is that movement typed? When did the good Methodist movement start as such? In whom? When, where and as what did he expand his spirit of consecration? As what? What were they nicknamed? Why? What did Wesley in 1729 read? With what effect? What did he do in 1732? How did Law affect him? How long? When was Wesley ordained? When did he assist his father as vicar? What did he do in 1729? How long did he there remain? With what effects? What did he do in 1735? As what? What greatly affected him during the involved voyage? What unfavorably affected his ministry there? Whom did he first meet

in London? With what effect? When did he leave Georgia? Reach London? What was his course from 1719 to 1738? What did he think that he experienced May 24, 1738? What was it in reality? Where, among others, is it typed? What visit followed this?

(16) What about Sept. 21, 1738, did he see? What was this encroachment? How did he react to it? How may this be otherwise worded? How typed? What should here not be stressed? What stressed? What did the movement do during these 5½ years? Who at first were its three main leaders? What was Whitefield's rank as a pulpit orator? What effect did their trenchant preaching have on the Anglican clergy? Where? To what did this lead? How many did they sometimes reach in field preaching? What were its advantages? What was another important step taken by Wesley? With what effect? What was Wesley's stewardship doctrine? Despite this, on what did he lay great stress? What led to this? What marked contrast was there between the motives that Whitefield and Wesley offered to lead to repentance and faith? On what did Whitefield mainly depend for influencing his hearers? Wesley? What kind of a voice did he use? What was its reach? What were the contrasted results of the preaching of the two? What did Whitefield in 1740 stress? Wesley? With what two results? What did the divided movements become? What resulted from the increase of antitypical Jotham? What two things were formed? How did they differ? What marked the good work? Until what? When?

(17) What inaugurated antitypical Jotham's reign? How typed? Whom did Wesley have in his movement from late 1738? What was added to these ere long? How many of each of these met in the first conference? When? How long? What was here decided? What were here discussed? What did these conferences become? Under whose direction? What were kept? What was done with them? Why? Whose decisions were accepted as authoritative expressions of the conferences? What was the effect of his firm and kindly control over the movement? Like whose teaching and executive control was his? How old was this movement when it began its ascendancy? By what act was it begun? How typed? How long did it last? From what to what year? How typed? What mothered it? How typed? What was the character of this endowment? How

typed? In what matters did it deal? How typed? How did it act? How typed? In whose footsteps? How typed? What of the Pietists did it not imitate? How typed?

(18) What was practiced? Where? In what forms? How typed? What other evil prevailed? In what forms? How typed? What did the sectarians severally do? To the neglect of what? How typed? What other evil did they do? How typed? What special thing did this movement do? What else? How typed? How did it use its executive powers? How typed? How do we get this antitype from Ophel? Who held the title of the movement's property? Until when and what? Who else did similarly? Of what did Wesley's published literature consist? From whose writings generally and particularly were these extracts taken? Including whom? What were these books called? In how many octavo volumes was the second edition printed? Why did Wesley furnish these extracts? How came he so to do? What else did he publish? What two things moved him thereto? Who selected the two kinds of extracts? Where? How did he indicate his choices and rejections? How long was he engaged in compiling *The Christian Library*? What did he write for his schools? For example? Of what were they usually abridgements? What else appeared in this period? Of what consisting? Especially from what? What is said of Bengel's *Gnomon*?

(19) What did this movement gather? Of what did they consist? Where? How typed? What else did it organize? Where? How typed? By whom were they served? How typed? What is a description of these preachers? What else did it establish? How typed? What is a description of it? What did they not serve? What were these two sets of workers to the movement? What did it have from its outstart as a public movement? Of what did the Anglican bishops and clergy mainly and bitterly complain? What did they consider the representatives of this movement to be? How many bishops especially wrote against it and Wesley's pertinent activities? Who were they? What did bishop Butler, author of the *Analogy*, do to Wesley? Who else wrote against him? Especially who? What did he do? What guaranteed good answers from him? In what two ways did he answer their objection that he had no right to enter their dioceses and parishes? What famous saying did he utter in this controversy in reply to the charge of busyboding? On what did he base the reply? Of what

evil were the clergy the main movers? Of what was this controversy a war? How typed? Who gained the victory? What could the bishops and clergy not do? What resulted from their neglect? What uses did the good Methodist movement make of this neglect in the controversy? By using what did they refute their opposers? What were these opponents really? In what two things in time did their defeat result? How typed?

(20) To evade their arguments, what were the clericalists forced to do? How typed? What error did they then teach? What was another result of this controversy? A third result? How was this brought about? What was George III's view of the situation? Whom, besides his brother Charles and Whitefield, did Wesley have as intimate friends among the Anglican Church's clergy? Whom of such did he esteem the highest? For what? On what did he count? What prevented its realization? What were the most valuable things that the bishops and clergy had to yield to the good Methodist movement? How did they feel in the Anglican Church? Into what kind of an atmosphere did they come? Why was it such? Of how many kinds were they? How is each kind typed? How is their justified humanity typed? From what was it taken away? What were these to the bishops and clergy? Of how many kinds were these losses? What was each kind? What effect did their loss have upon the Church of England? What do points (2)-(4) imply? Despite what? What lifelong struggle did Wesley make? What was his design with his societies? As to his relation thereto? How are all these things typed? What kind of a loss was it to the Anglican Church? How typed?

(21) What was the attitude of the good Methodist movement? Toward what things? How typed? With what result? How in these respects did it compare with the other good more favored movements of God's people? From which to which one? How outstanding were its zeal, self-sacrifice and labors? Especially whose? With what result? How typed? In what did it grow? In what particulars? What was the character of the bulk of its preachers and ministers? Of the consecrated? Why? Into what figures did the adherents run? The general and local preachers? What is to be said of its hymns and hymn-writers? Especially what two? Particularly what one? What was another feature of its strength? Why was this?

How so? What did Wesley require for membership in its societies? Classes? Officials? With what results? Why?

(22) What did not mark this period? Apart from what? Of what did Wesley's experience with his lay preachers convince him? What was the first thing giving him this thought? The second? The third? The fourth? Therefore, what did he do as to lay local and circuit preachers? Despite what? Temporarily what did he not have them do? Later what? What did he do lifelong? With what success? When did he die? What happened shortly afterward? What did his foreseeing this prompt him to do? What has been written of the three main Methodist leaders? Especially of which one? What furnished materials for these? What in this connection was done with some of its lesser lights? With it itself? What have these biographers and historians been? How typed? What need not be done with v. 8? Why? When did it cease operating? How typed? In what was it held? How typed? As worthy of what? How typed? With what was it succeeded?

(23) What remains of our present study? What will not here be discussed? Why not? What only of antitypical Ahaz will here be studied? What will then be done? Before what? What does Ahaz type? During what years was it the more favored movement of God's people? Paralleling what? How typed? What is one of the proofs of man's depravity? Among others, in what three cases do we see this illustrated? By what is this typed? How long did this evil Methodist movement exist before coming into the ascendancy as that of the more favored one of God's people? In what year did it come into existence? In connection with what? What occasioned the break? How was it accomplished? What was the first result of the controversy? Why? What made matters worse? What things shortly thereafter happened? What did not set in? What was the final outcome of this affair? How were these two movements disposed toward each other? What did the Whitefield movement become early in 1744? Later the same year what similar thing happened? What did certain adherents of the good movement do, despite these things? In what did this result in 20 years? How typed? How long did its pertinent ascendancy last? How typed?

(24) What did this movement not do? How typed? What did it disregard? How typed? Instead, what did it first do? What do God's people find to be their experiences

as to these two sins? How have most of them done as to these sins? How typed? What did it become? Over against whom first? Secondly? How did it become guilty of clericalism? What did these two evil developments occasion Wesley? Especially why? How typed? What worse sins did many of these ministers commit? How typed? What did some of his unordained preachers seek to have Wesley claim and do? How were they made to feel? By whom? What did these evils do? Especially during what period? What greater evil did they commit? Who gave and who did not give encouragement to this evil? Whose example did many of Wesley's preachers follow in this matter? Hence how did they picture God? What did they do with this threat? How typed?

(25) In what did they go further? In what three particulars? How typed? What worship was this? As the antitype of whom? In what? What bad eminence have the spokesmen of the bad Methodist movement achieved? Thereby what have they furnished? Whom even did they outdo? How typed? What result did Moloch worship effect? Of what is Moloch worship the type? What result did its antitype effect? How typed? For what should these sins have been sufficient? What two sins did they add thereto? How typed in each case? In interests of what systems did they do these things? How typed? In the interests of what persons? How typed? What did antitypical Ahaz commit? When will more of them be shown? What warning lesson does he give to those who have followed the good Parousia movement? What exhortation is hereover given? What will result from following it?

(26) What was intimated above? Why the interruption? What was a time relation between the reigns of Pekah and Ahaz? Who was the last Israelite king, type and antitype, so far studied? When was this reign, type and antitype? What ceased with this reign? What did Sir Robert Walpole's ministry do to it? How? How typed? What did that ministry do? How long? As what? How typed? By what, how and why was it ended? How typed? From and to what did it proceed in its good aspect? How typed? To what did it put an end? How typed? Where are this ministry's acts described? How typed? Especially what part of its acts?

(27) When did antitypical Menahem reign? How typed? What did it conduct? Where? With whom was the first?

Who was their main leader? What was and is their characteristic? What was good and bad in both? How did they stand toward antitypical Menahem? What did they do to it? What did they seek to do to the bishops? What did they refuse antitypical Menahem? How typed? What resulted? Why did antitypical Menahem act? How typed? What did it do with their adherents? How typed? To accomplish this what did it leave? How thoroughly did it do this refutative work? How typed? When did the controversy occur in antitypical Menahem's reign?

(28) When did it begin and end? How typed? Why was its reign evil, despite some good? In what two evils did it abound? How typed? Despite protests what did it do? How typed? With whom was its more important controversy? How typed? What is Deism? What, accordingly, do its adherents call it? What are they often called? Who began it? What did Hobbes add to it? Blount? Toland? What should be said against his view? What did Collins and Whiston add to their predecessors' views? Woolston? Tindal?

(29) Up to this time what did Deists hold as to the Law of Moses and the law of nature? What did Morgan do as to this? What did Annet add to Deism? By antitypical Menahem's time what had Deism done? What was a summary of its claims? What did this make it do? In a word what did it deny? When did the full impact of its attack come? How typed? In whom did antitypical Menahem rally its forces? Especially by what did it refute Deism? What was the first of these three works? What of Deism did it overthrow? The second? The third? What is a brief description of it? What else appeared against Deism? How and how long did the Deists react toward these refutations? When did the controversy end? How?

(30) Inferior to whose refutations were those of antitypical Menahem? In how many particulars was it lame? What was the first of these? What does the type do with this feature? What verses treat of its lameness in this controversy? What for a hundred years had pertinently arisen in the Anglican Church? Further depraved, what did Deists do with this view? How did their view of reason fit in with their general position? How did these two erroneous views compare? The Anglican and Romanist theologians' views?

(31) What does the ambiguity of the word *reason* result in? To what does it amount? With what result? What in this connection is not, and is sanctified reason? How does it see Biblical things? Why? What do they never do? What has so-called Orthodoxy accepted? With what result? To whom? How does the natural man regard some Divine things? What did the pertinent unhealthy view of many Anglicans move them to do to Deists? How is this typed? How do the figures of the type show this? Why was this evil concession made?

(32) As what did it exact these concessions? How typed? From whom? Especially from whom? How typed? What was not, and what was the character of these concessions? How typed? To what were they yielded? How typed? Who was the main sinner herein? Despite what? What does Butler's Analogy reveal? Why is this said? How should he have used it? What in this connection is unwise, yea, wrong in a Truth controversialist? What would have insured a sounder refutation of Deism? What was the result? How typed? What did the Deists then do? How typed? Who especially have recorded the acts of antitypical Menahem? Especially in what particulars? How typed? When did it cease to be the most prominent movement of God's less favored people? After what? How typed? What succeeded it? How typed?

(33) What did the Anglican hierarchy and clergy love? Even when? What did Archdeacon Blackbourne say of the clergy? To whom did he write this? What prevailed among the bishops and lower clergy? What are four illustrations of this among bishops? How did the statesmen view bishoprics? In what ways were the hierarchy and clergy mad? What attracted them? What were in favor with them? Into what other things did they enter? What did their spirit become? What were the parallel years of typical and antitypical Pekahiah? How typed? Out of what did antitypical Pekahiah naturally grow? How typed? What did it exercise? How typed? In addition to these evils, of what was it guilty? How typed?

(34) What was Calvinistic Methodism? How typed? Who was its leader? What was its character? What resulted therefrom as to antitypical Pekahiah? What did it witnessingly expose? How typed? What did it particularly expose? How typed? In this attack what did it single out?

For what? How typed in each class? In what did this result? How typed? By whom was it supported in these attacks? What was their position? Of what classes of people were they? How typed? What did this course meet? Why? What was the result of Calvinistic Methodism's course? How typed? Where are antitypical Pekahiah's acts set forth?

(35) What was done in describing antitypical Jotham's reign? What similar thing will be done in describing antitypical Pekah's reign? What were the pertinent parallel dates? How typed? What are the years of Whitefield's birth and death? What was his early work? Why did he do it? Where did he study? With whom did he fall in at Oxford and what did he there do? What year did he profess "conversion"? When ordained deacon? What two works did he then undertake? How did he rank as a pulpit orator? Where did he labor? Die? What was done to him in 1738? What resulted from his pointed preaching? With whom, like the Wesleys, did he temporarily work? What two things happened to him in 1739? Whom did he induce to do the same? What door did this open to the Methodists? What did he thereupon begin? How did he rank as such? What was his largest sized audience? How did he denounce antitypical Pekahiah? With what result? How was his Calvinism affected by association with American Calvinists? Particularly by whom? What was pointed out above? In what did it temporarily result? What occurred shortly afterwards? How long did their friendship last? Despite what?

(36) What did he leave to others? Especially to whom? To what did he devote himself? Even doing what the day before his death? To what was he accustomed? What did he, like our pilgrims, do? What of his writings have been published? To what was his success due? Why is this said? What through him did Lady Huntingdon seek? What was the effect of one of his sermons on Lord Chesterfield? Benjamin Franklin? Who were the greatest non-apostolic evangelists? Not excepting whom? What in their works were similar? How was it inferior to the Wesleyan movement? Why the difference? What three things made Wesley's movement far better than that of Whitefield? How do the antitypical Ahaz and Pekah phases compare? Whose influence had some effect on their relative appeals to the people?

(37) What is to be here noted? What is the difference in the expression and its force? Which was the worse of the two movements? When will some of antitypical Pekah's evils be brought out? In what respects was it the worse of the two? Wherein is its sectarianism apparent? Its clericalism? Of all of whom, except one, were these two evils characteristic? In what words are these evils set forth? What movement established these two evils? With what effect? What was not slack as to antitypical Pekah? Despite Whitefield's work in the then organized eight American colonies, what did the preliminary acts of the American revolutionists do to antitypical Pekah in Britain? How are these things typed? What were the eight American colonies organizationally in those days? How is each one typed? From another standpoint how many colonies were there? What did the American revolutionists henceforth do? How typed? What worked against antitypical Pekah as being the most prominent movement of God's less favored people? How typed? Despite what, what did it do to it? How typed? What did it then do? When? How typed? Who have described the acts of antitypical Pekah? How typed?

(38) To what will we return? What of its acts have already been described? For its wickedness what did God arouse to attack it? On what subject? How typed? With what results? How typed? Who were the leading representatives of antitypical Rezin? On what other subject did antitypical Rezin attack antitypical Ahaz? What did it move the Wesleyan Methodists to do thereon and to accept instead? How typed? What has it done on this subject since? How typed? Who were antitypical Rezin's main warriors against the Wesleyan Methodists on predestination and the Millennium? Whose names will be omitted here? Why? What did they do? What was even more bitter and rude? How typed? What did both of these movements seek to do to antitypical Ahaz? How typed? What did they do? Especially which one? How typed? In what did they fail? How typed? Who were antitypical Pekah's main warriors? Antitypical Ahaz's? What did Wesley do in this controversy? In what spirit did he take the abuse of antitypical Pekah's four main warriors, especially Toplady's? What marked Fletcher's pertinent writings? Who sank nearly to the level of the four? How did Sellon act in it?

(39) What were the main questions at issue? How does the Bible harmonize them? What was the result of the controversy? Under what difficulty did antitypical Ahaz labor? Why so? What did its denial of future probation give it? What was antitypical Rezin's and Pekah's difficulty? How did each side's difficulties affect it? Which side won from the other more proselytes? What were the main questions involved in the main question? From the standpoint of the Divine plan what may we say?

(40) In what state was antitypical Ahaz? How typed? What resulted from this? How typed? Whom in certain phases of the question at issue did Toplady refute? How typed? Whom did antitypical Pekah win over to his side? How typed? What else did it win? Who in its domain disapproved of its course? How typed? Where did they appear? How typed? In what manner? How typed? For what did they blame it? How typed? What did they point out? How typed? For what else did they blame them? How typed? What did they charge? How typed? To what did they exhort? How typed? What threat did they make? How typed? What did the leading antitypical Israelites do? How typed? Nationally of whom did they consist? How typed in each of the four? What did they declare? How typed? Assert first? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Thirdly? How typed? Fourthly? How typed?

(41) To what did these remonstrances lead? How typed? What was first done? How typed? What three things did they first do? How typed in each case? What two things secondly did they do? How typed in each case? To whom did they lead them? How typed? What did these elected antitypical Israelites then do? How typed? In its extremity what did antitypical Ahaz then do? How typed? What effect had the American colonies' protest against tyranny aroused? Where? Who, among others, favored their cause? What thoughts and spirit were among them? How typed? How so? What resulted? What resulted therefrom? Especially in what? How typed? Who else mistreated it? At whose instigation? With what results? How are these things typed? Who else made inroads? How typed? Among what kind of adherents? How typed? In what six countries? How typed in each case? What other classes did this invasion affect? How typed? What did God do to antitypical Judah? How

typed? Why? What two bad effects had antitypical Ahaz wrought? How typed in each case? What were the two effects of liberty-lovers on antitypical Ahaz? How typed?

(42) What did antitypical Ahaz give up to the secular liberty-lovers? Why? How typed? What were some of such religious teachings? How typed? Civil teachings? How typed? What were some of these? How typed? Aristocrats' teachings? How typed? What was one of these? Why did it do these things? What effect did these concessions have? How typed? What did the secular liberty-lovers then do? How typed? With what result? How typed? What did they do with the opinions of these? How typed? Of antitypical Rezin's? How typed? What was shown above? Thereupon what did antitypical Ahaz do? How typed? Why? How typed? What did it therein consider? How set forth? How typed? What did it do therewith? How typed? As what? How typed? Wherein? How typed? What response was made? How typed? Who were among the responders? How long did this development take? Not completed until after what event? Why is it set forth as occurring in the Ahaz phase? How are these things typed? When was the misdevelopment begun? How typed?

(43) Thereafter what did antitypical Ahaz do? How typed? What did it then do? What did it add to its past sins? How typed? What were its pertinent ministries? How typed? Despite what? How typed? What did it think as to these evils? How typed as to antitypical Rezin? As to itself? Instead, what occurred? How typed? What did it presume to do? How typed? What kinds? How typed in each kind? What were these sacrifices actually? How typed? What great evil did it next do? How typed? From what place? How typed? To what did it relegate the true Church? Whom did it then charge? How typed? What did this involve? What did it charge? How typed? What eight features of sacrifices were by it charged? How typed in each case? What was to be publicly used? As doing what? How typed? What did it further charge? How typed? What did the charged ones do? How typed?

(44) What further evil did it do? What did it thereby do? How typed? In its estimation what did the error close? What did it actually close? How typed? What did it change? Where? How typed? What did this effect?

How typed? With what result? How typed? How did this affect God? How typed? How and where are these evils otherwise typed? What did its doctrine of sinless perfection of the sanctified sever? How typed? What did it thereby overthrow? How typed? What did it remove from the Old Testament? How typed? How did this leave the New Testament stand? How typed? What did it do to the proven doctrine of reckoned and actual justification as the antitypical rest? How typed? To the doctrine that justified the entrance of God's more favored movements into the antitypical court? How typed? Why did it do these things? Where are its acts described? How typed? What finally happened to it? How typed? How has it been honored? How typed? But not how? How typed?

(45) To the study of whom does this bring us? Who was he, type and antitype? What are the parallel years? How is this proved? What is the date of antitypical Hoshea's end? Where will this be shown? What was antitypical Pekah? By what was it displaced? When? Why? Wherein? What was antitypical Hoshea? In what capacity? Particularly in what? In relation to what? What did it claim? In what did it begin its reign? When? After remitting what? At whose insistence? How typed? What was its character? How typed? In what was its character contrasted with its predecessor movements? How typed? What was its main sin? Especially in whom? To what did this sin lead it? What did the British liberty-lovers do as to its autocratic efforts toward America? Why? How typed? What did the liberty-lovers do as to tea shipped to America?

(46) How did this affect antitypical Hoshea? How was it met? With what result? What price did it pay to the liberty-lovers? How typed? What did the liberty-lovers do as the Revolutionary War continued? How typed? Why? How typed? In view of this what did it no more do? How typed? On the contrary, what did it do? With what result? In what way in Britain? In America? What fluctuations occurred? With what result? Until when? How typed? What then occurred? How typed? Thereupon what did the liberty-lovers do?

(47) How did this turn of affairs come about in Britain? In America? Where? When? By 1781 what did the American liberty-lovers force Cornwallis to do? What

was his plan? What did the Americans, helped by their French allies, under Washington then do? With what result? When? What occurred March 20, 1782? Shortly after what? By what was it succeeded? What did it immediately set into operation? How typed? In what did this result? When? How typed? What did this prove to be? How typed? In what did this result to the less favored people of God? What did the liberty-lovers require of them? From when on? How typed? Henceforth where did they mentally dwell? How typed?

(48) Of how many kinds were these liberty movements? What was the first? How typed? What liberties did it effect? What was the second kind of liberty movements? How typed? What liberties did it effect? What was the third kind? How typed? What liberties did it effect? What has set in since 1782? What do these prove?

(49) What result is thus shown to have occurred? In what did these outcomes result? Why these consequences? How typed? What was the first set of principles that they violated? The second? How typed? What did they do as to Jesus' charges? How typed? Despite what did they so act? How typed? What did they reverence? How typed? What principles did they not follow? How did they conduct themselves? How typed? After God had done what? How typed? How else had they conducted themselves? How typed? What four sets of movements did evil? How many successive movements did evil? What admission as to the course of the less favored people of God does a consideration of the evils of these compel us to make? Of what other kind of evils were they guilty? How typed? What was developed in every denomination? How typed? From what to what did they do this? How typed in each case? What else did they develop? How typed? What did they form? How typed? Under whom did they serve? How typed? In and for sects what did they offer? How typed? After what example? How typed? To what extreme? How typed?

(50) To what did they give themselves up? How typed? What does God in the Bible do as to such a thing? How as to time? How typed? In remonstrance what did God do? Whom and in what to the Lutherans? Whom and in what to the Calvinists? Whom and in what to the Anglicans and Presbyterians? Whom and in what to all

denominations? How about others? How are these things typed? What did they do? How typed? In accordance with what? How typed? Despite these how did they do? How typed? In what evils did they indulge? How typed? What did they cast off? How typed? What did they abandon? How typed? With whom made? How typed? What did they give up? How typed? Instead, what did they do? How typed? In what did this result? How typed? What did they imitate in the worldly? How typed? Against what? How typed? What did they forsake? How typed? What, generally speaking, did they institute? How typed? What, specifically speaking? How typed? Into what evil did they enter? How typed? What evil qualities did they serve? Typed by what and why? What special evils did they serve? Typed by what?

(51) What blasphemous doctrine did they also teach? How typed? What else? How typed? Especially what? How typed? To what did they give themselves up? How typed? In what matters? How typed? With what first result? How typed? Second result? How typed? With what third result? How typed? Who else was at times untrue to God's teachings? How typed? Whose example did these at times follow? In what particulars? How typed? What resulted from this? How typed? What from time to time did He send? How typed? Into what did He permit them to fall? How typed? These not resulting in their reformation, what did God finally do to them? How typed? What quality did His wrath have? In it what was exercised? When did it begin? How typed? What did they then make? How typed? Into what did the Lutheran movement drive the less favored people of God? How typed? What else did it make them do? In what respects? How typed? What did they not do with these sins? How typed? In what did their strong and long indulgence in these sins result? How typed? In harmony with what? How typed? What does this mean? How typed? How long have they remained in the sphere of secular liberty teachings and spirit? How typed? Where wrought out?

(52) What did the secular liberty-lovers arouse adherents of five movements to make? How typed? What did they do to these? What had their hearts and minds formerly been? How typed? What did they make them? How typed? What was the first of these movements?

How typed? The second? How typed? Third? How typed? Fourth? How typed? Fifth? How typed? What did these occupy? How typed? How in time did these originate? How typed? What quality did they not at first exercise? How typed? As punishment what did God send? How typed? To whom did these report the situation? How typed? What four things did their attitude say? How typed in each case? What did it say was the cause of their trouble? How typed? What did the liberty-lovers do as to it? How typed? How are these described? How typed? What did their attitude require of the former and the latter? How typed in each case?

(53) With what did these teachers occupy themselves? How typed? How is this proved? What did they, generally speaking, republish? Particularly speaking, what did the Parker Society republish? Others? What were published as new books? What was held pertinent to the conditions? Where else were similar things done in this matter? How are these things typed? Of what were and of what were not the five movements, typed in v. 24, reduplications? What illustration is to the point? How did this find illustration in the other four? How typed? What did they make as their gods? How typed? Wherein did they establish these? How typed? In what were these? What were they? How typed?

(54) What suggests the five movements to be given as above? What is here to be noted? What did the Combinationists make to be their god? How typed? The Contradictionists? How typed? The Infidelists? How typed? The Reformers? How typed? The No-ransomers? Typed?

(55) What did these practice? How typed? What did they appoint? Of what characters? How typed? How did these minister to them? How typed? What kind of a mind did they have? How did it manifest itself? How typed? How was this service performed? How typed? How do they yet do? How typed? What was the result of this double-mindedness? How typed? According to what do they not live? How typed? Nor what else? How typed? How is it summed up? How typed? Into what were their two Parousia representatives turned? How typed? With whom individually had God made a covenant? How typed? What was its implication? What four things did it bind them not to do? How typed in each case? What three

things did it bind them to do? How typed in each case? Why were these requirements fitting? How typed? Through what two things was the deliverance wrought? By what two agencies? How typed in each case?

(56) What four things had God set forth clearly? How typed in each case? What did He charge as to these? How typed? What did He prohibit? How typed? What did He emphasize? What does it imply? How typed? What did He stress by repetition? How typed? What did He charge? How typed? In what would it result? How typed? How did the people act as to these things? How typed, positively and negatively? In what did this result? How typed? How successively? How typed? As imitators of whom? How typed? How long? How typed?

CHAPTER VIII

LAST PARALLELS.

HEZEKIAH. MANASSEH. AMON. JOSIAH. JEHOAHAZ. JEHOIAKIM.
JEHOIACHIN. ZEDEKIAH.

FROM NOW on our study of the Large Parallels will be restricted to those of Judah's kings, since we have with Hoshea, Israel's last king, completed our study of those of the latter's kings. Still we will continue to use the same wording for the subject of our study in Kings and Chronicles, for the sake of indicating the relationship of our pertinent coming studies with those of the past thereon. It was after Hezekiah had reigned six years, Hoshea ceasing then to reign, that the Large Parallel becomes restricted to the kings of Judah. With these preliminary remarks we begin our study of the Hezekiah parallels. Hezekiah (*Strength of Jehovah*) types the Bible recension, printing and distributing movement. The parallel periods were 745-716 B.C. and 1776-1805 A.D. See 274-277 above. This movement had its faint beginning in the publication of J.J. Wetstein's recension of the Greek New Testament, which appeared in 1751, just 25 years before the movement became in 1776, through the completion of J.J. Griesbach's epochal recension of the Greek New Testament, the chief movement among God's more favored people; and it came to the end of being such a movement in 1805, when J.J. Griesbach, whose text is that of our Diaglott, finished his work on the last edition of his recension of the Greek New Testament, and had it thus ready for the press, whence it appeared in 1806 (began ... five and twenty ... reigned nine and twenty, 2 K. 18:1, 2; 2 C. 29:1). It was also in the period of these 29 years that the first Bible Societies came into existence, the first of these was that which arose among the Methodists in 1778, though there had been Bibles published previously by several societies

which, however, were not mainly devoted to printing and distributing the Bible. The greatest of the Bible societies, the British and Foreign Bible Society, was founded March 7, 1804, a little over a year before antitypical Hezekiah ceased to reign (April, 1805). As we have shown in E 3, 28 (26)-33 (30), the main impulse in the formation of this society came as a result of a Methodist damsel's, Mary Jones', 50-mile journey for a Bible, and of a Methodist minister's, Pastor Charles', fervent advocacy of a Bible society; but it was an undenominational society, joined in by members of all Protestant denominations.

(2) Hence this Bible society and almost all others have been non-sectarian, mothered by the Bible itself, as coming from the Heavenly Father (mother's name was Abi [*my father*] ... Abijah [*Jehovah is my father*], 2; 1 [in allusion to God as the Author, symbolic Father, of the Bible]); and, of course, the Bible, above all other things, serves to remind people of God (daughter of Zechariah [*reminder of Jehovah*]). The Bible recension, publication and distribution movement, which has sought from its beginning to print and circulate cheap Bibles for the common people of Christendom and heathendom, did and still does a very good work; and it did very commendably before the Lord (right ... Lord, 3; 2), in the same spirit and in the very words of the Apostles as recorded in the New Testament (according ... David ... done). Whereas during the preeminence of the apostate Methodist movement, antitypical Ahaz, those servants of God's house who led people into repentance and faith-justification were estopped from their work by antitypical Ahaz's evil doctrines and practices, immediately after antitypical Hezekiah came into preeminence as the movement of God's more favored people, it reversed that course by beginning to set at work such servants of God as opened the way of entrance into repentance and faith with faith-justification (first month opened the doors, ;3), by cleansing them of their errors of

doctrine and practice and by giving them correct teachings and practices (repaired them). Moreover, it attracted to itself the main and subordinate leaders of God's people (brought the priests and Levites, ;4) and assembled them about the first principles of the Lord's house (together into the east street; literally, broad place to the east, *i.e.*, the first part of the temple enclosure, where even heathen could stand, typical of the condition of repentance). There it gave forth its message (said unto them ;5). It exhorted them to separate themselves from sin, error, selfishness and worldliness (Hear ... sanctify yourselves), as it also exhorted them to separate all God's people from these (sanctify the house of the Lord), and thereby to remove these unclean things out of the sanctuary (carry forth the filthiness ... holy place).

(3) It pointed out the transgressions and sins of their predecessors (have trespassed ... done evil, ;6) in their relations to God (eyes of the Lord), by apostatizing from Him (forsaken him) and removing their favor from His people (turned ... habitation) and disfavoring them (turned their backs). They also stopped the work of those who led people to faith-justification (shut up the doors of the porch, ;7), quenched the enlightenment of the teachers (put out the lamps), stopped offering to God their choice human powers amid fiery trials with accordant graces (not burned incense) and ceased offering the things that effected justification and sanctification as manifesting God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice (nor offered burnt offerings) in the antitypical Court (holy ... God). This resulted in God's wrath coming upon His more favored people and the sphere of their executorship (wrath ... Judah and Jerusalem, ;8), expressed in their becoming distressed (trouble) and objects of disagreeable surprise (astonishment) and abhorrent disapproval (hissing), even as they witnessed (see). Their predecessors had been refuted in controversy (fathers ... sword, ;9); their movements, powers and supporters

were proselyted into erroneous sects for this (sons ... captivity). The movement then taught that it desired to renew its and their covenant with God (heart ... covenant ... God, ;10), to the end that His wrath be removed from them (wrath ... from us). Affectionately (My sons, ;11) it exhorted them against negligence as to God's ways (negligent), since the main and subordinate leaders were God's choice to officiate as His representatives (chosen ... before him), to advance His purpose (serve ... minister) and to sacrifice their choice human powers amid fiery trials, resulting in the graces as their prayers ascending to, and pleasing God (burn incense).

(4) Thereby were aroused to their work recensionists of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures (Mahath [*grasping*] ... Amasai [*burdensome*, in allusion to their seizing hold of burdensome work], ;12), translators of such Scriptures (Joel [*Jehovah is God*] ... Azariah [*help of Jehovah*]) as linguists (antitypical Gershonite and Eliezerite Amramites) among learned scholars (Kohathites); antitypical Merarites (Merari): editors of Bibles (Kish [*bow*] ... Abdi [*my servant*], antitypical Mahlites) and publishers of Bibles (Azariah ... Jehalelel [*Jehovah is praised*], antitypical Mushites); antitypical Gershonites: pastors (Joah [*Jehovah is brother*] ... Zimmah [*planning, i.e., their work*], antitypical Shimites) and evangelists (Eden [*delight*, in allusion to their bringing joy to the believing sinner] ... Joah, antitypical Libnites); antitypical Uzzielites: controversial (Shimri [*guarding*], ;13) and constructive (Jeiel [*removed by God*, in allusion to God's setting them aside as becoming teachers of error]) dogmaticians (Elzaphan [*God hides*, in allusion to God's hiding the bulk of Truth, but not the stewardship truths, from them]). Antitypical Hebronites as historians in the widest sense of the word gave no service to the Bible recension, printing and circulating movement, hence are not typed in this connection. Besides the above there were aroused to pertinent activity the

continually traveling preaching brethren (Asaph, *he gathers*): those who traveled throughout all Britain, *etc.* (Zechariah) and those limited to circuits, *i.e.*, circuit riders (Mattaniah, *gift of Jehovah*); the occasionally traveling preacher brethren (Heman, *trustful*, ;14), consisting of those who traveled occasionally all over Britain, *etc.* (Jehiel) and those who traveled occasionally in a circuit (Shimei, *famous*); and local preachers (Jeduthun, *praising*), consisting of those who preached Sundays in their local churches (Shemaiah, *fame of Jehovah*) and in neighboring churches (Uzziel, *power of God*), all good works for God.

(5) These brethren gathered together all of those who consisted of their kinds of colaborers (gathered their brethren, ;15) and separated themselves from sin, error, selfishness and worldliness (sanctified [literally, caused themselves to separate] themselves), and in harmony with the movement's charge (commandment of the king) by God's principles (words of the Lord) gave themselves to put aside all uncleanness from God's people (came ... cleanse the house). The main teachers (priests, ;16) ministered to cleanse the consecrated and the things that pertained to them in the antitypical Holy as to the main leaders (inner part ... to cleanse it) and cast out unclean teachings, wrong readings in the received texts of the Hebrew and Greek Testaments and wrong translations and unclean practices therefrom (brought ... uncleanness ... temple) and ended the beginnings of their cleansing work as to the antitypical Holy, when they reached pertinent justification matters and persons (into the court). Such latter matters and persons the subordinate leaders cleansed (Levites took ... abroad) and put them where they belonged, in the domain of evil away from God's people (into the brook Kidron [*turbid, i.e.*, in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, typical of the condition of the curse]). This reformatory work began immediately on antitypical Hezekiah's becoming the most prominent movement of God's more favored people. It at once grappled with the first feature

of the evil (first day of the first month, ;17) and in a week's time had grappled with the last feature of the evil, as matters of the Holy in the main leaders and other new creatures (eighth day ... came ... porch). This will become clear, if we remember that the beginnings, not the endings of the various features typed are usually meant in the antitype; for certainly the many errors of doctrine, wrong readings in the Hebrew and Greek and wrong translations and errors of practice introduced by antitypical Ahaz and others were not removed in eight days; but within eight days every feature of them was begun to be set aside (sanctified the house ... eight days). Thereafter the subordinate leaders began to set aside the errors of doctrine, wrong readings, translations and practice pertinent to the condition of these subordinate leaders as the antitypical Court, *i.e.*, pertinent to justification. Within eight days more (sixteenth day) the subordinate leaders had made a beginning of attacking every error of doctrine, reading, translation and practice among themselves. Here, again, the remark is in order, that they did not within eight days rid themselves of all these wrongs of doctrine, readings, translations and practice, but had by that time begun to cleanse every one of them (made an end).

(6) Then the main and subordinate leaders made a report of their activities to the movement as represented in God's more favored people (went ... king, and said, ;18). Their report embraced the several items that they did. First of all, they reported that they had begun to cleanse all of God's people as His Temple (cleansed all the house); secondly, they reported the beginning of cleansing the whole Church in its capacity of comforting, encouraging, *etc.*, by God's Word the sacrificing and tried people of God as they appear to those in the antitypical Court (altar of burnt offering); thirdly, they reported the beginning of cleansing every one of the doctrinal, refutational, corrective, textual and ethical teachings pertinent to the Church as comforter,

encourager, *etc.*, as it appears to the subordinate leaders in the Court (all the vessels thereof); fourthly, they reported the beginning of cleansing the Church in its capacity of holding up the bread of life to the brethren as main leaders, to strengthen them in every good word and work for their heavenly journey (shewbread table). Fifthly, they reported the beginning of cleansing all the doctrinal, refutative, correctional and ethical teachings pertinent to the antitypical Shewbread Table (vessels thereof). Sixthly, they made particular report that all of the Truth teachings that the apostate Methodist movement, antitypical Ahaz, had repudiated in its sinful course (all the vessels ... cast away in his transgression, ;19) were prepared anew and fitted for the Lord's people (prepared and sanctified) and had been placed at the disposal of God's Church for its use of them for sacrificial purposes (before the altar).

(7) The Bible recension, printing and distributing movement in its members, on learning of the prosperity of the cleansing work, very promptly gathered the leaders (Hezekiah ... early ... rulers, ;20), and together they betook themselves to God's people as His Temple (went ... house). From v. 24, as well as from v. 21, we see that the seven goats were the sin offering, and since we see that from v. 24 it wrought atonement for the then people of God, it types teaching emphasis put upon Jesus' sin-offering sacrifice, which is further confirmed by the seven lambs, typical of Jesus as the Lamb of God, and typifying Him as such. Hence from v. 24 we infer that the seven bullocks were the burnt offering and the seven rams were the peace offering, the former typing God's manifesting His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice, *e.g.*, by Jesus' ministering as Teacher, Justifier, Sanctifier and Deliverer in cooperation with the then serving brethren (seven bullocks) and the latter typing His fulfilling His vows while in the flesh and since coming into the Spirit. Of course, the priests' offering these sacrifices represents their serving as reminders of Jesus' sacrifice, and not making a

repetition of His sin-offering sacrifice (seven ... goats, ;21). These sacrifices prove that Jesus made atonement for the rulers (kingdom), God's people as His Temple (sanctuary) and God's more favored people (Judah). Antitypical Hezekiah in its members charged the main leaders to make the offering (commanded ... of Aaron to offer) in connection with God's people in their capacity as comforting, encouraging, *etc.*, the sorely tried sacrificers (the altar). These then stressed by their teachings God's acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice (killed the bullocks, ;22), their faith laying hold of this acceptance (received the blood), and taught how it atoned for God's people as comforters, encouragers, *etc.*, of the sorely tried priesthood (sprinkled ... altar). Their faith laying hold on Christ as His vows-Fulfiller (killed the rams), they showed how His fulfilling His vows atoned for the same antitypical Altar (sprinkled ... altar). They did the same as to the antitypical Lamb, His blood and the Altar (killed also the lambs ... altar). Then they set forth Jesus as the sin offering (brought ... goats for the sin offering, ;23), publicly before the movement as such and all God's people (king and the congregation). They also set forth the thought that Jesus was their substitute (laid their hands upon them). Thereupon they set forth the thought that Jesus died for the sins of God's people (killed them, ;24) and makes atonement by His merit for God's people (reconciliation ... altar), which made God pleased with His whole people (atonement for all Israel), even as the movement charged that atonement be made to man (burnt offering—which reconciles man to God) and to God (sin offering, which reconciles God to man).

(8) The Bible recension, printing and distributing movement arranged offices for the subordinate leaders throughout the Church (set the Levites in the house, ;25), to minister, some with tracts (cymbals), some with books, especially with star-member books (psalteries) and some with Bibles (harps), which they expounded, even as the Apostles, their special helpers

as seers and general teachers, charged (commandment of David, and of Gad ... Nathan the prophet), even as God also charged by the Old Testament writers (commandment ... prophets). The subordinate leaders stood ready with the Apostolic teachings (Levites ... instruments of David, ;26); and the main leaders stood ready with discourses and lectures (priests with the trumpets). Then the movement charged that by the main leaders God's manifestation of His acceptance of Christ's offering be set forth as to Christ doing His teaching, justifying, sanctifying and delivering work for the Church (commanded ... burnt offering upon the altar, ;27). As soon as the main leaders began so to do, they also began to deliver suitable sermons and lectures, and the subordinate leaders began to serve with tracts, books and the Apostolic writings (began ... song ... trumpets ... instruments ordained by David). This moved the entire people of God to serve (all ... worshipped, ;28); all the time the pertinent sermons and lectures continued (singers ... trumpeters ... continued ... finished). At the conclusion of these activities in each of its phases, the movement in all its members humbled themselves and served God (King ... bowed ... worshipped, ;29). It and the leaders charged the subordinate leaders to set forth God's attributes as praising Him in His teachings as given in the Apostolic words and in those of the star-members (commanded ... praise ... words of David and of Asaph the seer, ;30). This they did, humbling themselves and serving the Lord (worshipped).

(9) The movement then invited the non-official brethren who had consecrated themselves to join in sacrificing for, and thanking, the Lord (said ... consecrated ... sacrifices and thank offerings, ;31). This they did (brought ... offerings); and the most zealous ministered in a way that manifested God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice, by cooperating under Jesus as He gave the blessings of instruction, justification, sanctification and deliverance; for it is by these acts that God

manifests His acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice (free heart burnt offerings). They brought Divine and human blessings (70 [7 × 10] bullocks, ;32) in tentative justification (100 [10 × 10] rams) and vitalized justification (200 [2 × 10 × 10] lambs), all expressive of Jehovah's manifesting His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice (all ... a burnt offering). Even unjustified people offered service in that they yielded up contributions (six hundred [6 × 10 × 10,—6 the number of imperfection and evil, combined with the thought that these gifts were by their unjustified givers intended for the tentatively-justified's blessing] oxen, ;33) and their loved ones as (1) tentatively-justified, (2) vitalizedly-justified and (3) new creatures (three thousand [3 × 10 × 10 × 10 = 3,000,—the third 10 standing for crown-losing new creatures, because they formed the bulk of the new creatures] sheep). The main leaders alone, *e.g.*, John and Charles Wesley and John Fletcher, *etc.*, were too few to set forth the people's sacrifices alone (too few ... flay all the burnt offerings, ;34). Hence the subordinate leaders helped them, until all the sacrifices were made (Levites did help ... ended) and until others were developed into main leaders unto fitness for such main service (*other* priests had sanctified themselves); for the subordinate leaders were more hearty for this service than those of their number who later became main leaders (more upright ... sanctity themselves than the [other] priests). Many indeed were the expressions of God's manifested acceptance of Christ's sacrifice, in the form of much Truth clarified, many persons justified, consecrated and given victory over the devil, the world and the flesh and over the fear of death and the grave (burnt offerings were in abundance, ;35), as was the case of love coupled with consecration vows (fat of the peace offerings) and of preachings of the simpler truths (drink offerings) as to the various expressions of God's manifested acceptance of Christ's sacrifice (burnt offering). Yea, the entire movement in its participators rejoiced in the

Lord's favors, as well as all God's people (rejoiced ... people, ;36), on account of God's fitting His people for this matter (prepared the people), which was done quickly (done suddenly).

(10) 2 Chro. 30 treats of the great Passover of Hezekiah's day. The Passover in general represents the deliverance of God's people from Satan's rule on the basis of the antitypical Lamb's blood; its emphasis, therefore, is mainly on justification through faith in Christ's merit. Celebrated the 14-21 of Nisan, it represents mainly the salvation of the Gospel Age and its joys, *etc.*, particularly that of the Gospel Church, which is the antitype of the account in Ex. 12; but celebrated the 14-21 of the second month, it types mainly the salvation of the Millennial Age, particularly that of the world of mankind, which is the antitype of the account in Num. 9:6-14. However, the great Passover of Hezekiah is an exception to this rule; for though celebrated the 14-21 of the second month, the facts prove it does not type the Millennial Passover, but a particular part of the Passover of the Gospel Age; for, according to the parallel, this antitypical Passover was begun to be celebrated about the beginning of May, 1776. By oral and literary messengers (sent ... and wrote letters, ;2 C. 30:1) the movement invited God's less favored (Israel) and God's more favored people (Judah), particularly of God's less favored people those who lived in England (Ephraim) and in Scotland (Manasseh), asking them to come to the real people of God (house of the Lord), in the sphere of the executorship of God's more favored people (Jerusalem), to live out tentative and vitalized justification on the basis of the Lamb's shed and sprinkled blood, accepted by the justified and consecrated people of God, in honor of God (keep the passover ... God of Israel); for the movement had in consultation with the leaders and ledlings of God's people (counsel ... congregation, ;2), as a matter of executorship (Jerusalem), exhorted to work on justification and consecration (keep

the passover) at the earliest moment proper for them (second month), since the cleansing of God's Church from error and wrong had to precede that particular antitypical Passover (could not keep ... priests ... sufficiently, ;3), and since the ledlings had not yet entered into the Bible recension, printing and circulating movement sufficiently to come under its executorship for that antitypical Passover celebration (people ... to Jerusalem). To hold such a justification and sanctification activity pleased the movement and its ledlings (pleased the king ... congregation, ;4). Hence they decided to decree an agitation (established a decree, ;5), among all professed Christians, from mere formal hangers-on (Dan, *judge*) to crown-losers and crown-retainers (Beer-sheba [*well of the oath*, in allusion to the teachings of the Oath-bound Covenant]), to the end that all should live out justification and consecration matters (come to keep the passover) to God's glory (unto the Lord), under the movement's executorship (at Jerusalem), a thing that was neglected for a long time in Christendom (not ... long ... written).

(11) Accordingly, messengers went forth with pertinent literature (posts [messengers] went with letters, ;6) sent to the movements and the leaders among God's less (Israel) and more favored people (Judah), entreating the less favored people of God, some to exercise repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus in the renewal of their justified life, and others to renew their consecration (Israel, turn again unto the Lord of ... Israel), promising them that God would return (he will return) to the remnant of God's less favored people who had up to then escaped going into the captivity of the secular liberty-lovers (remnant ... escaped ... Assyria). The exhortation pleaded with the less favored people of God not to imitate their predecessors or contemporaries who sinned against God (be not ye like ... which trespassed ... God, ;7), who resultantly delivered them to manifest spoliation (gave ... desolation, as ye see). The plea specifically exhorted

them not to be stubborn, as their predecessors had been (not stiff-necked, as your fathers were), but to surrender to God and come among His true Church (yield ... sanctuary), which God had set apart to Himself perpetually (sanctified for ever), and to serve God (serve the Lord), which would result in His removing His wrath from them (that ... wrath may turn away), assuring them that if they so did, they, their fellows and winlings (turn again ... children, ;9) would obtain mercy before their secular liberty-loving captors (them ... captive) and thus return to the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (come ... land), since God is favorable and compassionate (gracious and merciful) and will not refuse them favor, if they return to Him (not ... face from you, if ye return). Accordingly, the messengers went from one denomination to another among God's less favored people (posts ... to city, ;10) throughout England (Ephraim) and Scotland (Manasseh), even unto Ireland (Zebulun), but the majority despised and reviled them (laughed ... mocked). Yet different ones from little Wales (Asher, ;11), Scotland (Manasseh), Ireland (Zebulun), as well as from England and continental Europe (Ephraim ... Issachar, ;18), abased themselves in a renewal of repentance, faith and consecration, and came under the executorship of God's more favored people (humbled ... came to Jerusalem).

(12) And God's power acting through His Word, Spirit and providences effected God's more favored people to become of one heart to fulfill the charge of antitypical Hezekiah and its leaders (hand of God ... one heart ... commandment ... word of the Lord, ;12). Multitudes gathered themselves to the sphere of the executorship of God's more favored people (assembled ... people ... a very great congregation, ;13) to live out repentance toward God, faith in the Lord Jesus and entire consecration (keep the feast ... second month). They effectively set aside their adherence to their denominations (took away the altars, ;14) from the

sphere of the executorship of God's more favored people (Jerusalem), even all the sects to which choice human powers were sacrificed (altars of incense), and heartily cast them into the unclean condition of the curse (cast them into the brook Kidron, *turbid*). Then they in faith, set forth the teaching that Jesus is the Paschal Lamb (killed the passover, ;15), in the period of justification and consecration (fourteenth day of the second month). But the main and subordinate leaders not yet cleansed were abashed at their uncleanness and cleansed themselves (priests ... ashamed, and sanctified themselves). Thereafter they performed services that manifested God's acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice, *i.e.*, they cooperated with Jesus in His teaching, justifying, sanctifying and delivering work (brought the burnt offering ... Lord). Each one officiated in his position according to the way that Jesus' teaching directed by God's charge, as His special Servant (place ... law of Moses the man of God, ;16), the main leaders teaching the atoning efficacy of Jesus' blood (priests sprinkled the blood), as the subordinate leaders served them therein (hand of the Levites). Many of the people had not examined themselves and purged out the evil from themselves (many ... were not sanctified, ;17). Hence the subordinate leaders had the work of leading them through repentance and faith unto justification (Levites ... killing the passovers ... not clean) and then to consecration, in order to set them apart unto God (sanctify them unto the Lord).

(13) For very many (a multitude, ;18) from England (Ephraim), Scotland (Manasseh), continental Europe (Issachar) and Ireland (Zebulun) had not exercised repentance, faith and consecration (not cleansed themselves); but they ignorantly counterfeited these (eat the passover otherwise ... written). The movement labored for them in work and prayer (prayed for them), to the end that the gracious God might forgive (pardon) every one who set his heart to serve the Lord (prepared ... seek God, ;19), who was their

predecessors' God (God of his fathers), despite their erroneous self-examination, purgation, repentance, faith and consecration (not cleansed ... purification of the sanctuary). The Lord graciously, in answer to the labors and prayers of the movement, by Jesus' ministry exercised through His servants, cured these into a proper self-examination, purging, repentance, faith and consecration (Lord hearkened ... healed the people, ;20). Not only so, but the less favored people of God who had come under the executorship of His more favored people (Israel ... Jerusalem, ;21) remained in the privileges of new creatures in the Christian life (kept the feast ... seven days with great gladness); and the subordinate and main leaders set forth God's Word continually in ways that reflected credit upon Him (Levites and priests praised the Lord day by day), using the teachings of the Word energetically for the Lord (loud instruments unto the Lord). The movement by word and act spoke encouragingly to the subordinate leaders (spoke comfortably ... Levites, ;22) who taught God's profitable thoughts to the people (taught the good knowledge of the Lord); and these appropriated the Lord's blessings throughout their Christian life (eat ... seven days), carrying out their consecrations, encouraging others to do the same (offering peace offerings), and professing God's Truth, as well as their own weaknesses (confessing to ... God).

(14) Those who adhered to the Bible recension, printing and circulating movement did not stop at their justification, especially typed by the first antitypical Passover, but they proceeded on to and into consecration in full determination and unanimity (whole assembly ... keep other seven days, ;23). This second step of the Christian life they took and kept with special joy (seven days with gladness). The movement as a whole very abundantly ministered to Jesus in His capacity of giving evidence of God's acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice by His ministering instruction, justification, sanctification and deliverance to many (thousand

bullocks, ;24) and abundantly did it stress Jesus' sacrifice as the basis of these works for the Church (seven thousand sheep). The cooperating leaders in all Protestant denominations who supported this movement ministered in this very abundantly (princes ... thousand bullocks) to all the adherents of the movement (congregation), especially stressing Jesus' sacrifice in its justifying aspect to the adherents formerly in it, those just coming into it and those being invited to come unto justification (ten thousand sheep). Many of the main leaders renewed their consecration (priests sanctified themselves). All of God's more favored people, together with the main and subordinate leaders were full of the joy of the Lord (all ... Judah ... Levites ... rejoiced, ;25). And not only they, but also all of the less favored of God's people who responded to the movement's invitation (all ... out of Israel), yea, those Israelites who fled from the less favored people of God and came and dwelt among God's more favored people joined in the great rejoicing (strangers that came out ... dwelt in Judah). As a result of these justifications and consecrations, combined with instruction and deliverance, there was much joy in these in connection with the Bible recension, printing and circulating movement in its sphere of executorship (great joy in Jerusalem, ;26); for since the ascendancy of the Interim's star-members (Solomon), as they conformed to the Apostles' teachings (son of David), there had not been in any other of the more favored movements of God's people such a period of justification and sanctification in their executorship (Solomon ... David ... not the like in Jerusalem), since at this time the main and subordinate leaders wrought blessingly toward the people (priests ... blessed the people, ;27); for their message was heeded (heard) and their prayers ascended to their Covenant God (prayer ... unto heaven).

(15) After this great antitypical double Passover (finished, ;31:1) the work of uprooting every form

of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness continued. This was participated in by all God's people who had taken part in these Passovers (all ... present), and that in every denomination of God's more favored people (to the cities of Judah). They thoroughly destroyed creedism (brake ... pieces), set aside union of state and church (cut down the groves), uprooted sectarianism from their hearts (threw down the high places) and rejected the denominationalism (altars) of God's more favored people (all Judah and Benjamin), of that in England (Ephraim) and Scotland (Manasseh). And they wrought thereon until they had driven these evils out of their hearts (utterly destroyed them all). Thereafter each one abode in his class standing, in spite of his denominational adherence (all ... returned possession ... cities). The movement appointed the kinds of services as to its peculiar activities for the main and subordinate leaders (appointed ... Levites, ;2); according to each one's particular kind of work was he appointed (courses ... service), some of the main and subordinate leaders to minister as to God's manifested acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice (for burnt offerings), some of them as to consecration vows (peace offerings, to minister), both as to rendering God duty love (thanks) and disinterested love (praise), as they served and by their service held high God's kindnesses and His glorious character, as those who brought others in among God's people as His Temple (gates ... Lord). Moreover, this movement in its adherents arranged for their ministries to manifest God's acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice (king's ... burnt offering, ;3), first, that which was directly connected with the acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice while He was in the flesh (morning) and, secondly, that which connected it with the acceptableness of the Church's sacrifice while it is in the flesh (evening), also for it as connected with reckoned and actual justification (sabbaths), with the twelve chief graces of God's people (new moons), and the antitypical Passover, the justification and sanctification

of the Church of the Firstborns, as well as with the antitypical Pentecost of the new creatures, and with the antitypical Feast of Tabernacles—the final standings of each as the fruitage of the Gospel Age (set feasts), according to God's Word (in the law).

(16) It also gave a charge to the people within its executorship (charged ... in Jerusalem, ;4) to carry out their consecrations (give the portions), as an encouragement to the main and subordinate leaders in the good Word of the Lord (encouraged in the law). This charge met with an immediate response (as soon ... abroad, ;5); the brethren rendered up their consecrations abundantly (children of Israel ... firstfruits), in yielding deep and surface truths (corn and wine), mingled with the Holy Spirit (oil) and blessed hopes (honey), and of every kind of increase wrought by their sacrificed humanity (increase of the field). Thus they yielded up in consecration their human all very overflowing (tithes ... abundantly). It was indeed a time of very fruitful service of God in Spirit and Truth. This was faithfully done by God's less and more favored people who were associated in the denominations wherein God's more favored people held sway, *i.e.*, in certain Zwinglian, Unitarian, Congregational, Quaker, Pietistic and Methodist Churches (children ... dwelt ... Judah, ;6); for these made and carried out their consecrations (brought in), based on Jesus' merit (oxen) and consisting of their human all (sheep); for they consecrated their time, talents, health, strength, means, influence, reputation, learning—in a word, all they were and had and all they hoped to be and have (tithes of the holy things); and they put them combinedly together in great abundance (by heaps). They began by offering their tentatively (third month, ;7) justified human all, and ended by giving to and in God's service their new-creaturely all (seventh month). The movement in its adherents and the leaders saw these abundant consecrated things (Hezekiah ... saw the heaps, ;8), and therefore praised God and His

people (blessed ... people). The movement investigated the matter as to the abundant consecrated things at the hand of the main and subordinate leaders (questioned ... concerning the heaps, ;9). And Jesus (Azariah [*help of Jehovah*] ... answered, ;10) through mouthpieces made it known that since these numerous consecrations and their products began (since the people began ... offerings) the main and subordinate leaders were greatly satisfied as to their longings for fruitfulness in God's people (had enough), yea, that it was much more than they could appropriate (have left plenty), acknowledging that God had blessed His people (hath blessed), which resulted indeed in a great quantity (great store).

(17) The movement in its adherents then charged that official positions should be made and filled in the Church (prepare chambers, ;11), which the brethren did, in the forms of service as prophets, evangelists, pastors or teachers (they prepared them); moreover, they carried out their consecrations (brought in offerings, ;12); others made and carried out their consecration (tithes) and presented advancing Truth (dedicated things), all of which was faithfully done. In charge of this work were *twelve* subordinate groups of leaders, in symbolization of its being a Little Flock work (Cononiah ... Benaiah, ;13), whose two group leaders respectively correspond to the two group subordinate leaders in the Little Flock tribes of antitypical Judah and Ephraim (Cononiah and Shimei), even as Jesus and the movement in its adherents charged (Hezekiah ... Azariah). The leading evangelist group, which was among the Methodists (Kore ... porter toward the east, ;14), had charge of the work of gaining consecrations as freely made and to arrange for the ascription of praise to God and Truth features to be properly apportioned (freewill offerings ... oblations ... most holy things). The other six evangelist groups were in charge of these things in the Anglican (Eden, ;15), Presbyterian (Miniamin), Baptist

(Jeshua), Unitarian (Shemaiah), Congregationalist (Amariah) and Quaker (Shekaniah) Churches (in the cities), where there were main leaders (priests) all set in their proper offices (set office) to apportion the forms of services to their evangelistic brethren (to give ... courses), regardless of whether these brethren were great or small (great ... small). The general principles followed in these arrangements ran along the following lines: (1) sectarian denominationalism was ignored (beside [apart from] their genealogy, ;16), though the stronger brethren were included (of males); (2) they included those who had just consecrated (three years old) up to the fullest matured ones (upward); (3) every one was used who entered for service among God's people as His Temple (entered ... house); (4) a daily portion of the ministry was allocated (daily ... service); (5) in harmony with the form of their service (charges ... courses); (6) this was true as to the denominational relations according to the kinds of the service for and of the main and subordinate leaders (genealogy ... Levites, ;17); (7) qualification for service was required in each one as to his duties in his form of service (from twenty years old and upward ... courses); (8) these arrangements applied to the denominationally most immature, to their special helpers, their movements and their powers (genealogy ... daughters, ;18); (9) they were applicable to all the favored people of God (all the congregation); (10) each one was to act in his office in sanctification and holiness (sanctified ... holiness). Vs. 16-18 are a parenthesis explaining matters touched on in vs. 13-15. The same general rules applied to the main leaders (sons ... priests, ;19), including even those who were on the fringes of denominations (fields ... cities), of each one's denomination (several city), who were designated by their characters (names); for they were assigned to each strong one among the main leaders, as well as to the subordinate leaders in the denominations (portions ... males). These arrangements were

made throughout God's more favored people by the movement, doing according to God's will in His matters (did ... Judah ... before ... God, ;20); for all that the movement did in relation to God was heartily done (every work ... God ... heart, ;21); and it was successful (prospered).

(18) Following the above-described works and their firm operation (After ... thereof, ;32:1), in the year 1790 (fourteenth year, 18:13; ;Is. 36:1 [whenever a third book is used in the parallels, if it is the only one referred to, we will use a comma and two semicolons before it; and when there is another one used in the same place there will be two semicolons used before it, as above, to indicate the third book, Isaiah; for here we have often two and sometimes three accounts]) the French revolutionists as the leaders of the liberty-lovers (Sennacherib [*wrathful*, in allusion to the wrath of the French revolutionists]) made an invasion against God's more favored people (Judah), with the purpose of winning over all the strong denominations (fenced cities) to their theories and practices (thought to win them, ;1). When the Bible recension, publishing and distributing movement (Hezekiah, ;2) took note that the French revolutionists were working against it (saw ... come), and were intent on overthrowing its sphere of executorship (fight against Jerusalem), it as a whole advised (took counsel, ;3) with its leaders (princes) and warriors (mighty men) over the question of stopping all supplies and relief (stop ... fountains) outside of its sphere of executorship from falling into the hands of the French revolutionists. They supported it in this purpose (did help him). Thereupon there were united in this purpose multitudes of its supporters (much people, ;4), who cut off such supplies and relief (stopped all the fountains), which dried up every avenue for them to reach such revolutionists (brook), believing and declaring that it was unreasonable to let them succor the enemy (Why ... Assyria ... much water). It made its position strong

(strengthened, ;5), especially increasing and fortifying its powers where weak (built ... wall ... broken) and made them fit supports to its strongest points (raised ... towers) and secured power from those outside of its sphere of executorship, both in Britain and on the continent (another wall without). It strengthened the Apostolic ramparts (Millo ... David), and invented many sharp weapons (darts) and strong defenses against the theories and practices of the French revolutionists (darts and shields in abundance). It appointed leader warriors among its supporters (captains ... people, ;6), assembling them publicly in the ways of Truth in its sphere of executorship (gathered ... street ... gate of the city), cheering them and urging them to be strong and cheerful, not to fear or be discouraged at the liberty-lovers and revolutionists (strong ... Assyria, ;7), regardless of their great numbers (all the multitude), since their Helper was greater than they (more). With their enemies, it continued, was human strength (arm of flesh, ;8); with them was the Lord as Helper and Warrior (Lord ... help ... fight), which assurances gave them rest of faith (people rested ... words); for God helps in time of need.

(19) The Bible recension, publishing and distributing movement in Europe, especially in Britain, sought to come to terms with the French revolutionists and their liberty-loving supporters, especially those of the latter who were in Britain (sent ... Assyria, 14). These revolutionists were engaged in a sharp struggle with the stubborn defenders of the old order, in France especially, but also with their supporters in other nations (Lachish, *stubborn*). It acknowledged that it had offended in its too strenuous support of the old order (offended), and requested that it be left in peace (return from me), agreeing to accept their terms (puttest ... bear). These overtures were not made by words, but by the conditions of the movement requiring it to adapt itself to the circumstances forced upon it by the French Revolution. And the circumstances forced

it to face the question of yielding up an immense shrinkage of its circulation of the Divine Truth, as much as was humanly possible (appointed ... three hundred ... thirty). To meet the situation forced upon it by these circumstances it had to yield to a shrinkage of Divine teachings on secular government (silver ... house of the Lord, 15) and of human teachings thereon (king's house), *e.g.*, it gave up much of the right of rulers to absolute power as of Divine right, civil power derived by heredity, the rights of primogeniture and of aristocracy, and had to accept the doctrine of civil power as derived from the consent of the governed, the responsibility of all to civil law and the equality of all before the law. It also had to give up many of the supposedly Divine-right powers and privileges of the clergy and evangelists (cut off ... doors of the temple, 16), likewise of the hierarchs (pillars), even those that the movement had attributed to them (Hezekiah ... overlaid) and yielded these to the revolutionists.

(20) But despite their demands having been met, the French revolutionists aroused from their conflict with the absolutists (Lachish, 17; 9; 2) against the Bible recension, printing and distributing movement and all its supporters (Hezekiah ... Judah, ;9) the chiefs of the elected representatives (Tartan, *the third* [estate of France], 17), the chiefs of the military forces (Rabsaris, *chief of the eunuchs*) and the chief proponents of their theories (Rab-shakeh, *chief butler*, ;;2), all combinedly (servants, ;9), in its sphere of executorship (Jerusalem), they being accompanied by immense numbers of supporters (a great host, 17; a great army, ;;2). They took their position on the principles of reason (upper pool, 17; ;2) which lead to the Divine doctrines of the rights of man before his fellows (conduit) and on which all might go (highway) toward a riddance of the sphere of usurped authority (fuller's field). They demanded that the movement give them attention (called to the king, 18). Mentally the executive leaders of the movement (Eliakim, *my God arises*;

Hilkiah, *held by Jehovah*, 18; ;3), the humble scholarly writers and orators (Shebna, *shyness*, the scribe) and the historians (Joah, *Jehovah a brother*, recorder) of the movement journeyed to the theory claims of the French revolutionists (came out). Their theory propounders set forth their views (Rab-shakeh, *chief butler*, said, 19; ;4) to these that they inform the Bible movement of the views and demands of the French revolutionists (Thus saith ... king, 19; 10; 4). They considered their confidence baseless (confidence ... trustest) to endure a siege of the sphere of its executorship (abide ... Jerusalem, ;10). They asked if the Bible movement was not inducing them to a course which meant death by lack of deep and surface views (persuade ... die ... thirst), claiming, but in vain, to have the needed plans and power to fight (vain words ... war, 20; ;5), and demanded how the movement in which it trusted could presume to revolt against the French revolutionists as liberty-lovers (God shall deliver ... Assyria, 20; 11; 5). They accused it of relying upon the support of the unreliable secular powers (staff ... reed ... Egypt, 21; ;6) which will fail their trusting allies and injure their power (lean ... hand, and pierce it). Such is Satan as the ruler of the secular powers to his dependents (so is Pharaoh ... trust on him). Further, they argued that if their trust was in Jehovah for deliverance from the revolutionists (say ... trust ... God, 22; 11; 7), they were not to forget that He had turned against them, because the Bible movement had overthrown His sects and churches (high places and altars ... taken away, 22; 12; 7), charging its people and sphere of executorship (Judah and to Jerusalem) to serve in the interests of the one Church (worship ... altar) and to devote their choice reckonedly perfect powers in its interests (incense upon it, ;12). It should consider how the liberty-lovers have conquered all the opposing nations.

(21) Thereupon these theory teachers suggested that the Bible movement give pledges of alliance with the

French revolutionists as liberty-lovers (give pledges ... Assyria, 23; ;8), pledging to give it complete secular teachings for their mutual purposes (two thousand horses), provided that it would furnish teachers of these (set riders upon them). In view of the situation they asked how it, which could not frighten into flight even the least able leader of these revolutionists' subordinates (turn ... captain ... master's servants, 24; ;9), could place confidence in the secular powers (trust on Egypt) for secular organizations and their leaders (for chariots and for horsemen). They further asked whether they were coming against the Bible movement's sphere of teaching and of spirit to overthrow it (Am I now come ... destroy, 25; ;10) without the Lord's command (without the Lord). On the contrary, they claimed, but falsely, that they had received orders from the Lord Himself to campaign against, and to destroy that sphere (Go up ... destroy it). Thereupon the movement's executive leaders (Eliakim, 26; ;11), the humble scholars and orators (Shebna) and the historians (Joah), by their attitude, asked the revolutionists' doctrinaires (Rah-shakeh), very politely and humbly (pray ... servants), to speak their views in non-Truth forms of expression (Syrian language), since they understood it (understand), and not in Truth terms (not ... Jews' language), lest those standing in their powers understand them (ears ... wall). By their continued propaganda they claimed that they were not speaking at the revolutionists' charge to the Bible movement, but to those in power (sent ... speak ... wall, 27; ;12), to the end that they might believe their vile rejected deeper and shallower views (eat ... drink). They made still louder outcries in language approximating the Truth (cried with a loud ... language, 28; 18; 13) to the strong supporters of the Bible movement's sphere of executorship (Jerusalem, ;18), to discourage and intimidate them (affright ... trouble), to the end that they might capture their sphere of executorship (take the city), demanding their attention to the revolutionists

as liberty-lovers (Hear ... Assyria, 28; ;13), asking them to be on their guard not to let the Bible movement deceive them (deceive you, 29; 15; 14), since it could not deliver them (not ... deliver, 29; ;14) from the revolutionists' power (hand, 29). They sought to dissuade them from the movement's word, to trust in Jehovah as their sure Deliverer (neither ... trust ... surely deliver us, 30; ;15) and the Preventer of the fall of the sphere of executorship to liberty-lovers (city shall not ... Assyria).

(22) Again its supporters were warned by the revolutionists' doctrinaires not to heed the Bible movement (Hearken not, 31; ;16); for the revolutionists (king) advised them to make peace with them by giving them tribute (Make ... present) and by surrendering (come out), in which case they might continue to eat and drink of their work (eat ... drink), until the revolutionists would transport them to another sphere of thought and spirit (take ... land, 32; ;17), which they claimed was like their own (own land), in which they could produce deeper and shallower teachings (corn ... vineyards) and have a good spirit and happy prospects (oil and honey, 32), resulting in their surviving and not perishing (live and not die, 32); and to be on their guard against the Bible movement's making them believe that God would deliver them from the revolutionists (Beware ... deliver us, 32; 15; 18), asserting that no powerful one of any country was able to save from their power (nation ... hand, ;15), nor had any delivered out of the power of other, earlier liberty-lovers (hand of my fathers). Hence they argued that Jehovah would much the less be able to deliver them from their power (God ... mine hand). What powerful one of any nation was able to deliver his nation from the power of the liberty-lovers (any ... delivered ... hand ... Assyria, 33; 13; 18)? Where are the powerful ones of contradicting Romanism (Hamath, *fortress*, 34 [19:13]; ;19 [37:13]), of infidelistic philosophers (Arphad), of apostates impinging

on the ransom (Sepharvaim), of union of state and church (Hena, *lowland*) and of the destructive reformers (Ivah, *ruin*)? Did any of the powerful ones deliver absolutism (Samaria, *guard*) out of their power? Again they demanded which one of the powerful ones of those movements had delivered their spheres out of their predecessors' and their power (Who ... gods ... fathers ... my hand, 35; 14; 20). Could they hope that Jehovah could so do to them and their sphere of executorship (God deliver you ... Jerusalem, 35; 15; 20)?

(23) These doctrinaires continued to slander the Lord and the Bible movement, which was serving the Lord (servants ... against the Lord ... Hezekiah, ;16). Moreover, they wrote books and issued proclamations against the Lord as the God of the sphere of His people's executorship (wrote ... rail ... God, ;17), blaspheming Him by degrading Him to the level of powerful ones of non-Truth movements (speak against him), even asserting that He could do no more to protect the Bible movement (Hezekiah) and deliver His people out of the power of the French revolutionists (deliver ... hand) than the powerful ones of non-Truth movements could do to deliver them out of their power (not delivered their people). Thus they degraded the God of His people's sphere of executorship (God of Jerusalem, ;19) to the level of the powerful ones of non-Truth movements (as against the gods ... earth), which were but human manufactures (work ... of man). But the supporters of the Bible movement did not reply to this insolence, not answering even one word (people ... answered ... word, 36; ;21), even as the movement had charged them not to answer (king's commandment ... not). Thereupon the Bible movement's chief executives (Eliakim ... household, 37; ;22) and humble scholars and orators (Shebna the scribe) and the historians who gathered materials for the record of historical events (Joah ... Asaph, *gatherer*) were very much grieved (clothes rent), and in this state of mind made known to the Bible

movement the declarations of the revolutionists' doctrinaires (told him ... Rab-shakeh).

(24) The effect of this report, when the Bible movement heard it, was to grieve it in all its adherents (Hezekiah ... rent his clothes, 19:1; ;37:1) and it went into the deepest mourning (sack cloth) and betook itself to God's people as His sanctuary (house of the Lord). For this cause the movement and its most prominent faithful and strong teachers (Hezekiah ... Isaiah [*salvation of Jehovah*]; Amoz [*strong*], ;20) made special prayer and supplication (prayed and cried to heaven). Thereupon the Bible movement sent its leading executives (Eliakim ... household, 2; ;2), its humble scholars and orators (Shebna the scribe) and the chief preachers (elders of the priests) in deep mourning (sackcloth) to the main strong and faithful teachers (Isaiah ... Amoz), acquainting them (said, 3; ;3) with the movement's sentiments, which were to the effect that the period of the French Revolution was a time of tribulation (day of trouble), of rebuke for Christendom's sins (rebuke) and of slander against God (blasphemy); for a great crisis had come upon Christendom ready to produce a new order in church, state and society (children ... birth), but it was powerless to produce this new order (not strength to bring forth). The Bible movement longed for God to give heed to the teachings of the revolutionists' doctrinaires (may be ... hear ... Rab-shakeh, 4; ;4), whom the French revolutionists as liberty-lovers (king of Assyria) had stirred up to slander Jehovah with blaming charges (reproach the living God). Perhaps God would rebuke in a startling way the blasphemies against Him, made in His hearing (reprove ... heard). Therefore the Bible movement asked these chief faithful teachers to pray (lift up thy prayer) for its few remaining supporters (remnant). With these messages the representatives of the movement came to the chief faithful teachers (servants ... to Isaiah, 5; ;5). These teachers gave them an answer to give to the movement

(Isaiah said ... Thus ... master, 6; ;6) as a saying of Jehovah (Thus saith the Lord), encouraging it not to fear the teachings published in its hearing (not afraid of the words) and issued forth by the doctrinaire servants of the French revolutionists as liberty-lovers (servants ... Assyria); wherewith they blasphemed Jehovah (blasphemed me); for God was determined to bring upon them a powerful blow (send a blast, 7; ;7); a report that strong opponents of theirs would reach them (shall hear a rumor); they would leave the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, would go to their own sphere of error and its spirit (return ... land); and in their own sphere of error and practice the French revolutionists would succumb (fall) by theories subversive of theirs (by the sword).

(25) The revolutionists' doctrinaires then turned their attention to the French revolutionists, who, having overcome the autocrats in state and aristocracy (departed from Lachish, 8; ;8), turned their attention against the leaders of true Christianity (warring against Libnah, *whiteness, clarity*). In France the abolition of Romanism was considered and meant by the revolutionists as an attack on all religion. Reason as a goddess was enthroned as the sole source and rule of faith and practice; and while the existence of a supreme being was later declared, the indirect effect of the French opponents of religion was an attack on real religion, as the siege of antitypical Libnah was an attack on the Bible movement as an expression of real religion. Frightened by the report that a coalition of European secular powers under England's lead (heard say of Tirhakah, *distance*, 9; ;9) was coming to war against them (come ... against thee), in view of this feared attack of the coalition of European powers, to forestall its possible strengthening of their foes, these revolutionists increased their attacks legislatively and literarily on Romanism and all religion, except that of Reason. And from this standpoint their literary attacks were

really an attack on the Bible movement (sent messengers, 9; ;9), charging that their message be declared to the Bible movement as the chief movement of God's people (king of Judah, 10; ;10). They cautioned it not to let its trust in Jehovah deceive it (not thy God ... deceive thee) into believing that the sphere of its executorship would not be given into the power of the French revolutionists as the leaders of the liberty-lovers (Jerusalem ... hand ... Assyria).

Let it keep in mind what the various forms of the liberty-lovers' leaders had done with all anti-liberty spheres of teaching and practice, *i.e.*, completely overthrowing them (heard ... done ... destroying, 11; ;11), as the thing that should convince it that it would not escape (shalt thou be delivered?). Did the powerful ones of French social conditions (Gozan, *refuge*, 12; ;12), of the high ones of the French clergy (Haran, *mountainous*), of the friction-making French royalty (Rezeph, *heated stone*) and of the pleasure loving French nobility (Beni-[sons] *Eden [pleasure]*), which had rule over liberty-lovers (Thelasar, *hill of Assyria*) deliver any of these? For comments on vs. 13; ;13 please see comments on 18:34; ; and 36:19.

(26) The Bible movement received the writings of the revolutionists circulated by the publishers (letter ... messengers, 14; ;14) and digested their contents (read it) and thereover appeared before God's people as His temple (went ... house of the Lord), and spoke to God on its contents (spread ... Lord), praying (prayed, 15; ;15) and acknowledging that the God of His people, who acts according to His perfect wisdom, power, justice and love (Lord ... cherubim, 15; ;16), is the only true God (alone), mighty over all rulers of the social order (kingdoms) and is the Creator of the literal and symbolic heavens and earth (made heaven and earth). It pleaded that God would emphatically listen (bow ... hear, 16; ;17) and emphatically take note (open ... see), and give attention to the oppressive teachings of the French

revolutionists (hear ... Sennacherib), which by their authors they had sent to cast reproach upon the eternal God (sent ... reproach). It acknowledged before the Lord that the leaders of the liberty-lovers (truth ... Assyria, 17; ;18) had crushed those movements and their teachings and practices (destroyed ... lands) and had destroyed their religious beliefs (gods into the fire, 18; ;19), since such were really not true beliefs (no gods), but were human fictions (work of man's hands), some weak (wood), some strong (stone); and hence such liberty-lovers' leaders overcame them (destroyed them). Therefore it prayed God to save His people from their power (save ... hand, 19; ;20), in order that all rulers in human society (kingdoms of the earth) may learn that He alone is God (thou ... only). Thereupon the strong leading faithful teachers sent the Bible movement an answer (Isaiah ... saying, 20; ;21) from God to His people (Thus saith ... Israel), giving assurance that its prayer against the French revolutionists as liberty-lovers came with acceptance before Him (prayed ... Assyria I have heard). Now follows His answer (word ... concerning him, 21; ;22): The consecrated light-shiners (virgin ... Zion, *sunny*) lightly esteemed and ridiculed the French revolutionists (despised ... scorn), even the inhabitress of the sphere of His people's executorship despised them (daughter ... head), charging that they had blamed and slandered, raised their voices against, and given haughty looks on the One whom God's people held holy (Whom ... against the Holy One, 22; ;23).

(27) By their envoys they had blamed Jehovah (they ... reproached, 23; ;24), boasting that by their many organizations they would overcome God (come ... heights ... Lebanon, *white*), overthrowing His best justified (cut down ... cedar trees) and most faithful consecrated people (choice fir trees), overpowering the weakest (lodgings) and the most fruitful of His people (Carmel, *fruitful*), alleging that

they had captured and refreshed themselves with the supplies of foreigners (dugged ... waters, 24; ;25), and had proudly plundered the people's spheres of teaching and practice that they had invested (soles ... dried ... rivers ... places). God asked them whether they had not heard that in the long past God's plans and works were accomplished (heard ... done ... formed? 25; ;26). He assured them that it was He who had used the French revolutionists to devastate strong spheres of teaching and practice (brought ... lay waste ... heaps). Because of God's determination their subjects had been weak (inhabitants were of small power, 26; ;27), affrighted and discouraged, evanescent (dismayed ... herb), crushed (grass ... tops) and overthrown before fully developed (blasted ... grown up). God then showed them that He knew their position (abode, 27; ;28), their endeavors and results (out ... in) and their wrath against Him in His (rage against me). And because God had taken note of their wrath and agitation (rage ... tumult, 28; ;29) He would treat them like hooked and chained prisoners (hook ... bridle) and force them to retreat over the same course over which they came in invading God's sphere of teaching and Spirit (turn the back ... camest). And to the Bible movement God gave a sign of their successive operations (sign unto thee, 29; ;30); Their first period, *i.e.*, 1795 to Oct. 1800 would produce Bibles at small and individuals' efforts (eat this year ... grow of themselves); the next period, *i.e.*, Oct. 1800 to Apr. 1804, would be of a much smaller extent, coming from the remnants of the first period's efforts (second year ... the same); but in the third period the movement's supporters would agitate for printing Bibles and then form Bible societies, the first one coming in the form of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which would produce a most abundant crop of Bibles, refreshing human society (third year sow ... eat the fruits thereof).

(28) Then the chief faithful teachers promised that

God's people who would survive victoriously the trials of the French Revolution period (escaped ... Judah, 30; ;31), would be rooted deep in the Bible and would raise high the Bible as their fruitage (root ... fruit); for God promised that some would survive victoriously those trials in their sphere of executorship (Jerusalem ... remnant, 31; ;32) and in their embryo sphere of showing forth the light (escape out of mount Zion), guaranteeing that His loving active aggressiveness would accomplish this in due time (zeal ... do this). Furthermore God promised (thus saith the Lord, 32; ;33) as to the French revolutionists (king), that they would not enter the sphere of His people's executorship (not come into this city), nor pierce it with any of their sharp sayings (shoot an arrow), nor approach it with protective weapons (with shield), nor besiege it (nor cast a bank). They would reverse their theories and practices (came ... return, 33; ;34) and would not enter the sphere of His people's executorship (not come into this city); [This God repeated for emphasis], because God would protect that sphere (defend, 34; ;35), and deliver it for His glory's sake and for His Apostles' sake (my sake ... David's sake).

(29) The prophecy having been given, the fulfilment followed closely on its heels (that night, 35; ;36); for shortly after the Red terror that gripped France for nearly a year (Sept. 1793 to July 1794) subsided, a reaction (angel of the Lord, 35; 21; 36) set in, which, seeking to preserve the gains, set aside the extreme fanaticism of the revolutionists and destroyed its leaders. This was the beginning of the slaughter of the supporters of the extreme revolutionists and of their officials, who were very numerous and powerful (smote ... thousands); especially was this reaction fatal to the warriors (cut off ... men of valor, ;21), legislative giants (leaders) and other leaders (captains). And by 1796 the extremest revolutionists were either physically killed or killed as such by giving up

their extreme fanaticism and famine-hastening and painful results, the remnant viewing these dead or reformed extremists (arose early ... behold ... corpses). The revolutionists somewhat earlier changed their atheism into rationalism, which proclaimed God, virtue and immortality, and thus went back to a reformed France, which was a leaving of antitypical Judah and a return to antitypical Assyria in much shame (departed ... returned with shame ... land, 36; 21; 37), and occupied themselves in a combined civil and religious government (Nineveh, *dwelling of Nina*, goddess of love). While these reformed French revolutionists were engaged in works of patriotism (worshipping ... Nisroch, *patriotism*, 37; 21; 38), first, under a new constitution, the Directory, the executive body of five members appointed under the new constitution, that of 1795 (Adrammelech, *fire king*), then the Consulate, under a revised constitution, that of 1799, consisting of three members, of whom Napoleon was the first consul (Sharezer, *prince*), put an end to the French revolutionists as a party, by the action of these two constitutions (smote him with the sword), and betook themselves to higher grounds of government than that of the French Revolution (escaped ... Armenia, *highland*). As a result a modified democracy temporarily succeeded the French revolutionists (Esarhaddon, *conqueror*, 37; ;38). Thus the Lord saved the Bible movement and the supporters of its executorship (saved ... Jerusalem, ;22) from the power of French revolutionists, the leaders of the liberty-lovers, and from all others (hand ... all other) and guided them well in all matters (every side). This led many to consecrate themselves to the Lord (gifts to the Lord, ;23) and to give helps to the movement (presents), which resulted in its being honored by all other Christian movements from then onward (magnified ... thenceforth).

(30) It was during the period of the French Revolution (in those days, ;24) that, through the conditions

induced by that revolution: preoccupation of the bulk of the people in it, the destruction of commerce by it, the use of great funds to combat it and the resultant impoverishment in Britain due to it, *etc.*, that the Bible movement came to a standstill as to publishing, and to a low ebb as to circulating the Bible (sick unto death; 20:1; 32:24; 38:1). This is apparent from the story of Mary Jones, referred to above, and is the thing typed by Hezekiah's illness. This led it in its supporters to pray for a recovery (prayed, ;24); and God assured it and gave it an evidence of recovery (spake ... gave him a sign). The faithful and strong main teachers had delivered to it a message from the Lord (Isaiah ... came ... said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, 1; ;1), to the effect that it should arrange (set thine house in order) so that its affairs would be in a condition for it to cease being the chief movement of God's people (die and not live). But most dear to its heart in its supporters was its work, feeble as it was; hence, hiding its feelings from others (turned his face to the wall, 2; ;2), it was most loath to give it up, greatly grieved thereover, and poured out its grief in heartfelt prayer (prayed ... saying), entreating the Lord (beseech thee, 3; ;3) not to forget but to keep in mind (remember) its labor and love for His name, in that it ministered the Bible to His people (walked ... truth ... perfect heart ... good). So grieved was it (wept sore). Here is a case of the thought that before God's people call He answers, and while they are yet speaking He hears; for scarcely had the strong main and faithful teachers gotten out of the movement's presence, and while it was yet within its office precincts (afore Isaiah ... court, 4; ;4), God's providence and word gave them a message for it (came the word of the Lord).

(31) He charged them that they should return to, and tell the movement (turn again and tell, 5; ;5), as the leading movement among God's people (the captain of my people, 5), as a message from the Lord

as the God of the Apostles (Thus saith ... God of David, 5; ;5), in whose teachings it abode (father), that He had heard its supplications (heard thy prayer) and seen its grief (tears), to the effect that very shortly (third day, 5), cured of its evil (heal thee, 5), it would appear before God's people, as it was God's chief movement (into the house of the Lord, 5); that He would add 15 years to its term of being the chief movement of God's people (add ... fifteen years, 6; ;5), would deliver it and its sphere of executorship (deliver ... city) from the power of the French revolutionists, and would defend that sphere (city) for His honor and that of the Apostles (own ... David's sake, 6). The faithful leading teachers prescribed the sweet hope of coming success (Isaiah ... lump of figs, 7), which was applied to its cure (laid ... recovered). It desired some assurance of its cure (sign ... heal, 8; ;8) and of its appearing before God's people in the third period (house ... third day). The Lord gave it the choice as to whether the Bible should go back to its former unopposed or to a future unopposed ministry by justified and consecrated humans (shadow go forward ... go back ten degrees, 9). It chose the more difficult of the two (light ... return, 10). In answer to the prayer of the leading teachers (cried, 11), this was done (brought backward). The sign was that the Bible would recover from its then condition of opposition by the French revolutionists to the full condition of the support that justified and consecrated humans could give it (this ... shadow ... ten degrees, 11; 24; 8).

(32) So deeply impressed by these circumstances was the Bible movement that it in its supporters poured out its feelings in a widely spread tract, telling among other things the story of Mary Jones and her 50-mile journey for a Bible and the great dearth of Bibles, saying in the noontide of its activities (cutting off [better, noontide], ;;10) it was going down to the entrance of the death state (go ... grave), and was thus cut

off from its life's expectation. It concluded that it would not see God in His character and works anymore in this life (not see ... land of the living, ;;11), nor human beings with the rest of this world's creatures (man no more ... world). Its years were removed like a transitory shepherd's tent (departed, and is removed ... tent, ;;12). As a weaver cuts off his thread, so it was undergoing the cutting off of its existence (cut off ... life, ;;12). It felt that God was cutting it off as by a pining sickness (cut ... sickness). It expected daily to come to its end (day even to night, ;;12, 13). And when night came it thought it could not last till the morning (till morning), believing that, like a fierce lion, God would scatter from it its supporters (break all my bones, ;;13). It muttered incoherent sounds, instead of reasonable speech (chatter, ;;14). Like a bereaved dove (as a dove) it mourned, and almost became of no understanding from long looking to God for relief (eyes ... upward). It pleaded with God by reason of its oppression (O ... oppressed), asking Him to undertake for it (undertake for me). It knew not what to say (What shall I say?, ;;15). Despite God's having revealed Himself to it, He yet has afflicted it (spoken ... done it). Its future would be one of inactivity (softly all my years), after ending life in distress (bitterness of my soul). It recognized that men, as well as itself, really lived by God's Word, Spirit and providences (live ... life of my spirit, ;;16). Hence it prayed that thereby God might recover it and cause it to live (recover ... live). Instead of prosperity it had grievous disappointment by ill success (peace ... bitterness, ;;17); but in love for it God had rescued it from death (love ... delivered ... pit of corruption), since He had forgiven and forgotten all its missteps (cast ... thy back). This God did to it, because the death state cannot praise and honor God (grave ... death cannot celebrate, ;;18); since those in the death state are unconscious, they cannot hope to obtain

God's Truth (pit ... truth); for only the living can praise God (living ... praise, ;;19), as it, rescued from death, was then doing (this day). A predecessor will to successors declare God's Truth (father ... thy truth). Since God was alert to rescue it (to save, ;;20), it would declare God's as its message (sing my songs), with Bibles circulated (stringed instruments), all its existence (all the days), before God's people (house of the Lord). For the interpretation of vs. 21, 22, please see comments on Is. 38:7, 8.

(33) The Bible movement, like many people and movements, could not stand prosperity, at least for a while (rendered not ... benefit done, ;;25), but was temporarily proud (lifted up), for which God expressed His displeasure upon it (wrath upon him), His people (Judah) and its sphere of executorship (Jerusalem). But, unlike most of the self-exalted, it abased itself (humbled ... pride of his heart, ;;26), not only it, but also its special assistants (inhabitants of Jerusalem), which postponed the wrath until after its days of ascendancy (wrath ... not ... days of Hezekiah). It was greatly increased in its Bible work (riches, ;;27) and in the respect of its observers (honor). It increased its depositories of Bibles (silver), of Divine understanding of the Bible (gold), of graces (precious stones) of the utmost variety (spices) and of Bible defenses (shields) and every other kind of adornment of God's Spirit and Word (jewels), as well as pen-products as depositories (storehouses, ;;28) for hard (corn) and easy (wine) teachings and their spiritual understanding (oil), also churches (stalls) where the justified could stay (beasts), and where the consecrated were at home (cotes for the flocks). Moreover, it arranged for Bible societies (cities, ;;29) and made the sacrifice of the Church (flocks) and of Christ (herds) very prominent and greatly prospered in increase of sacrifices (flocks ... abundance). It also shut off Bible truths on secular things from giving aid to the French revolutionists (watercourse of Gihon,

stream, 18:17; 32:3, 4) and arranged by publishing Bibles to give directly (west side, ;30) Apostolic teachings to the Lord's people (down ... city of David). And in its Bible undertakings it was successful (prospered ... works). But in one thing it offended—in receiving and glorying before the messengers of nominal-church confusion (ambassadors ... Babylon, ;31), who came to congratulate it for its recovery and connected wonders (enquire of the wonder ... land). To test it God let it follow its own counsels (left him, to try him), to reveal its heart's attitude (know ... heart). The following shows the test; and the Bible movement's pride is described in ;25, 26.

(34) It was during the French Revolution that, doubly strong-willed and warlike, Satan (Berodach-[*warlike*] baladan [*strong-willed*], 20:12; ;39:1), the creator of symbolic Babylon, caused the sufferings of the French hierarchy and clergy to be made known to the Bible movement in a way that aroused its sympathy for, and confidence in them (sent letters). He also aroused much people to support it (present), because he thought that such expressions of sympathy for its recovery would enable him to get control, at least in the future, of its work (heard ... sick). Overjoyed, it listened to the messengers' proposal of sympathy and help for the French hierarchy and clergy as fellow-sufferers from the same agents (hearkened ... glad, 13; ;2). In its confidence it made known to Satan's messengers all that it had, as described in ;27-29 (shewed them all ... treasures). In its spirit of showing off it concealed nothing in its responsibilities and rulership (nothing ... shewed them not). But God's all-seeing eye saw the spirit and nature of its acts and sent by the leading faithful teachers (Isaiah, 14; ;3) a sharp rebuke, tactfully put as questions as to what the messengers said (What said these men?) and as to what was the sphere of teaching and practice from which they came to it (whence came they unto thee?). Its attitude showed that in teaching and practice they

were far from its teachings and practices (a far country) and it reluctantly by attitude admitted that they came from Satan's sphere of teaching and practice (Babylon). The leading faithful teachers further inquired as to what they had seen in its sphere of duty (seen in thine house, 15; ;4); and again it in honesty admitted by its attitude that they were given by it to see everything therein (all things), nothing at all having been concealed from them (nothing ... not shewed them).

(35) Thereupon the leading faithful teachers asked it to hear God's pertinent word (Hear the word of the Lord 16; ;5). They then forecast that all that it and its predecessors had amassed of good and had shown would come into Satan's control for his purposes of confusion (all that ... that ... laid up in store ... Babylon, 17; ;6), nothing at all being excepted (nothing shall be left). Satan's servants would capture its descendants (sons ... beget, 18; ;7) and they would become lowly slaves in Satan's sphere of activity (eunuchs ... Babylon). The pious Bible movement was submissive to this pronouncement (said ... good is the word ... spoken, 19; ;8) and took comfort in that this would not happen in its period of ascendancy (good, if peace and truth be in my days). The foregoing episode was the special one wherein the Bible movement exercised pride and later repented of it, as shown above. The above-described works and others of its acts are described in the works of the historians of this movement (rest ... Hezekiah, 20; 32). Among these works were the mighty and good deeds (all his might ... good deeds) of its making immense stocks of Bibles kept in storehouses (pool, 20) through its publishing work (conduit) whereby it brought, in the Bible, the due truths into the sphere of its executorship (water into the city). All of these things are recorded in the writings of its historians (book ... kings of Judah ... and Israel, 20; 32) particularly in the writings of the main strong and faithful teachers'

pen-products (Isaiah ... Amoz, ;32). In 1805 the Bible movement ceased to be the main movement of God's people (slept 21; 33). It is kept in highest and sacred remembrance as having carried on Apostolic work as among the movements of God's more favored movements (buried ... chiefest of the sepulchres ... David). This good movement has been held in especial honor and esteem by God's real people and the supporters of its sphere of executorship (all Judah ... Jerusalem did him honor in his death). Its successor as the main movement of God's people was the anti-infidelistic movement of the Gospel Age as distinct from that of the harvests (Manasseh ... stead, 21; 33).

(36) Manasseh (*forgetting*, in allusion, first, to his forgetting the Lord in idolatry and, second, to God's forgiving and thus forgetting his evils) types in the large parallel the supernaturalism movement, which was brought into activity, first, by the oppositions of rationalism and, secondly, by the first phase of higher criticism and related *isms*. Supernaturalism in its first form in its antagonism to rationalism was guilty of the sins typed by those of Manasseh and in its second form in its antagonism to the first phase of higher criticism and related *isms* performed good deeds typed by those of Manasseh's reformation. The involved parallel years are 716-661 B.C. and 1805-1860 A.D. Rationalism, the theory and practice that exalts reason as the source and rule of faith and practice and rejects the Scriptures as such, had its beginning with that of deism, whose father was Lord Herbert of Cherbury (died 1648). It progressed through the various phases of English deism, became transplanted to France in the so-called Illumination, the mother of the French Revolution; and from France it passed over to Germany, where it did its most destructive work through the activities of German University professors, *e.g.*, J. S. Semler, J. A. Ernesti, K. A. G. Keil, J. D. Mechaelis, J. G. Eichhorn, *etc.* It degenerated

into what was called vulgar rationalism, whose superficiality sank it into its proponents' discussing subjects like vaccination, methods of inducing sleep, food for beasts, which was their Christmas subject, and other secular subjects, *e.g.*, the best lesson that vulgar rationalistic preachers could draw from the resurrection of our Lord was the benefit of early rising. Like the Deists, they summed up religion as consisting of three articles of faith: God, virtue and immortality.

(37) Supernaturalism is the teaching and practice of the Bible as a Divine revelation, proven to be such by accompanying miracles and prophecies and by being delivered by credible messengers. This doctrine as to the Bible was denied by the rationalists, with the result that they denied almost every Bible doctrine which cannot be deducted from reason. So widespread was rationalism that not only in France, but also in Germany the universities were filled with rationalistic professors, with the result that in Germany most of the pastors were permeated with its fell teachings. After it had reigned supreme in Germany for a generation the Lord raised up the supernaturalists, whose leader in its first, or evil, phase was Frederick D. E. Schleiermacher, and whose leader in its second, or good, phase was Ernst W. Hengstenberg, the former being its leader in the antitype of Manasseh's wickedness, and the latter being its leader in the antitype of Manasseh's righteousness. The main helpers of Schleiermacher, who (1768-1834) was one of the ablest of the 19th-century theologians, in Germany were Claus Harms (1778-1855), E. G. Bengel (1769-1826), grandson of J. A. Bengel, the man who was the one "on that side of the bank of the river" (Dan. 12:5), F. V. Reinhard (1753-1812) and August Hahn (1792-1863), and in England were W. Paley (1743-1805) and Richard Watson (1737-1816). All of these taught and wrote works refutative of rationalism and in support of the Bible as a Divine revelation. This supernaturalism movement began in 1793, twelve

years before it became the most prominent Divinely favored movement in Christendom, through the publication of G. C. Storr's book, *Theological Notes For Kant's Philosophical Doctrine On Religion* (twelve years ... reign, 2 Kings 21:1; 2 Chro. 33:1).

(38) It was the ascendant movement from 1805 to 1860 (fifty-five years in Jerusalem, 1; 1). The disposition that developed it was its delight in the Bible as the Divine revelation (mother's name was Hephzibah, *my delight is in her*, 1). But this movement in its first phase, 1805-1825, which was closed by Schleiermacher's joining the union of the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches of Prussia, shortly after he had issued a final blast against rationalism's depreciation of Bible doctrines. During these 20 years this movement was guilty of much evil (did evil ... Lord, 2; 2) along the lines of human depravity in sin, error, selfishness and worldliness (abominations of the heathen ... cast out ... Israel, 2; 2). It developed denominations in England and Germany against the non-sectarian spirit of the Bible recension, publishing and distribution movement (built ... high places which Hezekiah ... destroyed, 3; 3) and developed power-grasping and lording Churches in Britain and Germany (altars for Baal [*lord*]; Baalim [*lords*]) and favored union of state and church in both countries (made a grove; groves), even as absolutism in state united state and church in Christendom (as did Ahab [*father's brother*] ... Israel, 3), and was subject to the clergy and hierarchy in both countries (host of heaven) and furthered them (served them). Through the unionistic efforts to bring the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches into one body, it created new churches in various of the German states; for many of the two Churches in various of the German states refused to join the union in those states, which resulted in a number of new church sects being formed (built altars, 4; 4), whereas God desired His character to dwell in His real Church, which was in the executive sphere of the most favored

movement (Lord said, In Jerusalem ... name). Yea, it developed churches as numerous as the clergy desired (altars ... host of heaven), both for the higher and the lower clergy (two courts ... Lord). Moreover, it laid very much stress on the doctrine of eternal torment (son pass through the fire in the valley of ... Hinnom [*wailing*], 6; 6). It observed sectarian anniversaries, like the tercentenary anniversaries of the Lutheran and Zwinglian reformations, *e.g.*, Claus Harms at that Lutheran anniversary republished Luther's 95 theses with 95 very sectarian ones of his own (observed times). It advocated with too much emphasis ununderstandable doctrines, like the trinity, the God-man, *etc.*, that had a benumbing effect upon men's minds (used enchantments). It dealt in much Satanic error (witchcraft, ;6) and had special dealings with the doctrine of the consciousness of the dead (familiar spirits) and with teachers of gross error (wizards), all of this resulting in much evil, unto enwrathing God against it (wickedness ... Lord ... to anger), expressed in condign punishment.

(39) Moreover, it set up as a creedal doctrine the theory and practice of the union of state and church (graven image of the grove; the idol ... made, 7; 7), which it set up in the Church (in the house of God), even in the true Church and God's real movements, which God had revealed to the Apostles and the Interim star-members that it should be the Church and the executorship of His choice from among the Gospel-Age nominal Israel (house ... chosen ... Israel), as that wherein He would set His character and honor (put my name for ever [for the Age]). Furthermore, God had pledged that He would not remove antitypical Israel from the sphere of the Truth, its Spirit and ministry bestowed upon their predecessors (make the feet of Israel move ... land ... fathers, 8; 8), on condition that they observed all His commands, precepts and arrangements (observe ... all ... commanded ... law ... statutes and the

ordinances) which God gave by Jesus' hand (hand of Moses). The supernaturalistic movement (Manasseh, 9; 9) caused the consecrated and the supporters of the sphere of the executorship of God's more favored people to go astray in doctrine and practice more than the depraved dispositions of the leaders of former more favored movements of God's people had done (seduced ... Judah ... Jerusalem to err ... worse than the heathen), which God had enabled His favored people to drive out of their minds, hearts and will (destroyed ... Israel, 9; 9).

(40) God raised up servants who protested against such evils. Men like Neander, the great Church historian, "the father of modern Church History"; Tholuck, the pious Bible exponent and advocate of Christlikeness; Hengstenberg, the exegete and enemy of all rationalistic advocates and higher criticism; Ullmann, the historian and apologist of Christ's sinlessness; Julius Mueller, who wrote against the sins of the times; Lange, the commentator and author of one of the ablest lives of Christ, and Dorner, the opponent of the doctrine that this life ends probation, with many supporters, chastised the aberrations of the erring supernaturalists. Some of them chastised some of the involved evils of these; others of them chastised others of these evils, until the evils of antitypical Manasseh were all rebuked, and they did this as servants of the Lord (spake by his servants, 10;). They pointed out how evil supernaturalism had committed all these evils (Manasseh ... abominations, 11;), sinning even worse than the earlier unconverted sinners (wickedly above ... Amorites [*highlanders*] ... before him), even leading God's more favored people to sin with their creeds (Judah ... idols). In view of these evils God, as Israel's Covenant God, declared (thus saith the Lord, 12;) that He would bring evil upon His more favored people and the sphere of their executorship (Jerusalem and Judah) in a way that would fully astound its hearers (heareth ... ears shall tingle). God

would treat it just as He had treated the sphere of executorship of His less favored people (stretch ... Samaria [*guard*], 13;), judging it as He had judged Anglicanism in its various phases (plummet ... Ahab [*father's brother, i.e., paternal uncle*]), making a thorough work of it and completely reversing its position (wiping it, and turning it upside down).

(41) He also said that He would forsake those spared from the destruction (forsake ... inheritance, 14;), delivering them into the hands of Satan, their real enemy, and his cohorts (deliver ... enemies), who would treat them as booty and plunder (a prey and spoil ... enemies), and that because in matters pertaining to Him (in my sight, 15;) they had greatly sinned (done ... evil), to the degree of enwrathing God (provoking me to anger), even as former unfaithful spiritual Israelites had done, after they had exercised repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus (fathers came forth out of Egypt), a course that had marked such throughout the Gospel Age up to the time of antitypical Manasseh (even unto this day). Moreover, various representatives of antitypical Manasseh had wickedly refuted and misled into apostasy harmless spiritual Israelites in great numbers (shed much innocent blood, 16;) everywhere in its sphere of executorship (Jerusalem from one end to another), and that in addition to its evils before mentioned against the Lord's more favored people (beside his sin ... to sin ... evil) in matters pertaining to the Lord (sight of the Lord). Despite God's many remonstrances against the course of the unfaithful supernaturalistic leaders and their adherents; they would not give obedience to His rebukes and warnings (Lord spake ... people, ;10), but continued on in their evils, so disobedient were they (would not hearken).

(42) Their impenitence provoked the Lord to bring retribution upon the earlier supernaturalistic leaders and ledlings, especially upon the former (Lord brought upon them, ;11); for He allowed the historico-critical

rationalists, led by DeWette, the higher critics of the Tuebingen school, led by F. C. Baur, the rationalistic supernaturalists, whose leader was Baumgarten-Curtius, and who put reason and the Bible on a par as sources of faith and practice, speculative dogmaticians, whose leader was Daub, professor at Heidelberg, and outright infidelism, whose leader was D. F. Strauss, with numerous followers, to make at Satan's charge inroads on the first phase of the supernaturalists (captains of the host ... Assyria) and by their sharp theories (among the thorns [literally, with a ring, *i.e.*, through the lip—subdued and controlled their teachings]) to take captive the first phase of supernaturalism and with their errors to restrain their activities and conduct (bound him with fetters), *e.g.*, Schleiermacher was by these moved to deny inspiration to certain Biblical books, to be infected with pantheism, to endorse the union of Lutheranism and Calvinism and the union of state and church and to dabble in politics. Other leaders of the earlier supernaturalism followed him in these matters. These all became captives in Babylon, *i.e.*, servants of Satan in the nominal church (carried him to Babylon). In this captivity they were greatly afflicted (in affliction, ;12) by the various forms or schools of error mentioned above. And by these afflictions they were brought to repentance and sought the Lord, beseeching Him to forgive and reinstate them into His favor as the leaders of His more favored people (besought the Lord). Deeply did they humble themselves as to the Lord's matters (humbled themselves greatly before the Lord). Their prayers were intense, expressed in their hard labors to regain the lost Truth and to make further advances in the unfolding Truth and in spreading it (prayed unto him, ;13). The God of all grace and mercy was appeased toward them (entreated of him) and graciously favored them with forgiveness (heard his supplication) and restoration to the office of supernaturalism in an executorship capacity (brought him to Jerusalem

into his kingdom). Among the Apocryphal books is one alleged to be the prayer of Manasseh; but it is unnecessary for us to enter into an exposure of its fraudulent character. These experiences taught the supernaturalists to have a right appreciation of God so far as it was then due for them to have it (knew ... he was God).

(43) Now came the time for the true supernaturalists to function in their office as such, which in the type is represented by Manasseh's reformatory works; for now Neander, whose motto was, "It is the heart that makes a theologian," Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Ullmann, Miller, Lange, Dorner, *etc.*, came forward into battle for the supernatural nature of the Bible and its teachings, though it was not yet due to see the Truth thereon as in the Parousia and Epiphany. They erected strong defenses for the genuineness of the Apostolic and Gospel histories and writings. Neander did this in his life of Jesus and history of the Apostles, especially against Strauss' and Baur's heresies thereon. Tholuck did this in a genuine representation of Jesus' character against those who alleged Him to have been a sinful man. Ullmann did the same very effectively in his book on the sinlessness of Jesus, which also dealt a death-blow to the denial of His virgin birth. Hengstenberg did magnificent work in his defense of the books of the Pentateuch, Psalms, Daniel and Zechariah and Jesus' Messiahship, against the first school of higher critics. Miller overthrew the superficial views of sin and man's ability without the Savior to overcome it. Lange followed the lines of all of these in his life of Jesus and Bible Commentary; and Dorner gave a hard blow to the doctrine of eternal torment and no future probation. And they made these strong defenses for the Old and New Testament truths as far as then due, by many secular facts and histories, and thereby defended the position of Jesus and the Apostles (built a wall without ... David, ;14) on Old Testament history and Truth and practice (west side of Gihon), making

them intelligible to the pastors and teachers (fish gate). They insisted on the leadership and rulership of our Lord as to executory matters (Ophel). They exalted to a high degree these powers of the sphere of executorship (very great height) and appointed controversial leaders of their own mind in the various denominations where they had influence (put captains ... fenced cities of Judah). They set aside the idols of sin and error (strange gods, ;15), repudiated the doctrine of union of state and church (the idol ... house of the Lord [compare with 2 Kings 21:7]) and repudiated the sectarian churches as the true church in favor of the Church invisible, the former of which the first phase of supernaturalism had erected as the true Church in the sphere of its executorship (mount ... Jerusalem), and allowed them no more to remain in the sphere of its executorship (cast ... city). These and other Biblical scholars dealt to higher criticism of the New Testament a death-blow and certainly caused the disintegration of the Tuebingen school in its rejection of New Testament books, *e.g.*, Baur rejected all the New Testament books, except Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians and Revelation, claiming of the others that they fraudulently originated after the middle of the second century—a real higher critic.

(44) These true supernaturalists refuted the idea that the nominal church, which they called the visible church, was the real Church and proved unanswerably that the true Church consisted of the faithful only, regardless of the denominations where they were; and this true Church especially Neander, who swayed more influence for good over theologians and pastors than any other theological professor since the days of Luther and Melancthon, emphatically stressed; and he and Tholuck exerted themselves to the utmost to bring their students to repentance, faith and consecration, their pertinent labors therein being blessed by God; and to this day their writings are edifying (repaired the altar of the Lord, ;16). They ministered character

development to the faithful, encouraging them to carry out their consecration. They brought literally thousands to justification and consecration (sacrificed thereon peace offerings and thank offerings) and encouraged God's more favored people to serve the Lord in spreading and living the then due Truth; and in this they were ably supported by their brethren named in the preceding paragraph (Judah to serve ... Israel). But we are not to understand that they made saints of all in Germany, for many of those who sympathized with the teachings and works of the supernaturalists still continued to remain in the denominations and to serve there (the people did sacrifice still in the high places, ;17), intending it as a service of God (unto God only), which proves that they did not take part in the Second Advent movement, led in America by Wm. Miller, in Europe by the celebrated missionary Wolff, whose work extended into Asia, and in the work of the cleansed sanctuary. Thus we see that the supernaturalist movement was not a Little Flock movement, but was one led mainly by crown-losers. In its good part its conflicts correspond to Saul's and Jonathan's victory over the Philistines, as previously shown in this book in the Chapter on Samuel and Saul.

(45) Many other things in vindication of the Bible that the good supernaturalists did, also those that the evil supernaturalists did, with their many wrongs, are written in the works of Church historians, like Nippold, Kurtz, Sheldon, Newman, Hagenbach, Dryer, Baum-Geyer, Fisher (rest ... Manasseh ... his sin ... kings of Judah ... Israel, 17; 18). Their repentance and prayer are likewise set forth by the more favored people's Church historians, some of whom were just mentioned (prayer unto God, ;18); and the protestations made against their evils by men like Neander, Tholuck, Ullmann, Lange, *etc.*, are also thus set forth (the words of the seers ... name of the Lord, ;18). These are described by other preachers and writers of repentance (book of the kings of Israel, ;18).

These gave details as to their penitential confessions and labors (prayer, ;19), on how God was appeased toward them, with an unambiguous description of their wrongs and transgressions (sins, and his trespass, ;19), of their support of sects (built high places) and work for union of state and church (set up groves) and advocacy of creeds (graven images) in the first phase of their activity before their repentance (before he was humbled, ;19). These are all found among the sayings and writings of preachers and writers of repentance (written among the sayings of the seers, ;19). This movement, like its predecessors among God's more favored people, ceased being the chief movement among God's more favored people, and that in 1860 (slept with his fathers, 18; 20). They have been held in respect for their strong fruitfulness in their sphere of service (garden of Uzza [*strength*] ... in his own house, 18; 20). And the movement was succeeded by the Y.M.C.A. and other young people's movements (Amon [*builder*] his son reigned in his stead, 18; 20).

(46) The Y.M.C.A. movement became the ascendant movement in 1860. As an ideal it arose in the mind and practice of Sir George Williams in 1838, in Bridgewater, England, where he became deeply imbued with a religious spirit 22 years before the movement became the ascendant one among God's more favored people (Amon was twenty and two years ... to reign, 19; 21). It remained such a movement for two years, *i.e.*, from 1860 until 1862 (reigned two years [the parallel years were 661-659 B.C.]), in executorship (in Jerusalem, 19; 21). Sir George Williams founded the first Y.M.C.A. in 1844, in London, making his fellow trade employees members of it. The movement spread to young men of other trades, first in different parts of London, then it spread over Britain, Ireland, Australia, India, France, Switzerland and other parts of Europe. It also spread to America, *etc.*, first at Boston, 1851, next at New York, 1852.

Its full members, who alone had the right to vote and hold office, had to profess faith in Christ as Savior and Lord and belong to an evangelical church; but later associate members were accepted without professing faith in Christ as Savior and Lord or membership in an evangelical church. It established reading rooms, libraries, gymnasiums, athletic rooms and fields, educational and lecture courses, religious meetings and Bible classes, boarding houses, dormitories, employment bureaus and special workers to visit the sick, hold religious services in shops, *etc.* But it was not long until the associate members thoroughly secularized the Y.M.C.A. By April, 1860, it had in North America 203 associations and about 25,000 members. Its members, full and associate, took a prominent part in the American Civil War for the help of the soldiers on both sides, ever becoming more and more secular. And in America and various other countries it in a unionistic manner affiliated with all Protestant Churches and absorbed or countenanced their evils. Its developing thought was carefully by goodness to cultivate friendship among its members and the so-called Evangelical Churches (his mother's name was Meshullemeth [*friend*], Haruz [*careful*], Jotbah [*goodness*], 19;), but by its secularization and the various evils in the sects to which it required its full members to belong, it became the aider and abettor of all their evils (did ... evil, 20; 22) in matters pertaining to the Lord (sight of the Lord), even in the same ways as the first or bad form of the supernaturalists did (as did Manasseh, 20; 22). It became guilty of all such sins, because of its own secularization and the evils of the sects, membership in which it required of its full members (walked ... his father walked, 21;), serving in these sects their creeds (sacrificed ... carved images ... father had made, and served them, ;22) and yielding itself to all the evil qualities of the bad supernaturalists (idols that his father served, 21;).

(47) However, unlike the good supernaturalists, it

did not repent of its evils and turn to good (humbled not himself, ;23) in matters pertaining to the Lord (before the Lord), after the example of the good supernaturalists (as Manasseh ... humbled himself. ;23). It apostatized from the principles of the Lord's Word (forsook the Lord God of his fathers, 22;), and did not direct its steps in the teachings of God's Word (walked not in the way of the Lord, 22;), but continued to increase in violations of the Lord's Word (trespassed more and more, ;23), *e.g.*, when part of its members supported the Confederate army and part of them supported the Union army, thus encouraging the soldiers of each side to fight against the other in fratricidal conflict, it greatly increased its trespasses. Doubtless some of their members, like D. L. Moody, did not pursue this course in each army, but the bulk of them did. Some of them consulted together, not only as respects its course as to the Civil War, but also as respects its general course of siding with the so-called Evangelical sects and thus partaking of their evils, agitated against it in its evil policies and refuted them (his servants conspired against him ... slew the king, 23; 24) as it was engaged in these spheres of its activities (in his own house). But such a consultation and refutation was abhorrent to the common people (people of the land, 24; 25) and even the general run of the Y.M.C.A.'s full and associate members, and they vehemently disapproved such consultation and refutation and in turn refuted these in their course and secured their dismissal from the Association (slew all ... conspired against king Amon). Such common people made the evangelistic movement the ascendant one among God's more favored people (people ... made Josiah, *Jehovah heals*, his son king in his stead, 24; 25). Other acts of the Y.M.C.A. are recorded in histories and encyclopedias of the more favored movements of God's people (rest of the acts ... chronicles ... Judah, 25;). After the Y.M.C.A. ceased to be the more favored ascendant movement, it

was given respectful treatment in the strong (Uzza) sphere of its fruitfulness (in the garden, 25;).

(48) The Evangelistic movement had as its earthly leader Bro. D. L. Moody (1837-1899), one of the greatest evangelists of the entire Gospel Age. Indeed, in its various features as typed by Josiah, *Jehovah heals*, in the Scriptures cited above under our subject, he was always its leading spirit. He was undoubtedly a consecrated brother of tireless zeal, full of good works and of practical common sense. Like our Pastor and the great Spurgeon of London, he was a self-educated man, having only a common school education, with no college or university diploma. The poverty of his widowed mother, who, when he was only four years old (1841) was widowed, gave him little chance for secular education. For years after he had become the world's greatest living evangelist his speech was quite ungrammatical and his bodily carriage quite clumsy. He consecrated at 17 years of age, in 1854, at Boston, whither he had but recently gone for work from his farm home near Northfield, Mass. (eight years old, 2 K. 22:1; 2 C. 34:1). So uncouth were his language and manners that, despite his evident earnestness, it was said that some of the cultured in the church counseled him to be silent in the testimony meetings. Some doubt is cast on this having been done to him in Boston, but it certainly was done to him in Chicago. It was undoubtedly due to his lack of culture that his request to become a member of the old Mount Vernon Congregational Church at Boston was denied, when it was first made; but it was granted a year later, after he had undergone instruction at the hands of the church's pastor and elders. And seven years later, in 1862, he began that course in his career which made the evangelistic movement the ascendant one in Christendom, and that in the Union army as a representative of the Y.M.C.A., in which he worked after his removal to Chicago from Boston in 1856. And unlike most Y.M.C.A. representatives in the Union and

Confederate armies, he attended strictly to his evangelistic work coupled with his merciful relief of wounded soldiers. Thus it was in the outstart of his army service in 1862 that he began his work of leading the evangelistic movement, which he did for 31 years (reigned thirty and one years in Jerusalem, 1; 1). The Parallel years were April 659—April 628 B.C. and April 1862—April 1893 A.D.; and the evangelistic movement was developed by the thoughts that God and His people loved it (Jedidah [*beloved*], 1;) and that God adorned it with needed knowledge and grace (Adaiah [*adorned by Jehovah*], 1;).

(49) The evangelistic movement was one of the most righteous movements of God's more favored people (did ... right, 2; 2) in its relations to God (in the sight of the Lord, 2; 2) and followed strictly the evangelistic course of the Apostles (walked ... David 2; 2) as its ancestors (father, 2; 2). It avoided a too conservative (turned not ... right) and a too liberal course (left, 2; 2). This evangelistic movement was first active in Chicago and in the far-flung vicinity of Chicago. It started in real earnest in the Spring of 1869, while it was yet quite undeveloped (eighth year ... while yet young, ;3), at an Illinois county Sunday School convention, where Bro. Moody preached a fervent sermon, after which he announced that an inquiry meeting would be held in the town school house, which became crowded with inquiries, and the meetings, continuing a week, made many converts. From this small beginning the evangelistic movement started out conquering and to conquer. It actually went into high gear along Apostolic lines in 1870. This occurred in Bro. Ira D. Sankey's accepting Bro. Moody's invitation to become his colaborer, the latter to do the evangelistic work by preaching, and the former to do the evangelistic work by singing, for Bro. Sankey had a wonderfully sympathetic baritone voice of great sweetness and power. It was the union of these two consecrated brothers that increased the evangelistic

movement to serve the Lord in great heartiness along Apostolic lines (to seek after the God of David his father, ;3). These two true yokefellows labored together in Chicago and vicinity with great evangelistic success. In 1873 Bro. Moody, who had twice before visited Britain, decided in response to several pastoral invitations to wage an aggressive evangelistic campaign in England, Scotland and Ireland, declaring that he would by God's help make 10,000 converts there. Accordingly, he and Bro. Sankey left the U.S. for England, arriving there in September, 1873 (twelfth year—April 1873—April 1874); and for two years did an evangelistic work almost without an equal up to that time since the days of the Apostles (in the twelfth year, ;3). Only the great revival movement led by the two Wesleys and Whitefield in the 18th century exceeded it in magnitude (23:22; 35:18).

(50) Bro. Moody did not mince words and acts in his denunciation of sin and error, neither in America nor among his associates in executive matters (Judah and Jerusalem, ;3), where he denounced denominationalism (high places), the illicit unions of the (nominal) church and the world (groves), false doctrine (carved images) and creedism (molten images). He utterly refuted power-grasping and lording churches (brake down the altars of Baalim [*lords*], ;4) that were before him (in his presence); and the creeds that were exalted over these churches (the images ... above them) he utterly undermined (cut down); and the above-mentioned unions (groves), false doctrines (carved images) and creedisms (molten images) he by Scripture, reason and facts pulverized (brake ... dust) and dishonored by these the memories of those who served them (strowed ... graves ... sacrificed unto them). The evangelistic movement thus destroyed the relics of their leaders (burnt the bones ... altars, ;5) in their churches, and so did it cleanse the more favored people's sphere in America (Judah) and their sphere of executorship (Jerusalem). This it also did

among the churches of Scotland (Manasseh, ;6), England (Ephraim), Wales (Simeon) and Protestant Ireland (Naphtali); for two years (1873-1875) Bros. Moody and Sankey labored in these lands, converting approximately 50,000 people, infusing a more spiritual life among the consecrated, reforming sinners, including thousands of drunkards, unto justification, and undermining with strong refutative Biblical arguments the above-mentioned evils (with their mattocks round about). Its work was done in all the large cities of Britain and Ireland; sometimes its audiences numbered 25,000, *e.g.*, at London. It was only after it had waged such campaigns in all the large cities of these countries, and had done its work of decimating (had broken down, ;7) in the minds of multitudes the false churches (altars) and unions of the (nominal) church and the world (groves) and had pulverized false doctrines (graven images into powder) and overthrown sin and error (cut down the idols) throughout Great Britain and Ireland (throughout ... Israel), that it in the persons of Bros. Moody and Sankey returned to its sphere of executorship in America (returned to Jerusalem).

(51) Between April 1879 and April 1880 (eighteenth year, 3; 8), after it had well nigh finished its fight against evil (purged the land, ;8) under the lead of Bro. Moody, the evangelistic movement started a series of educational movements that had as its heart to inculcate knowledge of the Bible as the great educator of Christians. This was started by the founding of a seminary for the training of young women at Northfield, Mass., not only in secular, but especially in Bible knowledge, through believing directors and teachers (Shaphan [*rabbit*, in allusion to the secular studies that they taught]; Azaliah [*near Jehovah*, in allusion to the Biblical knowledge that they taught]; Meshullam [*friend*; these directors and teachers were friendly to the objects of the school], 3; 8). This educational movement was intended to build up Christianity after

the ideals of Bro. Moody, and it sought to enlist into its help the leading crown-losers of America (go up to Hilkiah [*portion of Jehovah*, in allusion to their relation to God], 4; 9). A little later, 1881, Bro. Moody founded the Mt. Hermon School for young men, whose teachers and directors, of like mind to those of the Northfield Seminary, were as such more influential than the first set and were by the movement sent to enlist into its help the same leading crown-losers of America (Maaseiah [*work of Jehovah*] the governor of the city, ;8). Still later it by Bro. Moody founded at Chicago the Moody Bible Institute for home and foreign missions. Its teachers and directors (Joah [*Jehovah's brother*, in allusion to the consecrated character of its teachers and directors]; Joahaz [*Jehovah possesses*], ;8) also were sent to enlist the support of the leading crown-losers in America, and to help them apply Bible teachings to the development of the church as they saw it (to repair the house ... God), requesting them to sum up the Bible teachings of this movement given the Lord's people (sum the silver ... house of the Lord, 4;). These truths had been gathered together by those minor leaders who introduced people into the temple's court (keepers ... gathered, 4;), especially those gotten from Bros. Moody's and Sankey's Scotch and English, Irish and Welsh visit in 1873-1875 (hand of Manasseh and Ephraim ... remnant of Israel, ;9), as well as from America and Canada (Judah and Benjamin), after which they went to their sphere of executorship (Jerusalem, ;9).

(52) Such truths they were to deliver, first, to those in charge of the work of repairing the house of God (deliver ... doers ... oversight of the house ... to repair ... house, 5;; Put it in the hand ... oversight of the house, ;10) and, secondly, to those working under their charge (gave ... workmen ... in the house ... to repair and amend, 5; 10). Some of these wrought in justification matters (carpenters, 6;), some on putting brethren in their proper place (builders, 6;)

and some on developing new creatures (masons, 6;), who by their labors and truths were to acquire justified ones (buy timber, 6; 11) and Spirit-begotten ones (hewn stones, 6; 11), so as to make good repairs on God's house (repair the house, 6;). Such chargees gave these truths to the workers in justified matters (artificers, ;11) and to those who wrought on the developers of justified and sanctified ones (builders, ;11), the justified ones being intended to serve as connectors for the consecrated (couplings, ;11) and to give a firm footing for the worshipers, which certain movements had undone (to floor ... destroyed, ;11). So faithfully did the colaborers work that they were not creed-bound in their teachings (no reckoning ... money ... dealt faithfully, 7; 12). Bible (Jahath [*united*], ;12) and other religious book publishers (Obadiah [*servant of God*]) superintended the publishing work (Merari, ;12), while Bible expounders (Zechariah [*remembrancers of Jehovah*]) and historians (Meshullam [*friend*]) as scholars (Kohathites) used their offices to prosper the cause (set it forward, ;12). Additionally, those who could deliver discourses rendered help (Levites ... skill ... musick, ;12). These presided over the work of lowlier helpers (over bearers of burdens, ;13). In fact, these were superintendents of all who served in any capacity (overseers ... wrought ... service). Moreover, of the less prominent workers (Levites) some were scholars (scribes), some superintendents (officers) and some those who led people to justification (porters, ;13).

(53) As the chargees were dispensing the truths that were brought to the justified and consecrated (brought out the money ... house of the Lord, ;14) the chief crown-losers (Hilkiah) found the Bible given by Christ to be a neglected and disobeyed book (found ... law ... Moses, ;14). These, first of all, brought the Bible to the attention of the teachers and directors of the Northfield Seminary (said unto Shaphan the scribe, 8; 15), declaring that they had found

it neglected and disobeyed in God's house (found ... law ... Lord); and they put it into the hands of these teachers and directors (gave ... delivered to Shaphan, 8; 15). These made a study and interpretation of it (read it, 8;). These brought this neglected and disobeyed book to the attention of the entire evangelistic movement (came to the king; carried the book to the king, 9; 16). They reported that all the teachers and directors of the three institutions had done as charged and were delivering their truths found among God's people (gathered the money ... house; all committed ... they do, 9; 16) to the superintending collaborators and their helpers (delivered ... do the work, 9; 17). Thereupon the teachers and directors of the Northfield Seminary reported to the evangelistic movement that the leading crown-losers had delivered to them the Bible as a book long lost beneath the traditions of men and as recently rediscovered (Shaphan shewed the king ... delivered me a book, 10; 18). The study of the Bible and its interpretation by the teachers and directors of the Northfield Seminary was by them presented to the evangelistic movement (Shaphan read ... king). The effect was greatly to sadden the evangelistic movement into deep repentance at the prevalent non-use and non-practice of the Bible (king had heard ... rent his clothes, 11; 19). And this movement urged the crown-lost leaders, who usually met at the annual summer conference at Northfield (Hilkiah, 12; 20), the Student Volunteer leaders, who also met annually in the summer conference at Northfield (Ahikam [*my brother stands*]), the teachers of the Mt. Hermon school (Abdon [*servile*]; Micah [*godlike*], 12; 20), both the teachers and directors of the Northfield Seminary (Shaphan the scribe) and the teachers of the Chicago Moody Institute for home and foreign missionaries (Asaiah [*whom the Lord made*]) to make diligent search of the Lord's will pertinent to the gross neglect of the Bible on its and the people's behalf (enquire ... for me ... people ... Judah ... left in Israel, 13; 21);

for it feared that God's displeasure thereover was very great (great is the wrath ... kindled ... poured out), since the people's predecessors had not faithfully obeyed the Word (our fathers have not hearkened ... kept the word) as it was written in the Bible (to do according ... written, 13; 21).

(54) These five groups (Hilkiah ... Asahiah; they that the king had appointed, 14; 22) made diligent search in the teachings of foolish-virgin students of prophecy (went unto Huldah [*weasel*] the prophetess), who made special study of the Day of Vengeance passages (wife of Shallum [*revenge*]), in which they hoped for a better day, the Millennium (Tikvah [*hope*]), but were poor in the knowledge of the Truth (Harhas [*poor*]), though they diligently had, as their charge, the graces (keeper of the wardrobe). This group of foolish-virgin students was highly placed in the sphere of the executorship of God's more favored people (dwelt ... in the college). These messengers of the evangelistic movement diligently studied the views of these foolish-virgin students of prophecy (communed with ... spake to her to that effect, 14; 22). The latter declared to the former their understanding of the Lord's mind on the pertinent matter (she ... Thus saith the Lord, 15; 23) to be told their sender (Tell the man that sent you to me). Men like A. T. Pearson, F. B. Meyer, Joseph Seiss, A. J. Gordon, *etc.*, spoke and wrote a great deal on the Day of Vengeance. These were a part of antitypical Huldah, but their erroneous views on most of the matters as to the end of this Age are indicated in the meaning of Huldah (weasel, an unclean animal). However, they understood that the great tribulation, as being the trouble of the Day of Vengeance, was not far off. These informed the messengers by their writings and addresses that God was going to overthrow Christendom (I will bring evil ... inhabitants thereof, 16; 24), according to the Bible's teachings (even all the words; curses ... in the book), even as the evangelistic movement had heard

explained (king ... read, 16; 24). This was to come because God's nominal people had proven untrue to God (forsaken me, 17; 25), had used their human all in the service of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness (incense unto other gods), to the end that they enraptured God against them (provoke me to anger) with their evil deeds (works of their hands). For this reason God's wrath was aroused against His nominal people and their sphere of executorship (kindled; poured out) and would not cease until it had done away with them as such (not be quenched, 17; 25).

(55) But these foolish-virgin students of prophecy had a word of comfort for the evangelistic movement, which sent the inquirers to them (king ... enquire ... thus shall ye say to him, 18; 26), *viz.*, that the Bible indicated (Thus saith the Lord) as to the teaching that it had heard (words ... heard) that its conscience was tender (heart was tender, 19; 27) and its disposition humble (hast humbled thyself) on hearing God's pertinent Word (heardest ... against this place ... inhabitants thereof), that they should be desolated and accursed (desolation and a curse), on account of which it abased itself, lost its spirit of joy and exercised heart's grief (humbledest ... rent thy clothes and wept, 19; 27), hence God regarded it with favor (heard thee). These foolish-virgin students of prophecy forecast that the Lord would bring the evangelistic movement as the ascendant one to an end before the great tribulation would destroy Christendom and the sphere of its executorship and that that movement would prosper to the end of its ascendancy (gather thee ... in peace, 20; 28), that its end would be in respect (grave) and that it would not experience the forecast punishment upon Christendom and its sphere of executorship (eyes shall not see all the evil ... this place) and upon all the supporters of that sphere (inhabitants of the same, ;28). This message those sent to inquire thereover brought back to the evangelistic movement (brought ... again, 20; 28). The seriousness

of this situation very greatly impressed the evangelistic movement, especially its leader, Bro. Moody, and it gathered all the leaders of God's more favored people and of the sphere of its executorship (gathered ... elders of Judah and of Jerusalem, 23:1; 29). The movement and all the stronger ones of God's more favored people and all leaders of its sphere of executorship went among God's people (king ... house ... men of Judah ... Jerusalem, 2; 30), together with the main and subordinate leaders, its preachers and all its great and small supporters (priests, and the prophets ... Levites ... people ... both great and small). To these this movement expounded the Bible's teachings newly discovered, but long neglected respecting consecration (read ... words ... covenant which was found ... Lord).

(56) Thereupon the evangelistic movement, Bro. Moody leading therein, in its office as such (king stood by a pillar ... in his place, 3; 31) solemnly vowed to keep the covenant of sacrifice (made a covenant) in matters of the Lord (before the Lord), to keep His teachings in harmony with the Bible's types and rules of practice (commandments ... statutes) wholeheartedly and wholesouledly (heart ... soul) and to carry out their consecrations according to the Bible (covenant ... book). The movement did this work in evangelistic meetings held in churches, workshops, Y.M.C.A. buildings, large auditoriums, in meetings for the Student Volunteer Movement held in colleges and at special annual gatherings of students' conferences and Christian Workers' conferences at Northfield and in the three above-mentioned educational institutions founded by Bro. Moody—all this being done under Bro. Moody's direction. By these and personal effort means this movement aroused an exceptionally large number of people to consecration. Our readers will remember that our Pastor wrote that it was through the Moody evangelistic movement that the Lord called large numbers to consecration, thereby

completing provisionally the fulness of the Gentiles by 1878 and 1881, the work taking place in the U.S. and Canada (caused all ... in Jerusalem and Benjamin to stand to it; stood to the covenant, 3; 32). Especially did the supporters of the sphere of its executorship take the matter of consecration very deeply to heart and life (inhabitants of Jerusalem ... covenant ... God of their fathers, ;32). Not only so, but the movement charged the chief crown-lost leaders and second degree prominent leaders (commanded Hilkiah ... priests of the second order, 4;) and evangelists (keepers of the door) to put away from God's people (out of the temple) all power-grasping and lording teachings (vessels ... for Baal) and those on the union of the church with the world (for the grove) and those in the interests of a clergy class (host of heaven).

(57) By its teachings it decimated these outside of the supporters of its sphere of executorship (burned them without Jerusalem) in the condition of human corruption, where they belonged (fields of Kidron [*turbid*]), and showed that the memories of them belonged to the evils of sectarianism (ashes ... Bethel [(counterfeit) *house of God*], 4;). It denounced as officeless the power-grasping riches, ease and luxury loving clergy (put down the idolatrous priests, 5;) whom evil movements among God's more favored people had established to use their choice human powers to serve sectarian churches among God's more favored people and their supporters in executorship (whom kings of Judah ... burn ... high places ... Judah ... about Jerusalem), also those who served power-graspers and lords over God's heritage (Baal), the papacy ([counterfeit] sun), sectarian Protestantism ([counterfeit] moon), the denominations (planets) and the clergy (host of heaven, 5;). It cast out from God's people, outside the sphere of its executorship, the theory and practice of the union of the church and the world (brought out the grove ... without Jerusalem, 6;)

and assigned them to the condition of depravity and death (unto the brook Kidron). So set forth, it was utterly overthrown from the Word by the evangelistic movement (burned it ... Kidron) grinding it to dust (stamped it small to powder) and assigning it to death and corruption as being of the Adamic curse (cast ... graves ... people). It utterly refuted the efforts of the antichrist systems (Sodomites) to become one in united effort with those which claimed to be related to the church (by the house of the Lord, 7;); for in the service of such the churches made instruments of hiding the abominations of the union of the church and the world (women wove hangings for the grove). By its preaching it exposed publicly the leaders of the nominal church's sects (brought out ... cities of Judah) and proved the churches where such leaders served to be defiled (defiled the high places where the priests had burned incense), which it did throughout the sphere of God's more favored people from the nominal kingdom (Geba [*hill*], 8;) even to the defiled new creatures who yet were in the teachings of the covenant (Beer-sheba [*well of the oath*]). It also refuted in churches that publicly sought an entrance into the sphere of politics (high places ... entering ... Joshua the governor of the city) a union of church and world. Such churches stood in error and weakness as to how entrance was gotten into the sphere of executorship of God's more favored people (left hand at the gate of the city). The nominal-church leaders (priests of the high places, 9;) exercised no real ministry for the Lord (not up to the altar) in the sphere of executorship for God's more favored people (Lord in Jerusalem).

(58) These, nevertheless, partook of a measure of sincerity and Truth with those of minds like theirs (eat of the unleavened bread among their brethren, 9;). While Bro. Moody early in his career as an evangelist used the eternal torment theory to drive frightened sinners to repentance, during most of his career

as such he stressed the love of God and the death of Christ as its main manifestation to work in his hearers repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus, and thereby set forth eternal torment as a defiled thing (defiled Topheth [*place of burning*], 10;), which was the theory of those who taught eternal wailing (valley of the children of Hinnom [*wailing*]), and that to the end that no one should teach that their own were doomed to eternal torment (no man ... son or his daughter) to pass through the fire to Molech (*king* [error]). Moreover, it set aside the doctrines (took away the horses, 11;) that certain movements of God's more favored people had supported, favored by the papacy, *e.g.*, the mass, transubstantiation, auricular confession, self-atonement, justification by works (kings ... to the [counterfeit] sun), which were alleged to be the means of entering into relations with God (entering in ... the Lord) by the office (chamber) of the Romish priest as the alleged gift of the king (Nathan-melech [*gift of the king*]), whose work was to give alleged rest to their penitents and followers (chamberlain) and which were outside of the sphere of executorship of God's more favored people (suburbs), and it completely destroyed as of Biblical sanction the organizations of the papacy (burned ... [counterfeit] sun with fire). Also the churches that were in the height of the higher office that the corrupt Methodist movement (altars ... chamber of Ahaz, 12;) had made by movements of God's more favored people (kings of Judah had made) and the churches that the evil supernaturalist movement had made (Manasseh) for the nominal professors of Christianity and for the justified (two courts ... Lord) it overthrew as unbiblical (the king beat down) and displaced them therefrom (brake ... thence) and set forth their remembrances as being corrupt and dead (dust ... brook Kidron). The Romish churches (high places, 13;) which faced the sphere of executorship of God's more favored people (before Jerusalem), and which

were in favor of the corrupt kingdom of the papacy (right ... mount of corruption), which the papacy (Solomon) had erected for the illicit union of state and church (Ashtoreth [*star Venus*]) as the abomination of traffickers in religion, business and politics (Zidonians [*fishers*]), and for the Romanist hierarchy (Chemosh [*subduer*]) as the abomination of the autocrats (Moabites) and for eternal torment (Milcom, *king* [error]), the abomination of sectarian Protestantism (abomination ... Ammon [*son of my people*]), did the evangelistic movement prove Biblically to be vile and defiled (did the king defile).

(59) It utterly refuted creedisms (brake in pieces the images, 14;) as objects of worship, undermined Biblically the union of the church and the world (cut down the groves), and defiled them with the proof of their coming from the Adamic corruption (filled ... bones of men). Moreover, the church of many sects (altar at Bethel [(counterfeit) *house of God*], 15;) that the Lutherans introduced (high place which Jeroboam [*strife of the people*] ... Nebat [*view*] ... had made), the misleader of Protestantism (made Israel to sin), even both the Lutheran Church and its sects the evangelistic movement refuted (he brake down), utterly overthrowing the sects (burned the high place), and pulverized its position (stamped it small to powder) and overthrew its union with the world, especially with the state in Europe (burned the grove). Turning its attention to its history (turned himself, 16;) and perceiving the respect given its misleaders in Europe (spied the sepulchres ... mount), it charged those acquainted with its history to show disrespect to the memory of these misleaders (took the bones out) and blasted the memory and reputation of them in their church (burned them upon the altar) and rightly held it up as a polluted thing (polluted it), according to the teachings of Martin Bucer of Strassburg, whom God had sent from the Zwinglian movement to undo Lutheran sectarianism, denouncing its evils and sects

and stressing them as enemies of the Church (word of the Lord ... proclaimed ... proclaimed these words).

(60) As it considered the memories of those who had more or less to do with making Lutheranism sectarian, it came across the memory of Martin Bucer and asked after his character and acts (What title is that that I see?, 17;); and the leading sectarian Lutheran leaders (the men of the city) answered it that that was the memory of Martin Bucer, a servant of God, who came from the Zwinglian movement and forecast the acts that would be done against Lutheran sectarianism (sepulchre ... which came out of Judah) and forecast the things that the evangelistic movement had done against that sectarian church as the counterfeit house of God (proclaimed ... thou hast done ... Bethel). It left undisturbed and unpolluted the memory of Martin Bucer and charged others to do the same (let him alone; let no man move his bones, 18;), which charge was fulfilled (let his bones alone); and they left undisturbed the memories and refutations of those Lutheran leaders who desired fellowship with Martin Bucer (with the bones of the prophet that came out of Samaria [*guard*]). But it refuted all of the Lutheran bodies that maintained the Lutheran sects in its sectarianism (all the houses ... places ... cities of Samaria, 19;), even those that the movements of God's less favored people had raised up unto provoking the Lord (which the kings of Israel had made ... to anger), according to their deeds in sectarianism, a counterfeit church (did ... acts ... Bethel). And the leaders of these sects it refuted in their own churches (slew all the priests ... places ... upon the altars, 20;) and destroyed the revered memories of the leaders in their churches (burned men's bones upon them). Then it betook itself to its sphere of the executorship of God's more favored people (returned to Jerusalem). Moreover, those who dealt with the fallen angels (workers with familiar spirits, 24;) false teachers (wizards), creeds (images) and sin, selfishness

and worldliness (idols) and every other thing abhorrent to God and His faithful people wherever they showed themselves (abominations that were spied) in the sphere of God's more favored people and of its executorship (in ... Judah and in Jerusalem) the evangelistic movement put away, that it might fulfill the Word of God (perform ... the law ... book ... priest found ... of the Lord). Not only did it do this in its own sphere, but also in all the spheres of God's people (took away all of the abominations ... countries ... of Israel, ;33) and persuaded all in these spheres to serve God (present ... serve the Lord their God); and during the time of the evangelistic movement's ascendancy these ceased not to serve Jehovah, as their fathers' God (all his days ... from following ... the God of their fathers, ;33).

(61) In evangelistic zeal, devotion and efficiency there was no other movement among God's more favored people equal to it, as in zeal for recensioning, publishing and circulating the Bible there was no movement among God's more favored people equal to the antitypical Hezekiah movement (like unto him ... king before ... after him, 25;), for it turned to the Lord wholeheartedly, wholesouledly and wholemightedly (all his heart ... soul ... might), according to the gospel of Christ (according ... law of Moses). But despite its great devotion and service God was not swayed away from the severity of His punishment as a result of His displeasure against the sphere of His more favored people (turned not from ... wrath ... kindled against Judah, 26;). This was the case in view of the arousal of His displeasure at the sins (because of the provocations) that the bad supernaturalistic movement had committed unto stirring up God to severe punishment (Manasseh had provoked withal). So great was God's displeasure thereat that He forecast that He would send God's more favored people away from their sphere of Truth, its Spirit and its ministry, outside of His favor (said, I will remove

Judah also out of my sight, 27;), even as He had done to His less favored people (as I have removed Israel), yea, that He would cast off from His favor the sphere of His more favored people's executorship (cast off this city Jerusalem), despite the fact that He had chosen it (which I have chosen) as such, and despite the nominal people of God among whom He had set His honor, character and word (the house of which I said, My name shall be there).

(62) Moreover, the evangelistic movement by charge and example in its sphere of executorship laid the greatest stress in its preaching and singing upon the sacrifice of Christ as the ransom basis of justification and consecration, urging repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus as the Lamb of God that beareth the sins of the world, and upon this basis invited believers to consecrate (commanded all the people, saying, Keep the passover unto the Lord your God; kept a passover unto the Lord in Jerusalem, 21; 35:1) as a service to the Lord (unto the Lord, 21;), as this is charged in the Bible as to justification and especially consecration (written in the book of this covenant). They observed this in harmony with the Gospel Age's general call (killed ... fourteenth day of the first month, ;1); for while, in harmony with the 1845 years' parallel, the fulness of the Gentiles came in probationarily in April 1878, some of these called ones fell away shortly, so that by April 1879 to April 1880 (the eighteenth year, 23; 19) there was need of added calls, which went forth unto a final completion probationarily by Oct. 1881, when the general call ceased. It was especially in this time that God used the evangelistic movement under Bro. Moody's supervision to complete the general call, as our Pastor pointed out. It was this work that constituted the great passover of the evangelistic movement, beginning in the Spring of 1879 and typically set forth in 21-23; 35:1-19. Apart from the chronological setting of this passover in the parallel, we are led to understand the matter

as just explained from the fact that the number of the paschal lambs and bullocks of the burnt offering totals 41,400 (thus 30,000 + 2,600 + 5,000 lambs = 37,600 and 3,000 + 300 + 500 bullocks = 3,800, both kinds totaling 41,400, a multiple of 12); for divided by 12, the number of the Little Flock, the quotient is 3,450, which may mean that that many were called to the high calling in the 2½ years involved, thus ending the general call, Oct. 1881.

(63) The evangelistic movement arranged for the chief evangelists, who besides Bro. Moody included Bros. Sankey, (Major) Whipple, Pentecost, Stebbins, Dixon, Pitt, (Sam) Jones, (Sam) Small, *etc.*, to do each one's part in the work (set the priests in their charges, ;2); and it strengthened them to serve the Lord by their evangelistic addresses and other connected services (encouraged ... service ... of the Lord). Moreover, it encouraged the local pastors, inquiry workers and personal workers as the consecrated teachers of the Lord's people (said unto the Levites that taught ... holy, ;3) to put the due Truth where it belonged (Put the ark in the house), thus leaving all speculating and learned knowledge alone (not be a burden upon your shoulders), but to content themselves with the movements of the Interim star-members (Solomon ... did build), since these followed the Apostles as teachers and executors for the Lord (son of David king of Israel), and to give themselves wholeheartedly to the Lord's service in the interests of His people (serve ... God ... Israel). Furthermore, it urged these antitypical Levites in harmony with their work as preachers (Gershonites), literature publishers and distributors (Merarites) and students (Kohathites) (prepare ... houses of your fathers, ;4), in harmony with their forms of service (after your courses) and in harmony with the Apostolic writings (writing of David) and those of the Interim star-members (writing of Solomon). It impressed upon them to stand ready to serve in the Lord's temple according

to the particular service of their particular group, thus using their positions, everyone according to his talents, spirit of consecration and providential situation (stand ... according to the divisions ... fathers ... division ... Levites, ;5). Furthermore, it urged them, thus arranged, to set forth Christ as the slain Lamb, whose blood satisfied Justice for the believer and constituted his robe of righteousness (kill the passover, ;6), to set themselves apart from sin, error, selfishness and worldliness unto the Lord's will wholly (sanctify yourselves), and to assist their brethren that they may act according to God's Word set forth by the Lord Jesus as touching the antitypical Passover as firstborn ones (prepare your brethren ... do ... Moses).

(64) The evangelistic movement in its leaders did by far more than others in bringing hearers to justification, consecration and Spirit-begetting (Josiah gave ... lambs and kids ... thirty thousand, and three thousand bullocks, ;7), given by their laying down much of their lives (king's substance). These leaders sacrificed themselves most freely for the people (people, ;8), the main (priest) and the subordinate (Levites) leaders. The leading foolish-virgin workers and scholars, *e.g.* Arthur T. Pearson, A. J. Gordon, F. B. Meyer, *etc.* (Hilkiah), especially able supporting ministers, like Drs. Cuyler and Storrs, of Brooklyn, Hoyt of Philadelphia, Spurgeon of London, *etc.* (Zechariah), and especially helpful higher clergy, like Bishops Simpson (Methodist), Cheney (Episcopalian), Mallalieu (Methodist), *etc.* (Jehiel [*Jehovah lives*], rulers of the house of God), gave the leaders for the antitypical passover much help for justification, consecration and Spirit-begetting purposes (two thousand and six hundred [lambs]) and helps on God's demonstrating His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice (three hundred [bullocks]) as antitypical burnt offerings. Scholarly brothers (Conaniah [*prepared by Jehovah*], ;9), literature publishers and distributors (Shemaiah [*heard by Jehovah*]), missionary preachers (Nethaneel [*gift of God*]),

personal workers (Hashabiah [*regarded*]), inquiry room workers (Jeiel [*God's treasure*]), and liberal contributing laymen, like Messrs. Wanamaker, Farwell, *etc.* (Jozabad [*Jehovah given*]), as chiefs of the subordinate leaders (chief of the Levites), helped with justifications and consecrations the subordinate leaders on the basis of our Passover (gave unto the Levites ... five thousand [lambs] and five hundred oxen). Thus were the preparations made for a great part of the antitypical passover (So the service was prepared, ;10). The chief leaders were set to serve in their part of it (priests stood in their place) and the subordinate leaders according to their several forms of service were set to serve in their places (Levites in their courses), even as the evangelistic movement had charged (according ... commandment).

(65) The leading evangelists set forth in their preaching, lectures and writings Christ as the antitypical sacrificed Paschal Lamb (they killed the Passover, ;11 [1 Cor. 5:7]) and by their ministries they assured the newly consecrated and Spirit-begotten ones that its merit imputed to them was their righteousness (priests sprinkled the blood [upon the antitypical Altar] from their hands); and the subordinate leaders convinced them, especially in the inquiry rooms, that their humanity was fallen and that by overcoming they must be divested from all fleshly-mindedness and depravity (Levites flayed [skinned] them). Temporarily the leading evangelists abstained from setting forth God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice, in that they at first did not stress God's acts of justification, consecration and Spirit-begettal (removed the burnt offerings, ;12), in order all the more to stress Christ as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, in the interests of the justified, consecrated and Spirit-begotten ones (give ... divisions ... people, to offer [their lambs] unto the Lord), according to the teachings of the Bible given by Christ (written ... Moses). Thereafter they stressed the evidences of God's

manifest acceptance of Christ's sacrifice, as this was apparent in the preaching of the Gospel, God's working repentance toward Himself and faith toward the Lord Jesus unto justification. Then they stressed as further evidence of such acceptance: consecration, Spirit-begetting, sanctification and deliverance (And so they did with the oxen [burnt offerings]). The subordinate leaders set forth Christ's sufferings as those of the antitypical roasted Lamb as being most severe (roasted the passover with fire, ;13), even as shown by God's pertinent arrangement for Jesus as the High Priest (according to the ordinance), but the parts of the antitypical burnt offerings that the justified and consecrated believers were to accept they set forth as less severe (sod [boiled]) by the pertinent doctrines (pots), precepts (caldrons) and corrections (pans), and quickly set these forth to the justified and consecrated believers for their appropriation (divided them speedily among all the people).

(66) In these ministries it was mainly the subordinate leaders who were active (afterward they [the Levites], ;14). They readied the necessary features of the antitypical Lamb and of the burnt offerings for the subordinate and chief leaders (made ready for themselves, and for the priests). This was because the chief leaders were much and long occupied in sacrificing as to the acceptance of Christ's sacrifice to God and showing forth His great love (priests ... busied ... burnt offerings and the fat until night). The subordinate regular evangelists preached the pertinent features of the Truth (singers the sons of Asaph [*gatherer*], ;15) and took their parts (were in their place), even as the Apostolic writings charged (according to the commandment of David) as to such evangelists (Asaph), as to the Sunday preachers (Heman [*trusty*]) and as to the occasional speakers (Jeduthun [*praising*]), who forecast matters for the evangelistic movement (the king's seer). Those who had the work of leading inquirers to repentance and faith were all at

their posts in the inquiry rooms (porters ... gate). They were often occupied until midnight in order not to fail of doing their part in this antitypical passover (not depart from their service) and their needs in their partaking in the benefits of the antitypical passover were cared for by their brethren, the subordinate leaders (their brethren the Levites prepared for them). Thus this whole service occurred during the Gospel Age's general call, at its very end (April 1879-October 1881), in order to set forth as such Christ as our Passover under the general call (service ... was prepared the same day, to keep the Passover, ;16), and to set forth God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice by setting forth those things whereby God expressed it, through giving and correcting teachings as to repentance, faith justification, sanctification and deliverance with the accordant Truth in the Church (offer burnt offerings upon the altar), even as the evangelistic movement had charged (according to the commandment of king Josiah).

(67) The justified and consecrated believers (children of Israel, ;17) who came under the operation of this evangelistic movement not only participated in the merit of the Lamb in justification, consecration and Spirit-begettal (kept the passover at that time), but the faithful and measurably faithful participated in the joys and privileges of the whole of the subsequent Christian life (feast of unleavened bread seven days). Surely not since the days of "the great revival" of the eighteenth century under the leadership of John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield was there so great a setting forth of calls to justification, consecration and Spirit-begettal as the antitypical passover held from April 1879 to Oct. 1881 (not holden ... from the days of the judges; of Samuel the prophet, 22; 18), in the days of any of the less or more favored movements of God's people (days of the kings of Israel ... of Judah) as was that held by the evangelistic movement in the days of the closing general call (as

Josiah kept), the main and subordinate leaders and God's more and less favored people and the supporters of the more favored executorship participating (priests and the Levites and all Judah and Israel were present ... Jerusalem, ;18). This special evangelistic activity began in the year from April 1879 to April 1880, but continued until Oct. 1881 (eighteenth year ... Josiah ... was this passover kept, 23; 19). This evangelistic movement continued to act as the ascendant movement for years after this great antitypical passover, but with decidedly smaller results so far as to Spirit-begetting taking place. In fact, it officiated as such a movement until April 1893, when it came to an end as such a movement through the preparatory movements of the Congress of Religions held in the Summer of 1893 in connection with the Chicago World's Fair, which events are typed in 2 Kings 23:28-30 and 2 Chro. 35:20-27.

(68) The historians and encyclopedists of the evangelistic movement have described its great work, especially in the many biographies of Bro. Moody and in shorter articles on his collaborators, such writings appearing in America and Britain (acts ... written ... chronicles ... Judah; Israel and Judah, 28; 26, 27). After the great antitypical passover of 1879-1881 (After all this, ;20) and after the evangelistic movement had fulfilled its work in completing the general call to God's temple (prepared the temple, ;20), while it was yet operating as such (in his days, 29;), the Satan system in its divided condition, which set in just after the individual Satan was bound toward the impenitent fallen angels, 1874-1878, some of the fallen angels standing for that system in its secular aspects (Pharaoh [*sun king*]-nechoh [*conqueror*] king of Egypt, 29; 20), through the efforts that especially Messrs. Bonney and Barrows, prime movers in arranging for the Chicago Congress of Religions, put forth to hold this congress, sought to overthrow that section of the impenitent angels under Satan himself which sought to maintain the Satan system in its religious aspects in the

nominal church (king of Assyria, 29;). Here, as in some other places, Assyria stands for Babylon; for as a matter of fact the battle of Charchemish (Charchemish [*fortress of the subduer*], ;20) was fought by Pharaoh-nechoh with Nebuchadnezzar about a year before the latter succeeded his father on Babylon's throne, and just after Nebuchadnezzar aided by the Medes had overthrown the Assyrian Empire. The reason why Josiah opposed Pharaoh-nechoh is that ever since the days of Ahaz Judah was an ally of Assyria. The battle was one that concerned the peoples of Christendom (Euphrates [*fructifying*], 29; 20) and in the type was, until the two phases of the World War, one of the ten decisive battles of the world. The evangelistic movement (Josiah), true to its alliance with the nominal church, opposed the efforts of those fallen angels, who sought by Messrs. Bonney, Barrows, *etc.*, to bring all religions upon one platform and thus through the heathen religions to secularize the nominal church, a thing that of necessity the evangelist movement had to oppose (went out against him, 29; 20), which resulted in the overthrow of the evangelistic movement as the ascendant one among God's more favored people (slew him, 29;) in destruction-doomed Christendom (Megiddo [*destruction*], 29;) at their encounter (seen him, 29;). The involved impenitent fallen angels through the Bonney-Barrows movement by messengers sought to dissuade the evangelistic movement from opposing their purpose (sent ambassadors, ;21), telling it that it had no conflict with it (What have I to do with thee, thou king of Judah?, ;21), alleging that it had no quarrel with the evangelistic movement, but with an empire of which it was no part (not against thee ... wherewith I have war).

(69) This secularizing movement of the impenitent fallen angels claimed that the gods had charged it to hasten against the nominal church (commanded ... haste), and admonished the evangelistic movement not to meddle with the gods [the original word *elohim* is

plural, though often used of our God, and here may be translated *gods*, for Pharaoh would hardly as a polytheist have meant that Israel's God had charged him to make war] (forbear thee from meddling with god[s], ;21), claiming that they were with them (with me), lest they [the gods] destroy it ([t]he[y] destroy thee not). But the evangelistic movement would not cease its opposition to their fell purpose (would not turn his face from him, ;22). It changed its appearance into looking like the nominal church (disguised himself), in order the more safely and the better to oppose them (might fight with him), and gave no heed to the words of these secularizing fallen angels as coming from the gods (hearkened not unto the words of Necho from ... god[s]). It came to battle in the condition of destruction (fight ... Megiddo [destruction]). The sharp speakers and writers made a special target of the evangelistic movement, especially from the standpoint of its years-long opposition to sectarianism, which now they designated its refusal to coalesce with heathen religions to be. They also charged it with bigotry, self-opinionatedness, prejudice and intolerance, as marking its position of refusing to fellowship on one platform with heathen religions (archers shot at king Josiah, ;23). So hurt was it by these charges that it asked its supporters to take it out of the debate (Have me away), declaring that these charges had sorely hurt it in the debate (sore wounded). Its supporters took it out of the organization whereby it did its evangelistic work toward sinners (out of that chariot, ;24) and placed it in the organization whereby it did its work toward the consecrated (put him in the second chariot). In this organization it ceased to be the ascendant movement of God's more favored people (carried him in a chariot dead from Megiddo, 30; ... he died, ;24), and was brought to its sphere of executorship (brought him to Jerusalem, 30; 24).

(70) It was given most honorable and sincere respect for its worthiness (buried him; was buried, 30; 24),

even as one of the worthy movements of God's more favored people (one of the sepulchres of his fathers, ;24), yea, as one standing by itself in the uniqueness of its ministries (in his own sepulchre, 30). It was mourned, first of all, by all God's more favored people and by the supporters of its sphere of executorship (Judah and Jerusalem mourned, ;24). Bro. Russell in the double Tower for Nov. 1, 15, 1893, reproduced and enlarged in D, 157-268, Babylon's Confusion Ecclesiastical, poured out his heart's grief over the demise of this evangelistic movement through the leaders of the nominal church fellowshipping with the leaders of heathenism in that Congress of Religions (Jeremiah lamented for Josiah, ;25) and all the speaking and writing brothers and sisters made lamentation in speeches and writings until 1914, for the ceasing of this movement from being the ascendant movement among God's more favored people (singing men and singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations). These were made an arrangement among God's people (ordinance in Israel, ;25) and were put into mourning writings (written in the lamentations). Its acts and goodness are described in histories of the less and the more favored movements of God's people as being in harmony with the Bible (acts ... goodness ... law, ;26). All its special deeds are recorded among the accounts of historians of both sets of movements of God's people (book of the kings of Israel and Judah, ;27).

(71) Having finished the study of antitypical Josiah, the evangelistic movement, there yet remain four kings in Judah to be considered. Three of these four kings were sons of Josiah, and, therefore, their antitypes indicate some thought relationship to the evangelistic movement. The first of these kings in the type reigned but three months. The third of them reigned three months and ten days; and the other two of them reigned eleven years each. The first of these four in the type was named Jehoahaz (*Jehovah possessed*). He

reigned during three months of 628 B.C. and types the consecration movement that Bro. D. L. Moody inaugurated when the evangelistic movement ceased to be the ascendant movement. The parallel dates, therefore, were the years 628 B.C. and 1893 A.D. In 1870 Bro. Moody and his fellow helpers started to emphasize consecration (23 years old, 2 Kings 23:31; 2 Chro. 36:1, 2). This movement was closely related to the Holy Spirit (Hamutal [*dew-like*]; Jeremiah [*highly exalted by Jehovah*]; Libnah [*whiteness, transparency*]). But after the movement got operating as the ascendant movement it lasted only three months, because it fell away (he reigned three months); for shortly after coming into the ascendancy, on account of the section of the fallen angels who stood for secularism taking control, this movement turned to the various evils that former evil movements committed (evil ... according to ... fathers, 32;).

(72) The secularizing fallen angels (Pharaoh-nechoh [*sun-god conqueror*], 33; 3) soon captured this movement, which, to gain favor, fruitfulness (Riblah [*fertile*]), associated itself with the secularized movement and was made to secularize itself in a strong set of secular thoughts and acts (Hamath [*fortress*]), which condition resulted in the movement's losing the place of ascendancy that it had maintained for three months (not reign in Jerusalem), and they secularized the sphere of its Truth and its spirit unto its impoverishment and the enrichment of the secularizing fallen angels (a tribute ... talents ... talent, 33; 3). Thus whatever of Divine Truth this movement had become subject to the secularizing fallen angels. Of course, these secularizing fallen angels had no use for the consecration movement, and therefore deposed antitypical Jehoahaz and put in its place a unionistic movement (Eliakim [*whom God raised up*], 34; 4), because this unionistic movement served the purpose of the secularizing fallen angels better than did the consecration movement. But to give it the appearance of a righteous

and Divinely-approved movement the secularizing fallen angels changed the movement's appearance into one allegedly established by Jehovah (changed ... Jehoiakim [*whom Jehovah established*]); and they brought the consecration movement completely into worldliness, that so generally prevailed at that time in the nominal church (took Jehoahaz ... Egypt [*fortress*]), and in that condition of worldliness this movement ceased altogether in its ascendancy as a Divinely-favored one (died there).

(73) The unionistic movement was begun in its earliest stage by Bro. D. L. Moody in 1868, when he cast aside for his evangelistic work the sectarian spirit that prevailed among the churches and that opposed his non-sectarian evangelistic campaigns (25 years old, 36; 5). This unionistic movement was in the ascendancy in executorship from 1893 to 1904 (reigned eleven years), the parallel years being 629-618 B.C. The doctrine that especially nourished this movement was one of freely giving up items in the stewardship doctrine of each denomination by conceding something redeemed by Jehovah and held in high honor to one another (Zebudah [*given*] ... Pedaiah [*Jehovah redeemed*] ... Rumah [*high*], 36;). This unionistic movement was evil in its activities in relationship to God (did ... evil ... Lord, 37; 5). The evil that this movement did is detailedly described in Jeremiah and has been explained, type and antitype, in the eighth chapter of our second volume on the Parousia Messenger. Hence we will not give any further explanation on it here. Satan was by no means pleased that this movement was given by the secularizing fallen angels a secularizing character. Hence in 1897 he began a set of antagonistic activities against this movement (Nebuchadnezzar ... came, 2 Kings 24:1; 6).

(74) For three years this movement was subject to the religious phase of Satan's empire, *i.e.*, from 1897 to 1900 (Jehoiakim ... three years). Thereupon this unionistic movement sought to secularize itself as

against Satan's religious purposes (rebelled against him, 1); and by 1904 Satan greatly restrained this movement in its religious phase and made it a captive in his religious empire (fetters ... Babylon, ;6). At the same time Satan perverted to the interests of his religious empire many of the stewardship teachings of the Lord's Word in his unionistically inclined churches, as they were held in the various denominations, and as they became unionistically inclined (carried of the vessels ... of the Lord to Babylon, ;7), and made use of these to further the interests of his religious empire (put them in his temple at Babylon, ;7). The acts of this unionistic movement are found described in the writings of the historians of the more favored people of God (acts ... all ... did ... written ... kings of Judah, 5; 8). The unionistic movement after ceasing to be the ascendant movement (slept with his fathers) was succeeded by the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement (Jehoiakin [*Jehovah appointed*] ... stead, 6; 8). It will be noted that in 2 Kgs. 24:8 Jehoiakin is said to have been 18 years old when he began to reign, and in 2 Chro. 36:9 it is said that he was eight years old when he began to reign. The latter is a copyist's mistake whereby he omitted the words "and ten" after the word "eight." It was in 1886 that the Student's Volunteer Missionary Movement was started by Bro. D. L. Moody; and this movement, like the preceding one, caused unionistic error to prevail and perverted stewardship doctrines of the denominations to evil ones in matters pertaining to God, even as the preceding movement had done (Jehoiakin was eighteen years old ... reigned ... Jerusalem three months ... did evil, 8; 9). It was the strong doctrine of the great commission, misapplied in the Harvest, that mothered this movement (Nehushta [*brazen*]), a commission that our Lord gave in Matt. 28:18-20 (Elnathan [*God gave*], 8;). Above it was mentioned that it did evil, like the previous movement (evil ... Lord, 9; 9).

(75) It was while the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement was in the ascendancy among the more

favoured people of God that Satan's servants in their religious capacity, both fallen angels and wicked men, made an onslaught on the sphere of executorship of this movement, and brought it under siege conditions (servants ... Babylon ... Jerusalem ... besieged, 10;). Even Satan himself in his religious aspect worked against the movement's sphere of executorship while his servants, human and spiritual, were besieging it (Nebuchadnezzar ... city ... besieged it, 11;). Under this method of attack the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement surrendered to Satan in his religious aspect (Jehoiachin ... went ... king of Babylon, 12;). The movement, the great commission (mother), its supporters (servants), its leaders (princes) and all its officials (officers) gave themselves up, and Satan in his religious aspect captured the movement (took him). This was in the eighth year after Satan began to assume the Babylonian aspect of his reign of that period (eighth year of his reign). Satan took from the sphere of its executorship all of the stewardship teachings of the nominal churches (carried treasures ... Lord, 13; 10); he also took all of the choice theories of the movement's sphere of operation (treasures of the king's house); and he utterly devastated the Divine teachings which the Interim star-members had made for God's temple (pieces ... gold which Solomon ... made in the temple ... as the Lord had said, 13;).

(76) Satan made captives of all who were in the sphere of this movement's executorship (carried away all Jerusalem, 14;), the leaders (princes) and all the able controversialists of the movement (all ... valour), even the full number of the nominal church's crown-losers and justified ones who were active in this missionary movement (ten thousand). Among these were all the directors (craftsmen) in the various denominations' missionary boards and societies and all the policy and doctrinal creators of their missionary work (smiths). Thus Satan got under his control all except poverty-stricken persons subject to the Students'

Volunteer Missionary Movement (poorest sort ... land). In the eighth year of Satan's particular reign in Babylon at this time he carried the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement away captive into Babylonian spheres of work (carried away ... Babylon, 15; 10). He also took into this captivity the strong doctrine of the great commission, misusing it as still applicable after the Harvest began, in addition to the movement's supporters (mother ... wives, 15;), with all in official positions in the movement (officers), as well as the most prominent subjects of the movement (chief men). He made them all his captives, taking them from the sphere of the movement's executorship to the sphere of Satan's executorship in the nominal church (captivity ... Babylon). He also took all of the warriors of the movement, even a perfect Divine number of them (all ... might ... even 7,000, 16;), together with the Missionary directors and the policy and theory makers who totaled a perfect number of crown-losers and justified ones (craftsmen and smiths a thousand). All of these were powerful and able warriors for the cause of the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement (strong and apt for war). Even these Satan took under his control as captives of his to his perverted religion on the subject of missions (king ... captive to Babylon).

(77) Satan made the combinism movement allied to the unionistic movement the ascendant movement in place of the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement (king of Babylon made Mattaniah [*a gift of Jehovah*] ... king in his stead, 17; 10). To palm off this movement, which, as the Federation of Churches, allied itself with the state in the U.S.-combinism movement, as one pleasing to Jehovah, Satan changed its exterior character into one apparently pleasing to God (changed his name to Zedekiah [*justice of Jehovah*]), God permitting it in allusion to Jehovah's exacting justice for the sins of Judah against the Law. Thus an imitation character of Jehovah's justice was by Satan put over the favored people of God in its sphere of executorship (Judah and Jerusalem). In 1942 the Students'

Volunteer Missionary Movement was given some freedom from its captivity (seven and thirtieth year ... Jehoiakin, 2 Kgs. 25:27; ;Jer. 52:31), for in that year, due to the course of Japan in forcing America into the war, Satan changed his method of dealing (Evil-merodach [*fool of death*, in allusion to Satan's folly in forcing America into the World War, Phase II] king of Babylon) and began to favor the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement (did lift up the head of Jehoiakin), because he thought it would serve his purpose in helping Japan to victory in countries where missionary work was being done. Hence he took away restraint from that movement (out of prison) and gave it preference to all other movements in the fallen nominal church (spoke kindly ... throne ... kings ... in Babylon, 28; ;32). Satan invested with new authority the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement (changed his prison garments, 29; ;33) and supported it with full provision as long as it lasted (did eat bread before him ... his life). Satan continued to give this movement such advantages as long as it existed to his advantage (allowance ... continual ... king, 30; ;34). It was only after the movement ceased to serve Satan's purpose in Japan's complete defeat that the movement ceased to be (every day a portion ... his life).

(78) Above the remark was made that Zedekiah represents the combinism movement, and we desire to add to that remark that this combinism showed itself not only in a quasi-alliance of state in the U.S. and church, but also, especially, in the Federation of Churches, in a quasi-alliance with the state in Protestant countries, and the tendency to the start of such a movement was made in 1883 by Bro. Moody, by which he sought to combine Christian people in an alliance for evangelism that more or less ignored the denominational stewardship doctrines (Zedekiah ... years old ... reign, 2 Kgs. 24:18; 2 Chro. 36:11). This movement was the ascendant movement until Oct. 1914, in actual time lasting ten and a half years, but

according to the Hebrew method of counting it was eleven years; for the Hebrews counted a part of a year a full year if the occasion entering into that year was the beginning of a whole year (eleven years in Jerusalem, 18; 11; 52:1). The theory that produced this movement was a counterfeit of the doctrine of the oneness of the Church (mother's name was Hamutal [*dewlike*, in allusion to the counterfeit of the oneness of the true Church, which was urged as the counterfeit reason for federationism], 18; ;1). This movement wrought evil in matters pertaining to the Lord, even as a counterfeit unity of the true Church found in a federation of churches should be expected to do. These evils are detailedly described in Vol. 2 of the Parousia Messenger and hence will not be here further mentioned (did ... evil ... Lord, 19; 12; 2). In such evil conduct it followed in a worse degree the evils of the unionistic movement (according ... Jehoiakim, 19; ;2). It refused to humble itself before that Servant, who spoke to it from God's Word (humble ... Jeremiah ... mouth of the Lord, ;12).

(79) In discussing the combinism movement it is necessary for us to remember what we showed in B, Note III, pp. 394-400; for while there was a quasi-alliance between the federation and various states, yet the six states of Europe that were more or less related to the federation in Combinism acted under Satan for the overthrow of Combinism in the sphere of the more favored people of God and the sphere of this movement's executorship. We ask our readers carefully to read over Note III in B, pp. 394-400, where the destruction of Christendom national is also emphasized, as well as the destruction of Combinism, its favored people and its sphere of executorship. Since the matter has been given in considerable detail in that note, we will not explain the features there explained that come in the section that we are studying, requesting our readers to keep in mind the remark just made on the relation of Federationism and the State. For that Combinism implies a semi-alliance with the State. God was

highly displeased at the evils committed, especially by antitypical Manasseh, antitypical Amon, antitypical Jehoiakim and antitypical Zedekiah. So greatly did this anger express itself that God cast off Combinism's sphere of executorship and the more favored people of God (anger ... Jerusalem and Judah ... cast ... presence, 20; ;3). This anger of the Lord showed itself in Combinism in church and state, by letting it rebel against Satan in his religious aspect (Zedekiah rebelled ... Babylon, 20; 13; 3). This rebellion was committed by Combinism against its sworn allegiance to Satan's purpose with Combinism (made him swear by God, ;13). Combinism became very stubborn and obdurate in apostatizing from the Lord (stiffened his neck ... from turning ... God). For the chronological data typed in Combinism we refer our readers to Note III in B, pp. 394-400, as well as to our discussion on the P.B.I. chronology in a chapter on its chronology in E-7. Since the matter has been discussed there thoroughly, we will make no more discussion thereon in the section of our present study (ninth year, 2 Kgs. 25:1; ;4).

(80) The besieging of Combinism started in 1912, as indicated in the note above referred to, through its first stage leading to World War, Phase I (king of Babylon ... against Jerusalem). There were many steps that Satan caused to be taken whereby Combinism was besieged (pitched ... forts ... about). The siege of Combinism's sphere of executorship continued into the 11th year of its ascendancy (eleventh year 2; ;5). Combinism and its supporters were famished, ran out of supplies in its sphere of executorship (famine ... city), which resulted in Combinism in state and church being unable to supply its subjects (bread ... land, 3; ;6). The outbreak of the World War, Phase I, caused Combinism's warriors to be scattered in flight secretly (men of war fled, 4; ;7). The flight was made by the way of escape open between the two walls, parts of Combinism, *i.e.*, church and state (gate ... walls), even where Combinism produced its main fruitage

(king's garden). Combinism fled into unfruitful conditions (king ... plain), pursued by the demon warriors, who overtook it in the sphere of the nominal church (Chaldeans [*demons*] pursued ... overtook ... Jericho, 5; ;8) and the warriors of Combinism, especially in its religious phase, were widely scattered away from it (army ... him). Combinism in both of its features, federation of state and of church, fell into the power of the demons (took the king, 6; ;9). They captured Combinism, especially in its religious phase, and brought it to Satan in a condition fruitful to Satan's purpose (carried ... Babylon to Riblah [*fertile*]), where Satan was especially powerful (Hamath [*fortress*]); and in this condition Satan sentenced Combinism (judgment upon him). He destroyed all of Combinism's movements (slew the sons of Zedekiah, 7; ;10) openly in its presence (before his eyes). He also cut off all of the leaders of God's more favored people where they were fruitful (slew ... princes ... Riblah). Satan also blinded Combinism to what he was doing with it (put out the eyes of Zedekiah, 7; ;11) and held it with strong bands and thus carried it captive into his ideals of Babylon (fetters ... Babylon) and restrained it in its captivity until it became extinct (prison ... death).

(81) For the exposition of 8-10; ;12-14, please see B, p. 397, par. 2 to p. 398, par. 1. Satan's chief representative (Nebuzar-adan [*whom Nebo protects*]) among fallen angels led into Satanic captivity the rest of the people that were supporters of the sphere of God's more favored people's executorship and those that had already fallen into Satan's hands (rest of the people, 11; ;15). He left free from captivity only the least developed of the sphere of Christendom's teaching and spirit, to do the lowliest work in that sphere (12; ;16). The demons set aside the 12 Apostles under Christ's headship and the 35 Interim star-members ([two] pillars of brass, 13; ;17) with Christ as their head (chapter, 17; ;22) from being held in esteem among

God's nominal people. Additionally, they set aside the New Testament (brazen sea) and its foundations, the Old Testament books (bases), as they were esteemed among the nominal people of God (brass), and carried these as they were esteemed by the nominal people of God away into Satanic captivity (brass ... Babylon). God's arrangements to enable consecrators to complete their sacrifice (caldrons, T 47, 1; 14; ;18), the refutations (shovels), the corrections (snuffers), the ethical teachings (spoons) and sin-offering teachings (basons), even all of the teachings as they appeared to the nominal people of God, they likewise took away for Satanic purposes. The doctrines (cups), Scriptural passages (firepans) and the sin-offering doctrines (basons) as they appeared to God and the new creatures, which were both true and Divine in character (gold ... silver), the chief representative of Satan took into Satanic uses (15; ;19). The star-members, represented in the 12 Apostles and the 35 Interim star-members (two pillars, 16; ;20), with Christ as their Head (chapter), and the New Testament in its cleansing office (sea), with the Old Testament books as its foundations, as set forth by the justice of God as the Bible's support to the 12 tribes of Spiritual Israel (twelve brazen bulls), as taught by the Interim star-members (Solomon), were in the estimation of the nominal people indescribable (weight). The 12 Apostles and the Interim star-members were by the nominal people of God considered imperfect ($18 = 3 \times 6$ [number of imperfection and evil], 17; ;21). Yet they were for the 12 tribes of Spiritual Israel (twelve cubits), and were in harmony with the four attributes of God (four fingers), and had no strength of their own (hollow). The 35 Interim star-members were as such given by God some power and strength, though not to the same degree as He gave to the 12 Apostles.

(82) Christ (chapter) as viewed by the people was a hybrid, a God-man, hence imperfect (five cubits [5 is a half of 10]), though actually perfect, 7. He was

the Head of each of these antitypical pillars (17 [the word *three* here is a copyist's mistake]; ;22), but as a God-man was imperfectly understood by the nominal people. Despite this the fruit of His redemptive work was very manifest in His headship of these two classes of star-members (network and pomegranates, 17; ;22). Thus these two sets of star-members' represented Christ's redemptive work among the nominal people of God. Originally there were 400 pomegranates (1 Kings 7:20), some of which seem to have dropped off, typifying His redemptive work's fruit to the humanity of the four saved human classes, though the nominal people of God did not properly comprehend these two Gospel-Age antitypical pillars. The fruit of Christ's redemptive work was complete for the human race (an hundred [four hundred; complete for humans], ;;23). Satan's chief supporter among the fallen angels took the Papacy (Seraiah [*warrior of Jehovah*]), the Federation of Churches (Zephaniah [*Jehovah's secret*]) and the three parts of Christendom: Roman and Greek Catholicism and Protestantism, out of their place of rulership (three keepers of the door, 18; ;24). And from the place of executorship of the nominal people of God Satan's chief officer among the fallen angels took the chief controversialists (officer ... war) and the total number of the counselors of the Federation of Churches (seven [five is a copyist's error] men ... king's presence), whose sphere was in the sphere of executorship of the more favored people of God, the scholars of these chief controversialists (scribe) who prepared the nominal people of God for controversy and all (three score [6 × 10]) the evil denominations and sects of the people of the sphere of the nominal-church teachings, even all of whom were found in the midst of the sphere of executorship of the Federation of Churches (city, 19; ;25). Satan's chief officer among the fallen angels took all of these to Satan in his sphere of fruitfulness (Riblah [*fertile*], 20; ;26) and Satan cut these off entirely from their

former power while he was at his sphere of fertility in his sphere of strength (Hamath [*fortress*], 21; ;27). Thus all of the more favored people of God were taken captive out of their sphere into Satan's sphere, where he cut them off from their former positions (put to death). In enumerating the number of captives in Jer. 52:28-30 no mention is made of the 10,000 captives taken when antitypical Jehoiakin was made captive. The total number of captives here set forth is 4,600, and this would indicate that all of these who were lower than those of the Divine class were made captives of Satan in one way or another during the three loosings upon Christendom of Satan's controversial weapons. What is stated in 2 Kgs. 25:22-25 we expounded in the ninth chapter of the Parousia Messenger, Vol. II, so it needs no repetition here. In the first period of Christ's reign (first year of Cyrus, 2 Chro. 36:22), *i.e.*, the Parousia and Epiphany, in fulfilment of the Lord's teachings given through "that Servant" (mouth of Jeremiah), God aroused our Lord Jesus to proclaim freedom for all Spiritual Israelites throughout all the earth, and caused it to be written as the statements of Jesus that God had given the kingdoms of the whole world to Him and had charged him to erect God's temple for the kingdom of God among God's more favored people, inviting all among God's people to go up and occupy themselves with the developing of the Church for the Kingdom (2 Chro. 36:22, 23).

(1) To what will our study of the Parallels be restricted? Why? Despite this, what will be continued to be used? Why? When did the parallels become so restricted? What parallels will now be made? What does he type? What were the parallel periods? When and with what did this parallel have its first faint beginnings? How? How typed? How much later did it become the predominant movement? Through what? How typed? When and through what did it cease being such? What has this recension as its Greek text? When was his final edition finished? Published? How typed? What else marked these 29 years? When and by whom did the first

one start? Despite what? Which is the greatest of the Bible societies? When founded? How long before the cessation of antitypical Hezekiah? How did the movement to organize receive its main impulse? Where is this explained? What kind of a society was it? Why so?

(2) In what did this result? By what was the Bible movement mothered? How typed? Of what does the Bible especially remind people? How typed? What is the character of this movement? How did it do before the Lord? How typed? In what spirit and words did it act? How typed? By what and whom were God's servants for justification estopped from their work? What occurred immediately thereafter? How typed? How did they do it? How typed? Whom did it attract to itself? How typed? To what did it assemble them? How typed? What did it there do? How typed? To what did it at first exhort them? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Thirdly? How typed?

(3) What did it point out? How typed? In what relation? How typed? How did they do it? How typed? By what two things did they do it? How typed in each case? What first evil did they stop? How typed? Second? How typed? Third? How typed? Fourth? How typed? Where? How typed? In what did this result? How typed? In what three ways was this expressed? How typed in each case? What evidence did they have thereof? How typed? What two things came to their predecessors therefore? How typed in each case? What did the movement then teach? How typed? To what end? How typed? How and against what did it next exhort? How typed? What three reasons did it give? How typed in each case?

(4) By this what two sets were first affected? How typed in each case? Secondly, what other two sets? How typed? Thirdly, what other two sets? How typed? Fourthly, what other two sets? How typed? To whom did this belong? What antitypical Levites are here not mentioned? Why? In addition what other workers were first aroused? How typed? In how many groups? How typed in each group? Secondly aroused? How typed? In how many groups? How typed in each case? Thirdly aroused? How typed? In how many groups? How typed?

(5) What did these brethren do? How typed? What did they cause themselves to do? How typed? In harmony with what? How typed? By whose principles? How typed?

What did they do? How typed? In what did the main leaders minister? How typed? What did they affect? How typed? At what point and persons did they end their work? How typed? In what did the subordinate leaders minister? How typed? What did they do? How typed? When did this reformatory work begin? Grappling with what? How typed? How long before they grappled with the last evil in the antitypical Holy? How typed? What will make this clear? Why is this said? How typed? What was thereafter done? By whom? How long did it take to make the beginning with all these evils? How are these things typed? What remark applies here also?

(6) Thereupon what did the leaders do? How typed? What did their report embrace? What was its first item? How typed? Its second item? How typed? Its third item? How typed? The fourth item? How typed? The fifth item? How typed? The sixth item? How typed in details?

(7) How did this report affect, first, the movement? How typed? Secondly? How typed? What do we see from vs. 24 and 21? What proves that these seven goats of the sin offering type Jesus' sin-offering sacrifice? By what is this further confirmed? What inferences do we then draw from v. 24 as to the seven bullocks? The seven rams? What does the former type? The latter? As what did the priests' sacrificing these serve positively and negatively? How typed in each case? What do these sacrifices prove as to Jesus' varifold atoning work? How typed in each case? Thereupon, what did the movement charge? How typed? What did these then stress? By what? How are these things typed? What then did they do as to the burnt offering? How typed? What did they then do? How typed? This done, what did they then do? How typed? Show? How typed? After this what did they do? How typed? Thereafter what did they do? How typed? Before whom? How typed? What two thoughts did they set forth? How typed in each case?

(8) What did the movement then do? How typed? In what three things? How typed in each case? What did they do with these? According to whose charge? How typed in each case? Who stood ready as two classes to serve? How typed in each case? With what did the movement then charge the main leaders? How did these do it? How are these things typed? What did the main leaders

do simultaneously? The subordinate leaders? How are these things typed? What did this move all the people to do? How typed? During what works? How typed? What was done at the conclusion of each of these activities? How typed? What did the movement and its leaders then charge the subordinate leaders? How typed? How did they do it? How typed?

(9) What did the movement then do? How typed? What was the response? How typed? How did the most zealous minister? How typed? What kind of blessing did they bring? How typed? In what two forms? How typed in each case? What did they all express? How typed? Even who offered service? For whom? How typed? Who else offered? For whom? How typed in each case? Who were too few to serve all? For example? How typed? Who helped them? How typed? Until when? How typed? Why this? How typed? What were many? In what forms? How are these things typed? With what else was this the case? How typed? In what kind of preaching? How typed? As expressions of what? How typed? What did the whole movement and the people do? How typed? Why? How typed? How done? How typed?

(10) Of what does 2 Chro. 30 treat? In general what does the Passover type? On what is its main emphasis? What does its celebration on Nisan 14-21 type? On 14-21 of the second month? Where is each typed? What proves that Hezekiah's Passover was an exception to this rule? How do the facts prove this? What in relation to this antitypical Passover was done by oral and literary messages? How typed? To whom sent? How typed? In what countries? How typed? Where to celebrate? How typed? What were they invited to do? How typed? Who authorized the invitation? How typed? Under what auspices was it to be kept? How typed? On what to work? How typed? When to be kept? How typed? For what two reasons was it delayed until then? How typed in each case? How was the pertinent proposal viewed? By whom? How typed? What did they then decide? How typed? How extensively? How typed? Why? How typed? To what end? How typed? Under what? How typed? How had this matter been neglected? How typed?

(11) What was then done? How typed? To whom? How typed? What was asked of some? Of others? How

typed? What was promised from God's side? How typed? To whom? How typed? What did the exhortation plead? How typed? What resulted from the former evil course? How typed? Against what did the exhortation caution? How typed? What first thing did it specifically entreat? How typed? Why? How typed? What second thing? How typed? In what would compliance result? How typed? What was the condition of the assurance that was given? To whom? How typed? What was the assurance? How typed? In what would compliance result? How typed? What two reasons were given? How typed in each case? What did the messengers do? How typed? To what three countries? How typed in each case? How did the majority treat the message? How typed? What did some do? How typed? In what countries? How typed in each case?

(12) What did God's power effect? How typed? What did multitudes do? For what purposes? How typed? What did they set aside? How typed? From where? How typed? Even what? How typed? Into what did they cast them? How typed? What did they then do? How typed? In what period? How typed? What did the main and subordinate leaders do? How typed? What service did they thereafter do? How typed? How did each one officiate? How typed? What did the main leaders teach? How typed? The subordinate leaders? How typed? What had many neglected to do? How typed? Who helped them in the first step? How typed? In the second? How typed?

(13) From where had many of these neglecters come? How typed in each case? What had they done ignorantly? How typed? What did the movement do as to these? How typed? To what end? How typed? For whom did they so do? How typed? Why? How typed? Despite what? How typed? What response did God make? How typed? What response did these make to God's gracious work on their behalf? How typed? What did the subordinate and main leaders then do? How typed? How? How typed? How did the movement speak to the subordinate leaders? How typed? What had they done? How typed? What did they, appropriate to themselves? How typed? Then do? How typed? Thereafter do? How typed?

(14) At what did the movement's adherents not stop? By what was it especially typed? To what did they proceed?

How typed? What did they then take? How typed? What did the movement as a whole then first do? How typed? Secondly? How typed? What did the cooperating leaders from all denominations first do? How typed? Secondly? What did many of the main leaders do? How typed? What did all God's more favored people with their leaders do? How typed? What second group did so? How typed? Third group? How typed? What four great blessings were wrought on all responsive ones? In what did they result? Where? How are these things typed? Since when was there not a greater antitypical Passover held? Among whom? Why not? Where? How are these things typed? For what two reasons? How typed?

(15) What was finished? How typed? What was continued? Who participated therein? How typed? Where? How typed? What four things did they uproot? How typed in each case? Who especially was active therein? How typed? Where? How typed? Until when did they do this uprooting work? How typed? What did each one thereafter do? Despite what? How typed? What did the movement then do? How typed? According to what? How typed? What four kinds of service did they render? How typed in each case? How did they represent God's kindnesses and character to the people? How typed? How did the movement's adherents arrange their ministries? Firstly? How typed? Secondly? How typed? In what other three respects? How typed in each case? According to what? How typed?

(16) What did it give the people in its executorship? How typed? What was the charge? How typed? As what did they do it? How typed? With what did this charge meet? How typed? As a result what did the brethren do? How typed? In what four forms? How typed in each case? What else? How typed? To sum up, what and how did they do? How typed? What kind of a time was it? By whom in general done? In particular? How typed? Why? How typed? Based on what? How typed? Consisting of what? How typed? What did they consecrate? How typed? How did they put them together? How typed? How did they begin? How typed? End? How typed? What did the movement and its leaders see? How typed? What did they do therefore? How typed? There-upon

what did the movement do? How typed? Who answered through mouthpieces? How typed? What did He answer? How typed? How long was this the case? How typed? What did the answer add? How typed? What did they acknowledge? How typed? How quantitatively? How typed?

(17) What did the movement then charge? How typed? In what forms did the brethren fulfill this charge? How typed? What did they do? How typed? What did others make? How typed? Present? How typed? How done? What and how many of them were put in charge of this work? In symbolizing what? How typed? To what did the two group leaders correspond? How typed? According to whose charge? How typed? Among whom was the leading evangelist group? How typed? Of what three things did they have charge? How typed in each case? To what bodies did the other six evangelistic groups belong? How typed in each case? Who else were in them? How typed? Set in what? Why? How typed? Regardless of what? How typed? Along what ten lines did the general principles work that were followed in these arrangements? How typed in each case? To whom else did these same general principles apply? How typed? Even including whom? How typed? Belonging to what? How typed? How were they designated? How typed? To whom were they assigned? How typed? By whom were these arrangements made? Where? According to whose will? How are these things typed? How did the movement act? How typed? With what result? How typed?

(18) How is a third book, used in the parallels, indicated? What followed the good things described above? How typed? What were the French revolutionists? How typed? What did they do as here typed? How typed? With what purpose? How typed? To what end? How typed? What did the Bible movement note? How typed? What else? How typed? What did it do? How typed? With whom? How typed? Over what question? How typed? Where? How typed? What was the purpose of this council? How typed? How did they respond? How typed? Who else united in this purpose? How typed? What was then done? How typed? With what result? How typed? What did they pertinently believe and declare? How typed? What did it then do? How typed? Especially

whereon? How typed? With what results? How typed? What did it secure? Whence? How typed? What did it strengthen? How typed? What did it invent? How typed? What did it strengthen? How typed? What did it appoint? How typed? Where did it assemble them? How typed? What did it urge? How typed? Despite what? How typed? With what did it do the encouraging? How typed? With what reasoning? How typed in each case? How did its supporters react thereto? How typed?

(19) What did the Bible movement seek to do? How typed? What were the French revolutionists then doing? How typed? What did the movement acknowledge? How typed? What did it request? How typed? To what did it agree? How typed? How were the overtures not made? How were they made? What did the circumstances force it to do? How typed? In what two ways was it forced to make concessions? How typed in the two ways? *E.g.*, what particulars did it have to give up? What other powers and privileges did it give up? How typed? Of whom else? How typed? What did they do with these things?

(20) Despite these concessions what did the French revolutionists do? How typed? Why aroused? What three classes did they arouse against the movement? How typed in each case? How in their mutual relations? How typed? Where? How typed? By what were these accompanied? How typed? On what did they take their position? How typed? To what did this lead? How typed? To what end? How typed? With what result? What did they demand? How typed? What three classes mentally journeyed forth to this theory conflict? How typed in each case? How is their mental journey typed? What did the revolutionist theory propounders do? How typed? Say? How typed? How did they consider their confidence? How typed? For what? How typed? What question did they ask? How typed? How did they speak of the movement's plans and powers? How typed? What did they demand? How typed? Of what did they accuse it? How typed? How did they characterize these? How typed? How did they emphasize this thought? How typed? What did they further argue? How typed? What should they not forget? How typed? To what had it given a charge? How typed? What was the charge, in the first place? How typed? In the second place? How typed? What should it consider? How typed?

(21) What did the theory teachers suggest? How typed? What did they promise? How typed? Under what proviso? How typed? What did they say it could not frighten? How typed? How could they trust the secularists? How typed? For what? How typed? What did they further ask? How typed? Without what? How typed? What, on the contrary, did they claim? How typed? What did the movement's representatives then do? How? How typed? Who were they? How typed in each case? Why did they ask it? How typed? In what did they not desire them to speak? How typed? Why this request? What did the propagandists claim? How typed? What did these doctrinaires then do? How typed? To what end? How typed? What was their intention? How typed? What else was their intention? How typed? To what end? How typed? Against what did they caution them? How typed? Why so? How typed? From what? How typed? From what did they seek to dissuade them? How typed? As what? How typed?

(22) What warning was given its supporters? How typed? What did the revolutionists advise? How typed? What else? How typed? With what result? How typed? Until when? How typed? What did they claim of the new sphere? How typed? What could they there produce? How typed? What did they promise them? How typed? In what would this result? How typed? What did they caution them? How typed? What did they assert? How typed? What else did they assert? How typed? What conclusion did they draw from these facts? How typed? What question did they ask based on these facts? How typed? What five examples did they give as proof? How typed in each case? What did they again demand? How typed? From these examples what conclusion did they draw? How typed?

(23) What did they continue to do? How typed? What other two things did they do? How typed? What else did they do as to God? How typed? What comparison did they make? How typed? How did they emphasize this thought? How typed? What did their claims do as to God and His sphere of His people's executorship? How typed? What were these powerful ones? How typed? How did the movement's supporters react to these claims? How typed? Why? How typed? What was the reaction of the three

groups of messengers of the Bible movement? How typed in each case? What did they then do? How typed?

(24) What was the first effect of this report on the movement? How typed? The second? How typed? The third? How typed? What did it and the chief faithful teachers then do? How typed? What did it then do? How typed? In what condition? How typed? Why? How typed? What were the movement's pertinent sentiments? How typed in the details? What had set in? How typed? What was its condition as to it? How typed? For what did it long? How typed? Why were they slandering Jehovah? How typed? What might God do about it? How typed? What did the messengers do? How typed? What did the teachers do? How typed? As what? How typed? To what did it encourage? How typed? Against whose message? How typed? What had they done by their message? How typed? Upon what was God determined? How typed? What else? How typed? How would it affect the French revolutionists? How typed? With what result? How typed? By what? How typed?

(25) To what did the doctrinaires turn their attention? How typed? What had the revolutionists succeeded in doing? How typed? What were they then attempting? How typed? What view of Romanism's overthrow in France did they hold? What was enthroned? As what? What was later declared? What was the indirect effect of their course? How typed? What frightened them? How typed in detail? In view of it what did they do? How typed? What did they seek to forestall? What did they increase? With what exception? From this standpoint what really were their literary attacks? How typed? What did they charge? How typed? What caution did they throw out? How typed? To what end? How typed? What did they say that it should keep in mind? How typed? As what? How typed? What illustrations did they give to emphasize their point? How typed in each case? Where are comments on 13; ; 13 given?

(26) What did the movement receive? How typed? What did they first do with it? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Thirdly? How typed? Fourthly? How typed? How did it address God? How typed? What did it first acknowledge? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Thirdly? How typed? For what did it plead? How typed?

How did it emphasize its plea? How typed? To what did it ask God to give attention? How typed? What did those writings actually do? How typed? What further acknowledgment did it first make? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Why was it so? How typed? Thirdly? How typed? What were their contrasted qualities? How typed? With what results? How typed? What petition did it offer? How typed? Why? How typed? What then followed? How typed? As whose message? How typed? What assurance did they give? How typed? What follows? How typed? What was it as to Zion? Jerusalem? How typed in each case? What did it charge? How typed?

(27) What had they by their envoys done to Jehovah? How typed? What was their boast? How typed? Overthrowing what classes? How typed in each case? Overpowering what other two classes? How typed in each case? What did they allege? How typed? What had they proudly plundered? How typed? What did God ask them? How typed? Of what did He assure them? How typed? Why were their subjects weak? How typed? What else were these? How typed? What other two things were they? How typed in each case? What did God then show them that He knew? How typed? What other two things? How typed in each case? In view of this how would He treat them? How typed? What would He force them to do? How typed? What did He give the Bible movement? How typed? Of what three things would the sign consist? How typed in each case?

(28) With reference to whom did God make promise? How typed? What was it? How typed? For what two spheres had God made promise? How typed in each case? What would accomplish it? Of whom else did He speak? How typed? What were the three things that they would fail to do? How typed in each case? On the contrary, what would they do? How typed? What would they not enter? How typed? Why repeated? How typed? For whose sakes? How typed as to each?

(29) What followed closely upon the prophecy? How typed? Shortly after what? What set in? How typed? What did it do? Of what was this the beginning? How typed? Especially to whom was this reaction fatal? How typed? Whom else did this include? What was done by 1796? What helped to this result? What did the remnant

do? How typed? What change did the revolutionists make? What did it proclaim? To what did they return? What was this actually? How typed? In what did they occupy themselves? How typed? In what were they engaged? How typed? What were the two forms of government that squelched them? Under what? How typed? By what means? How typed? To what did these betake themselves? How typed? What succeeded the French revolutionists? How typed? In what did this result? How typed? From whom? How typed? How did God guide His people? How typed? To what two things did this lead many? How typed? To what did this lead? How typed?

(30) When did the following-given event occur? How typed? What were the causes of this event? What was the event? From what is this apparent? To what did this lead? How typed? What did God do? How typed? What did the faithful and strong chief teachers do? How typed? What did the message say? How typed? In view of what was it delivered? How typed? How did it feel as to its work? What did it do with its feelings? How typed? How were its feelings expressed? How typed? What else did it do? How typed? How? How typed? What did it first ask? How typed? What else did it mention? How typed? How else did its grief express itself? How typed? What does this case as to its answer show? Why is this said? How typed? What occurred? How typed?

(31) Of what did God assure them? How typed? To it as what was the message sent? How typed? As what was it given? How typed? Why so? How typed? What was its first feature? How typed? Second? How typed? Third? How typed? Fourth? How typed? Fifth? How typed? Sixth? How typed? Seventh? How typed? Why these things? How typed? What did the teachers prescribe? How typed? Why? How typed? For what did it ask? How typed? For what two things? How typed? What choice did God give it? How typed? What did it choose? How typed? Who prayed thereover? How typed? With what result? How typed? What was the sign? How typed?

(32) What did the movement in deep impression from these events do? How typed? What three things did it bewail? How typed in each case? What did it first conclude? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Like what were its years removed? How typed? Like what other thing? How

typed? What did it feel? How typed? What did it expect in the morning? How typed? In the evening? How typed? What did it believe? How typed? What did it mutter? How typed? How did it mourn? How typed? What did it almost become? Why? How typed? Why did it plead with God? How typed? What did it ask of God? How typed? What did it not know? How typed? Despite what had God afflicted it? How typed? What was its future to be? How typed? After what? How typed? What did it recognize? How typed? For what did it therefore pray? How typed? Instead of prosperity what did it have? How typed? In love for it what had God done? How typed? Why? How typed? Why did God do this to it? How typed? Why can the dead not hope for God's Truth? How typed? Who only can praise God? How typed? What was it then doing? Why? How typed? Who to whom will declare God's Truth? How typed? What would it declare? Why? How typed? With what? How typed? How long? How typed? Before whom? How typed? Where will we find vs. 21, 22 interpreted?

(33) What, like many people and movements, could the Bible movement not temporarily stand? How typed? What was it temporarily? How typed? What did God do therefore? On what? How typed in each case? How later did it, unlike many, do? How typed? Who else? How typed? In what did this result? How typed? In what 12 things did it prosper? How typed in each case? For what did it arrange? How typed? What did it do with the sacrifice of the Church and Christ? How typed in each case? In what did it greatly prosper? How typed? What did it shut off? From whom? How typed? What did it arrange to give directly? How typed? In what did it prosper? How typed? In what did it offend? How typed? Why did they come to it? How typed? Why did God let it have full liberty? How typed? Why? How typed? Where is shown the test and its pride?

(34) When was the test? By whom was it made as a snare? In what of his qualities? How typed? Of what was he the creator? What did he cause to be made known to the Bible movement? In what way? How typed? Whom did he arouse to support it? How typed? Why? How typed? To what and how did it react? How typed? In confidence what did it make known? How typed? In what

spirit and what did it not conceal? How typed? What did God's all-seeing eye observe? How typed? What did He do in it? How typed? What was administered? How? As to what? How typed? What else did they ask? How typed? What did its attitude reveal? How typed? What else did its attitude reveal? How typed? What further inquiry did they put to it? How typed? What answer did its attitude give? How typed? How extensively? How typed? Thereupon what did they ask? How typed?

(35) What did they forecast? How typed? To what extent would these things be taken? How typed? What would Satan do? How typed? To what base extent? How typed? How did the Bible movement react to this forecast? How typed? In what did it take comfort? How typed? What evil quality was exercised and repented of in this episode? How typed? Wherein are this movement's works described? How typed? What were among these works? How typed in detail? Where are they recorded? Especially where? How typed in each case? What occurred to it in 1805? How typed? How has it been regarded? How typed? By whom was it honored in its death as chief movement? How typed?

(36) What does *Manasseh* mean? In allusion to what? What does he type? By what was the antitype brought into activity? Of what sins was it guilty? Through antagonism to what? What was its character in antagonism to higher criticism and other isms? What were the involved parallel years? What is rationalism? Through what and whom did it begin? Through what did it progress in England? France? What did it there mother? Whither did it then go? What did it accomplish there? Through what professors? Into what did it degenerate? Unto what, making what subjects its themes? What were its best lessons for Christmas? Easter? Into what three subjects did they sum up religion? Like whom?

(37) What is supernaturalism? How did it prove itself? What did the rationalists do with their doctrine of the Bible? With what result? What resulted from rationalism's being widespread? Where? What was the result of this in Germany? How long did it reign supreme in Germany? Thereafter what did God raise up? Who was the leader in its first, or bad phase? In its second, or good phase? In what was the former the leader? The latter?

How did the former rank as a theologian? Who were Schleiermacher's main helpers in Germany? In England? What did all of these do? In support of what? When did this movement begin? How long before it became the most prominent Divinely favored movement? Through what? How is this typed?

(38) What was the period of its ascendancy? How typed? By what thought was it developed? How typed? What was the period of its first phase? By what was it closed? Shortly after what? Of what was it guilty during these 20 years? How typed? Along what lines? How typed? What evil did it develop in England and Germany? How typed? What kind of Churches did it develop in England and Germany? How typed? What evil did it favor in both countries? How typed? After what example? How typed? To what was it in both countries subject? How typed? In what did its unionistic efforts result? How typed? Why was this? In what did this result? How are these things typed? Contrary to what desire on God's part? How typed? How numerous were these churches? How typed? On what doctrine did it lay stress? How typed? What kind of anniversaries did it observe? *E.g.*, what illustration shows this? How typed? What kind of doctrines did it advocate? *E.g.*, what kind of an effect on men's minds did these have? How typed? In what did it deal? With what special doctrine did it deal? How typed? With what kind of teachers? How typed? How did these things affect God? How typed?

(39) What did it set up as a creedal doctrine? How typed? Where did they set it up? How typed? In what even? What pertinent thing had God revealed to the Apostles and the Interim's star-members? How typed? As what? How typed? What had God pledged? How typed? On what condition? How typed? Given by whose hand? How typed? What did the movement do with the consecrated and the supporters of God's sphere of executorship? More than what? How typed? What did God enable His people to do to their pertinent dispositions? How typed?

(40) What did God do in opposition to this evil course of the first phase of supernaturalism? What are the names and works of the chief of these? What did they

do? How did they do their chastising work? Until what was done? As what did they do it? How are these things typed? What did they point out? How typed? Than whom did these sin worse? How typed? Unto what effect? How typed? In view of these evils who voiced opposition? How typed? As what? What did He threaten? How typed? In what kind of a way? How typed? After what example? How typed? How judging it? How typed? With what kind of a work and reversal? How typed?

(41) What did He also say of the spared ones? How typed? To whom would He deliver them? How typed? How would their enemies treat them? How typed? Why? In what matters? How are these things typed? To what degree had they sinned? How typed? After whose example? How typed? After doing what? How typed? How long had such a course been pursued? How typed? What had various representatives of the evil supernaturalists done? How typed? Where? How typed? In addition to what? How typed? In what matters? How typed? Despite what would they and their adherents not obey His warnings and rebukes? How typed? In what did they continue? Why? How typed?

(42) What did their impenitence effect? How typed? What were the five sets of the opponents that God allowed to assail them? How typed? What did these five sets of opponents do with them with their sharp theories? How typed? What did this make of them? How typed? *E.g.*, by these what five things was Schleiermacher moved to do? Other leaders? What did this make of them? How are these things typed? What did they experience in their captivity? By what? How typed? What was the effect of these afflictions? How typed? For what did they plead? How typed? What did they do with themselves? How typed? As to what? How typed? How were their intense prayers expressed? How typed? How did God react to this? How typed? What favors did He grant them? How typed? Where is a fictitious prayer of Manasseh found? What will not thereon be done here? What did these experiences teach the supernaturalists? How typed?

(43) What time had now come? How typed? How do we know this? What was Neander's motto? Who were

his main coworkers? To what did these come forward? What truth was not then due? What did they erect? In what did Neander do this? Against whose heresies especially? In what did Tholuck do this? Who else vindicated Jesus' sinlessness? What death-blow did this book on Jesus' sinlessness deliver? What did Hengstenberg do? Miller? Lange? Dorner? How did they make strong defenses of the Old and New Testament truths? To what extent? What did they thereby do? How typed? On what? How typed? On what did they insist? As to what? What did they exalt? How typed? What did they appoint? Where? How typed? What did they set aside? How typed? What did they repudiate? How typed? What else did they repudiate? In favor of what? What had been done as to the visible, nominal church? Where? How typed? What did they not allow to remain in the true sphere of executorship? What did these and other Biblical scholars deal to higher criticism of the New Testament? What school of theologians did they cause to disintegrate? What, *e.g.*, did Bauer reject of the New Testament? What did he claim of the others?

(44) What in this connection did the true supernaturalists reject? What did they call it? What did they unanswerably prove? Who especially stressed this thought? With whom did he especially exert himself? To what purpose? With what effect? What effect even now do their writings have? How are these things typed? What did they minister to the faithful? What else did they do to the faithful? To what did they bring thousands? How typed? What two things did they encourage God's people to do in God's service? Who ably supported them therein? How are these things typed? What are we not by these things to understand? Why not? How typed? What did they thereby intend? How typed? What did this prove? By whom led in America? Europe and Asia? From this fact, what can we see negatively and positively? In its good part to what does it correspond?

(45) What else is done with the deeds of good supernaturalists? Of the evil supernaturalists? By whom are they recorded? How typed? What else are there set forth? How typed? What else is recorded? By whom? How typed? By whom else are these described? How typed? On what did they give details? How typed? Of

God's course thereover? How typed? What four evils are here indicated of the bad supernaturalists? How typed in each case? Where are these found? How typed? What finally occurred with this movement's ascendancy? How typed? How is it regarded? Why? How typed? By what was it succeeded? How typed?

(46) In whose mind as an ideal in theory and practice did the thought of the Y. M. C. A. originate? When? Where? With what did he become imbued? In what year did it become the ascendant movement? How typed? How long did it last as an ascendant movement? How typed? What are the parallel years? In what? How typed? When did Sir George Williams found the first Y. M. C. A.? Whom did he make members of it? Where did it then spread? When and where did it spread in America? Who only could be full members? What prerogatives did they have? What other kind of members were later accepted? Without what? What did it establish? What effect did the associate members have on this movement? To what had it grown in North America by April, 1860? What did its members do as to the American Civil War? On which side? What did it even become? In what manner did it act toward all Protestant Churches? Where? With what result? What was its developing thought? How typed? What did its secularization and the evils in the sects make it become? How typed? In what matters? How typed? After whose example? How typed? Why did it become guilty of all these sins? How typed? What did it do in these sects? How typed? To what did it yield itself? How typed?

(47) Unlike the good supernaturalists, what did it fail to do? How typed? In what matters? How typed? After whose example? How typed? From what did it apostatize? How typed? Into what did it not direct its steps? How typed? What did it increasingly do? How typed? What illustrates its evils? What did this do with its trespasses? What did some of its members doubtless not do? What did the bulk of them do? What did some of them do? As to what courses? What did they, therefore, do? How typed? While it was engaged in what activities? How typed? How did such consultation and refutation affect the common people? By what are these typed? To whom else was this course abhorrent? What did they first do as

a result? Secondly? How typed? What did the common people then do? How typed? Where else are the acts of this movement recorded? What was given this movement after it ceased to be the more favored ascendant movement? Where? How typed?

(48) Who was the earthly leader of the evangelistic movement? When was he born? Died? How did he rank as an evangelist? In what way was he its leading spirit? As typed in whom? Where? What was his character as a consecrated brother? In what respect was he like our Pastor and the great Spurgeon? What was his age at his father's death? In what for him did the poverty of his mother result? How was his speech for years after he became the world's greatest living evangelist? His bodily carriage? How old was he at consecration? In what year? Where? Why did he go there? From where? How are these things typed? What was done to him, despite his earnestness? Where was it said to have been done? Where was it certainly done? Why was his request to become a church member at first refused? When was it granted? After what? What did he do seven years later? In what year? Where? As what? When and where did he begin to work in the Y. M. C. A.? How was he unlike most Y. M. C. A. representatives in the Union and Confederate armies? With what did he couple his evangelistic work in the army? Amid what and when did he begin the work of leading the evangelistic movement? How long did he do this? How typed? What are the parallel years? By what thoughts was it developed and adorned? How typed?

(49) What was the character of the evangelistic movement? How typed? In what relations? How typed? What did it strictly follow? How typed? As what did it so do? How typed? What two extremes did it avoid? How typed? In what year was it first active in real earnest? Where? How typed? What did Bro. Moody do there? What was thereafter announced? What followed? What did the movement then do? When did it go into high gear? In what did it occur? How was the work distributed between them? How was Bro. Sankey qualified for his part in the work? In what did their union in the work result? How typed? Where did they first work with success? What did Bro. Moody decide to do in 1873?

How often had he been there before? What moved him to go there the third time? In what countries? What did he declare that he would do? When did they arrive in England? How is the time typed? What did they do in Britain and Ireland? Only what movement did a greater work there? How typed?

(50) What did Bro. Moody not mince? As to what? Where? What did he denounce? How typed in each case? What did he utterly refute? How typed? In whose presence? How typed? With what? How typed? What did he do to these evils? How typed? How typed in each case? What by these did he dishonor? How typed? What did the movement do with the leaders of these? What in like manner did it do to God's more favored people and its sphere of executorship? Where else did it so do? How typed in each case? In what years did Bros. Moody and Sankey labor in these lands? Converting approximately how many? What other good things did they there do? How typed? Where was its work done? How large were their audiences at times? Only after doing what did it return to its sphere of executorship in America? How are these things typed?

(51) What did the movement begin between April 1879 and April 1880? How typed? Under whose lead? What did these educational movements have at heart? With what institution did it begin? By what kind of men was this institution administered? How typed in each form of instruction? When was the Mt. Hermon school for young men started? How did its teachers and directors compare and contrast with those of the first school? For what were they sent? How are these things typed? What third educational institution did it through Bro. Moody found? What kind of men were its teachers? Directors? How typed in each case? Why were these sent? How typed? What did they request? How typed? By whom were they gathered together? How typed? Especially what truths? How typed in the different lands? What did they do after this? How typed?

(52) To whom were they first to deliver such truths? How typed? Secondly to whom? How typed? In what separate steps did these work? How typed in each step? What were they by their labors and truths to acquire? How typed in each kind of service? Why were these

things done? How typed? What did these chargees do? How typed in both kinds of workers? For what two things were the justified ones intended to serve? How typed in each case? With what effect did the colaborers faithfully work? How typed? What two kinds of literature were published? How typed in each case? How were both sets typed? How were Bible expounders and historians used? How typed? As scholars how were they typed? How did they use their offices? How typed? Who else rendered help? How typed? How did they serve? How typed? What offices did some of the less prominent workers hold? By whom are these typed? How were these offices typed in each case?

(53) What did these chargees do? How typed? Who brought them something? How typed? What and how was it? How typed? To whose attention did they first of all bring the Bible? How typed? What did the former declare? How typed? Into whose hands did they put it? How typed? What did these do as to it? How typed? To what did they bring it? How typed? What did they report? How typed? What did the teachers and directors of the Northfield Seminary report to the movement? How typed? What did they then do? How typed? How did this affect the movement? How typed? On what five bodies did it call? Where and when did they usually meet? How typed in each case? What did it urge? Pertinent to what? On whose behalf? How typed? Why did it so urge? How typed? What did it acknowledge? How typed? As written where? How typed?

(54) What did these five groups do? How typed? In whose teachings? How typed? Of what did the latter make diligent study? How is such study typed? For what did they hope? How typed? In what were they poor? How typed? What did they diligently have as their charge? How typed? Where and how were they placed? How typed? What did the messengers do as to the views of these? How typed? What did the latter do to them? How typed? For what purpose? How typed? Who were some of the chief ones of this class of foolish virgins? On what did they speak and write? While these were a part of antitypical Huldah, how are their erroneous views typed? What did they understand as to the great tribulation as the trouble of the Day of Wrath? What

did they inform the messengers? How typed? According to what? How typed? What had the movement heard thereon? How typed? Why was this wrath to come? How typed? In whose service had they used their human all? How typed? With what result? How typed? By what? How typed? Against what was God's wrath aroused? How typed? Until when would it not cease? How typed?

(55) What did these foolish-virgin students of prophecy have for the movement's messengers? How typed? What was its source? How typed? As to what did it pertain? How typed? On what two matters did they express appreciation? How typed in both cases? At what did these two appreciable things work? What did they forecast of evil? How typed? How did this statement affect the movement? How typed? How did God regard its pertinent course? How typed? What first thing favorable to the movement did these foolish-virgin students of prophecy forecast? How typed? Second? How typed? Third thing? How typed? Fourth thing? How typed? What did the messengers do with these four things? How typed? What in this situation impressed the movement? Especially whom? What did this lead it to do? How typed? What did all these do? Together with whom? How typed? What did the movement do to these? How typed?

(56) What did the movement then do? Under whose leadership? In which of its members? How typed? What did it solemnly vow? How typed? In what matters? How typed? To keep what? In harmony with what? How typed? In what spirit? How typed in each case? And to carry out what? How typed? Where did the movement do this work? Under whose auspices were these meetings held? By what other efforts additionally were exceptionally large numbers won for consecration? What will our readers remember on this as told by our Pastor? Where especially was this work done? How typed? Especially who took this matter of consecration to heart and life deeply? How typed? Whom else did the movement charge, in three groups? How typed in each group? What did it charge them to do? How typed? What three things were they charged to put away? How typed in each case?

(57) What did the movement do with these things? Where? How typed? In what condition, really their

own? How typed? What did it show of their memories? How typed? Whom did it denounce as officeless? How typed? What had evil movements arranged to be used? Where? How typed? Whom else did it denounce? What four particular things? How typed in each case? What especially did it cast out from God's people and its sphere of executorship? How typed? To what did it assign them? How typed? So set forth, what was done to it by the movement? How typed? What did it do there with it? How typed? To what did it assign them? As of what? How typed? What did it utterly refute? How typed? In the service of such what did the churches make? How typed? By its preaching what did it publicly expose? What did it prove? From what? To what? How typed in each case? What did it further refute? How typed? How did they stand? As to what? How typed? What did the nominal-church leaders not exercise? How are they and this typed? Where not? How typed?

(58) Of what did they partake? How typed? Early in his career as an evangelist what doctrine did Bro. Moody use to frighten sinners to repentance? What motives did he use during the bulk of that career to lead people to repentance and faith? What did he thereby do? How typed? Whose theory was that one which he defiled? How typed? To what end? How typed? What else did it do? What are some of the errors that the papacy favored? How typed? What were they alleged to be? How typed? What office did they exercise? How typed? What were they allegedly giving? How typed? Where were they? How typed? What was done to them as to Biblical standing and organization? How typed? To what did it do similar things? How typed? What originated these? How typed? Which other churches were so treated? How typed? For what two kinds of professing Christians were they made? How typed? What did it do to them as unbiblical? How typed? What else did it do to them? How typed? As what did it set forth this remembrance? How typed? Where were the Romish churches? How typed? By what favored? How typed? What two things did the papacy as the antitype of the evil Solomon set up? What of Protestantism did he set up? How typed in each case? What did the movement do as to these? How typed?

(59) What did it do with credisms? How typed? As

objects of what? What did it undermine? How typed? Defiled them as coming from what? How typed? What did it do with the church of many sects? Who introduced it? How typed? What was it to Protestantism? How typed? What did it do to the Lutheran Church and its sects? How typed? What three things did it do to its sects? How typed in each case? To what did it turn its attention? How typed? What did it perceive? How typed? What did it charge those acquainted with its history? How typed? What was done to their memory and reputation? Where? How typed? As what did it hold it up? How typed? According to whose teachings? On what mission had God sent him? How typed?

(60) While considering the memories of those who had more or less to do with sectarianizing Lutheranism, what did it see? What did it ask as to him? How typed? What did the sectarian Lutheran leaders first answer? How typed? What had he forecast against that sectarian church? How typed? What did it do to the memory of Bucer? What did it charge others? How are these two things typed? What was done as to this charge? How typed? What else did they do to those Lutherans who desired fellowship with Bucer? How typed? What did it do with all Lutheran bodies maintaining Lutheran sects? How typed? Even what sects? How typed? According to what deeds? How typed? Where did it refute all sectarian leaders? How typed? What else did it do in this respect? How typed? What did it then do? How typed? Against what things among God's more favored people and the sphere of their executorship? How is each of these evils typed? Where were they? How typed? What did it do with them? Why did it do these things? How typed? In what spheres did it do this? How typed? What did it persuade all in these spheres to do? How typed? What did they do throughout its ascendancy? How typed?

(61) In what did this movement excel all others? In what did the Bible recension, printing and circulating excel it? How typed in each case? How was this so? How typed? According to what? How typed? Despite this from what was God not swayed? How typed? In view of what was this the case? How typed? What movement was especially responsible for this? How typed?

How great was God's resultant displeasure? How typed? What case was like this one? How typed? What else would He cast off? How typed? Despite what two things? How typed in each case?

(62) Upon what did the movement lay the greatest stress? By what two things? What did it urge? Upon this basis to what did it invite believers? How typed? As what? How typed? As charged where? How typed? As in harmony with what did they observe this? How typed? In harmony with what did the fulness of the Gentiles come in probationarily in April 1878? What did some of these called ones do? With what result from April 1879 to April 1880? How typed? Unto what did this call go forth? Until when? What ceased then? What did God especially do during these 2½ years? Under whose supervision? Who told us this? How was this work related to the great passover of this movement? When beginning? Where typically set forth? By what in addition to the parallel are we led to this conclusion? What was the total of the lambs and bullocks? Of what is this total a multiple? For what does the number 12 stand? How many times is 12 contained in 41,400? What may the quotient 3,450 mean in this connection? What did it end in Oct. 1881?

(63) Who were the chief evangelists of this movement besides Bro. Moody? What did it arrange for them to do? How typed? What did it strengthen them to do? How typed? Whom else did it encourage to serve? As what? How typed? What were these to avoid? How typed? With what did it exhort them to content themselves? How typed? Why should they have done this? How typed? How were they to give themselves to the service? How typed? What did it further urge upon these? In what three groups? What was the work of each group? How typed? In harmony with what? How typed? According to the writings of what two sets of Gospel-Age leaders? How typed in each case? What did it impress upon them? In what did this result as to the ways of using their talents? How typed? Furthermore, what did it urge them to set forth? How typed? From what and to what were they to set themselves apart? How typed? What else did it tell them to do? How typed?

(64) Whom did the movement in its leaders excel as

to bringing people to justification, consecration and Spirit-begettal? How typed? What did it do to attain this greater abundance of results? How typed? These leaders did what? How were they grouped? How typed in each case? What three classes gave the most assistance to the movement? What were the names of the chief ones in each class? How was each class typed? For what three stages of the Christian life did they render good service as to the antitypical Passover? How typed? In what two antitypical forms of sacrifice? How is each one typed? What five sets of other helpers assisted? What are the names of those belonging to each set? How is each set typed? As what and for what did they help? How typed? What did these services do in large part as to the passover? How typed? What was done as to the chief leaders? Subordinate leaders? According to what? How typed in each case? According to whose charge? How typed?

(65) What did the leading evangelists do? In what form? How typed? What assurance did they give? Through what? To whom? How typed? What did the subordinate leaders do? Where did they work this conviction mainly? How typed? From what did the leading evangelists at first abstain? How typed? Why this? In whose interests? How typed? According to what? How typed? What did they thereafter stress? As apparent in what? What did they stress as further evidence thereon? How typed? What did the subordinate leaders set forth? As being how? How typed? As shown by what? How typed? What did they set forth as less severe? How typed? First by what? How typed? Second by what? How typed? Third by what? How typed? What did they quickly set forth? To whom? Why? How typed?

(66) Who were mainly active in these services? How typed? What did they ready? For whom? How typed? Why was this? How typed? What did the subordinate evangelists do? How typed? In what way? How typed? According to what charge? As to whom first? How typed? As to whom secondly? How typed? As to whom thirdly? How typed? What did these last ones do for the movement? How typed? Where were those whose work was to lead to repentance and faith? How typed? Until when were such often active? Why? How typed? How were their needs in the antitypical passover cared for? How

typed? During what was this whole service performed? In what years? Why? How are these things typed? For what other reason? Through giving and correcting what? As to what? In harmony with what? How typed? According to whose charge? How typed?

(67) Who not only participated under the movement's operation in the Lamb's merit? How typed? Also what did the faithful and measurably faithful further participate in? How typed? Since what event had there not been so great an antitypical Passover as this one? Who were the leaders in that greater one? What is it usually called? How are these things typed? Not in whose days? How typed? In whose days was this one held? How typed? Who all participated therein? In what year did it begin? Until when did it continue? How is its beginning year typed? What did this movement as ascendant continue? For how long? With what comparative results? Especially in what respect? In fact, until when did it continue to officiate as ascendant? Through what events did it come to an end? Where are these events typed?

(68) Who have described its great work? Especially in what? In what else? Appearing where? How are these things typed? After what event did these closing events in the movement occur? How typed? And after what great event? How typed? While it was doing what? How typed? In what condition was the Satan system then? Since when did this occur? For what did some of the fallen angels stand? How typed? Through whose efforts especially did the secular phase of Satan's divided empire seek its preponderance over the religious phase of the divided empire of Satan? Who led the latter phase? How typed? Here, as in some other places, for what does Assyria stand? Between whom was the battle of Charchemish fought? What name was given this battle? A year before when? Just after what? Why did Josiah oppose Nechoh? What peoples were concerned in this battle? How typed? In the type, how did this battle rank? Until when? What did the movement do? As true to what? To what was it opposed? Why did it have to oppose such a purpose? How typed? In what did its battle result? How typed? In what? How typed? What did the involved fallen angels seek to do? Through what

movement? By whom? How typed? What did these declare to it? How typed? What two things did it allege? How typed?

(69) What did the secularizing movement claim? How typed? What was its admonition to the evangelistic movement? How typed? What number is the Hebrew word *elohim*? Why is it preferable to translate it here as a plural? How are these things typed? What did it claim of the gods? How typed? Against what did it warn the evangelistic movement? How typed? What was its reaction to the warning? How typed? Into what did it change its appearance? How typed? Why? How typed? To what did it not give heed? Why not? How typed? In what condition did it come to battle? How typed? What did the sharp speakers and writers make of the movement? Especially from what standpoint? How did they designate its refusal to coalesce with heathen religions? With what did they charge it? For what reason? How typed? What was the effect of these charges upon it? How typed? What did it declare? How typed? Accordingly, what two things did its supporters do? How typed in each case? Thereby what did it cease to be? How typed? Where did they bring it? How typed?

(70) What was given it? Why? How typed? Even as what? How typed? Yea, even as what? How typed? By whom, first of all, was it mourned? How typed? Secondly? How typed? Thirdly? In what? What did he pour out? How typed? What did all the speaking and writing brothers and sisters do? Why? How typed? What were these made? How typed? Into what were they put? Where are its acts and goodness described? How typed? By whom are its special acts recorded? How typed?

(71) What study have we finished? How many kings in Judah remain to be considered in our study? Whose sons were three of these? What conclusion do we draw therefrom? How long did the first of them reign? The third? How long did the other two reign? Who was the type of the first of the four? During what year B.C. did he reign? What did he type? Who inaugurated this movement? When? What are the parallel years? What did Bro. Moody and his fellow helpers start to emphasize in 1870? How typed? To what was this movement

closely related? How typed? How long was it the ascendant movement? What did it do? What happened shortly after it came into the ascendancy? Why? To what did this movement turn? How typed?

(72) Who captured this movement? By whom typed? What did the movement do to gain favor? Fruitfulness? How typed? With what movement did it associate itself? In what was it made to secularize itself? How typed? In what did this condition result? What did it secularize? With what two results? How typed? What did this second result effect? For what did the secularizing fallen angels have no use? What did they therefore do with it? What did they put in its place? Why? What did they do with the movement to give it an appearance of a righteous and Divinely approved movement? How typed? Into what did these secularizing fallen angels bring the consecration movement? What resulted to this movement?

(73) Who began the early unionistic movement? When? Through what? What proves this date? What was the period of the unionistic movement's ascendancy? How typed? What were the parallel years? What doctrine especially nourished this movement? What did that doctrine do? How typed? What was characteristic of the unionistic movement in relation to God? Where is the evil that this movement did detailedly described? Where has it been explained, type and antitype? What will we therefore not give further here? How did Satan regard the secularizing character of this movement? As a result what did he begin in 1897? How typed?

(74) How long was this movement subject to Satan? How typed? What did this movement then seek to do with itself? As against Satan's religious purposes? How typed? By 1904 what did Satan do with this movement in its religious phase? What did he make of the movement? How typed? What did Satan pervert for the interest of his religious empire? In the unionistically inclined churches? How typed? What use did Satan make of these stewardship doctrines? How typed? By whom have the acts of this unionistic movement been described? How typed? After it ceased being the ascendant movement by what movement was it succeeded? By whom typed? How reconcile the statement in 2 Kgs. 24:8 of Jehoiakin's age with his age as given in 2 Chro. 36:9? In what year was

the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement started? By whom? What error did it cause to prevail? What doctrines did it pervert? How are these things typed? What strong doctrine mothered this movement? How typed? Where and by whom was this commission given? How typed? What did it do similarly to the previous movement? How typed?

(75) While this movement was in the ascendancy who made an onslaught on its sphere of executorship? Under what conditions did it bring it? How typed? Even who himself worked against its sphere of executorship? During the captivity of whom? How typed? Who shared in the surrender? How typed in each case? Who captured it? How typed? In what year after Satan began the Babylonian aspect of his reign? How typed? What did Satan take from the sphere of its executorship? How typed? What else did he take? How typed? What did he utterly devastate? How typed?

(76) Whom did Satan make captive? How typed? How typed in detail? Even the full number of whom? How typed? Among these were all of whom? How typed? Whom else did Satan capture? How typed? Thus Satan got control of all belonging to the movement except whom? How typed? In what year of Satan's particular reign in Babylon did he carry the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement into Babylon's sphere of work? How typed? What strong doctrine did he take captive? What misuse did he make of it? How typed? Whom else? How typed? As well as whom else? How typed? In making them all his captives what did he do with them? How typed? Whom, numbering according to the Divine number, did he also take? Beside these whom else did he take? What did they total? How are they typed? What was the character of all these warriors as such? What did Satan do with them? How typed?

(77) What movement did Satan then make the ascendant movement? To what movement was it allied? In whose place did he make it the ascendant movement? How typed? Of what did this movement consist? To palm it off as seemingly pleasing to Jehovah what did Satan do with its external character? How typed? In allusion to what did God permit this? What resulted from Satan's pertinent act? How typed? What occurred in 1942 with

the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement? How typed? How did this come about? How did Satan change his method of dealing with it? How typed? What does *Evil-merodach* mean? In allusion to what? What did he begin to do with the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement? How typed? Why? As a result what did he take away from that movement? How typed? To what did he give it preference? How typed? With what did he invest the Students' Volunteer Missionary Movement? How typed? How long did he support it with full provision? How typed? How long did Satan give it such advantages? How typed? After what did the movement cease to be?

(78) What remark was made above as to Zedekiah being a type? What do we desire to do to that remark? Who gave the tendency to the start of such a movement? When? What was his intention therein? What did it seek more or less to ignore? How typed? How long was this the ascendant movement? Lasting in actual time how long? But according to the Hebrew way of counting how long did it last? How long was this the case according to the Hebrew method of counting a year? How typed? What was the theory that produced combinism as a movement? How typed? What doctrine did it counterfeit? What did it work in matters pertaining to God? What should be expected of such a movement? Where are these evils detailedly described? What will not be done with them here? How typed? Even what movement's evils did this movement surpass? How typed? What did it refuse to do before "that Servant"? As what did he speak to it? How typed?

(79) What is necessary for us to remember in discussing the combinism movement? What six European states were more or less related to Combinism acting under Satan to overthrow Combinism? As what? What do we ask of our readers? What is described there? As well as what else is described there? What will we not do because this matter has been given considerable detail in that note? What do we ask our readers to keep in mind? What did that Combinism imply? With whose evils was God highly displeased? To what degree did God's anger express itself? How typed? How did this anger express itself in Combinism in church and state? How typed?

Despite what fact was this rebellion committed? How typed? How did it become in apostatizing from the Lord? How typed? For the chronological data typed in Combinism to what do we refer our readers? What will the detailed discussion in those two places make unnecessary for us to do here? How is this chronology typed?

(80) When did the besieging of Combinism start? As indicated where? To what did its first stage lead? How typed? What steps did Satan cause to be taken for the besieging of Combinism? How typed? How long did this siege continue? How typed? What evil overtook Combinism and its supporters? Out of what did they run in its sphere of executorship? How typed? With what result? How typed? What did the outbreak of the World War, Phase I, do to cause Combinism's warriors to be? How did they flee? How typed? How was the flight made possible? Between what was the flight made? How typed? Even where? Into what kind of condition did it flee? How typed? What warriors overtook it in the sphere of the nominal church? How typed? What happened to the warriors of Combinism, especially in its religious phase? How typed? Into whose power did Combinism in its two features fall? How typed? In what special feature of its phase was it taken and brought captive to Satan? In what condition? How typed? What quality did Satan exercise especially in his fruitful condition? How typed? What did Satan do with Combinism? How typed? What did he do with all its movements? In whose presence? How typed? Whom else did he cut off? In what condition was he? How typed? What did Satan do with Combinism? How typed? With what did he hold it? And thus carried it away into what? How typed? Until what result did he restrain it? How typed?

(81) For the exposition of 8-10; ;12-14, where should we look? What did Satan's chief representative among the fallen angels do with the rest of the people who were the supporters of the sphere of God's more favored people's executorship and those who had already fallen into Satan's hands? How typed? Only whom did he leave free from captivity? For what purpose? How typed? What two sets of star-members under Christ's headship did the demons set aside? How typed as to Christ's headship? As to the two sets of star-members? From what standpoint?

From how being regarded by God's nominal people? What additionally did they set aside? By what typed? What was its foundation? How typed? How were they regarded among the nominal people of God? In such regard what did they do with them? What did they do with God's arrangements for completing consecrators' sacrifice? What typed these? With the refutations? How typed? The corrections? How typed? The ethical teachings? How typed? The sin-offering teachings? How typed? In summary, what did they do to these things as they appeared to the nominal people of God? What did they do with the doctrines? By what typed? Scriptural passages? How typed? Sin-offering doctrines as these appear to God and the new creatures? How typed? What did the chief representative of Satan do with these? In the estimation of God's nominal people how were regarded the 12 Apostles, the 35 Interim star-members, with Christ their Head, the New Testament with its cleansing office, with the Old Testament books as its foundation, as set forth by the justice of God as the Bible support to the twelve tribes of Spiritual Israel, as taught by the Interim star-members? How is each one of these details typed? What did the nominal people think of the describability of these? How typed? How did the nominal people of God consider the 12 Apostles and the Interim star-members? How typed? How does the type show this? Nevertheless, what were they for? How typed? How are the four attributes of God here typed? Did these star-members stand in their own strength? How typed? What were the 35 Interim star-members given by God? Like but inferior to whom? How typed?

(82) As what did the nominal people of God actually regard Christ? How is this evil view of Him typed? Whose mistake is the word *three* in 2 Kgs. 25:17? How was Christ understood by God's nominal people? How typed? Despite their imperfect view, how is the fruitfulness of His redemptive work manifest in His headship of the two classes of star-members? How typed? How did these two sets of star-members represent Christ's redemptive work among the nominal people of God? How many pomegranates were originally on the two pillars? Where is this shown? What does it type? Despite what fact? What characteristic did Christ's redemptive work for the

human race have? How typed? What did Satan's chief supporter do to the Papacy and the Federation of Churches? To the three parts of Christendom? How in each case are these things typed? Whom else did Satan's chief officer among the fallen angels take from the place of executorship of God's nominal people? What four sets of persons and things did Satan's chief officer take away from the sphere of executorship of God's more favored people? How typed in each case? To whom did this chief officer take these things? What did Satan do with them? Where? How typed? In summary, what was done with God's more favored people? How typed? In enumerating the number of captives in Jer. 42:28-30, what set of captives is omitted? How many were there of them? What is the total number of captives set forth in Jer. 52:28-30? What does this figure indicate? As to the class to which they belong? During how many campaigns of Satan against Christendom did he take these captives? Where did we expound 2 Kgs. 25:22-25? What, therefore, will not be done here? What two periods are the symbolic first year of antitypical Cyrus' reign? Of whom was he a type? In fulfilment of what did our Lord make the pertinent proclamation? Through whom were these teachings given? What did the proclamation embody? What did it invite all of God's people to do? How are all these things, typed in 2 Chro. 36:22, 23?

APPENDIX I

LAMENTATIONS

IN ITS FIRST application the book of Lamentations expresses Jeremiah's grief over the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, and the taking of the latter's vessels and furniture, and of Israel, into captivity in Babylon. This application is, of course, that of the type. But it has two antitypical applications. The first of these is the grief of the Interim's star-members, those who officiated between the Harvests, over the overthrow of the true Church as Jesus' sphere of rulership, and as God's temple, and of the captivity, in symbolic Babylon, of the Lord's people as such, and in its various capacities as such (the temple's furniture), and of the Bible (laver), and of the Truth teachings (vessels), together with their defiling during such captivity. Jeremiah, from this standpoint, represents the Interim's star-members. Its second antitypical application is the grief of the Epiphany Messenger over the Levites' desolating the Lord's Harvest people as the sphere of Jesus' rulership and as God's temple and their making captives of God's Harvest people as such in Little symbolic Babylon, and in their various capacities (furniture), and the Bible (laver), and the Truth teachings (vessels), together with their defiling during such captivity. It is not our intention to discuss here the type as such, nor the second antitype as such. Rather we will here discuss the first antitypical application of the book's contents. The comments will be brief and in the nature of a paraphrase, rather than extended explanations. The line of thought in this book is epitomized in Ps. 137, with this difference, that this book describes the grief-experiences of the star-members, and the Epiphany messenger, while Ps. 137 describes the grief-experiences of the whole Israel of God during the Interim

and Epiphany. We will, therefore, begin our exposition with a paraphrase of Ps. 137.

Besides the teachings of Great and Little Babylon, God's real people were seated respectively in the two above-mentioned periods, and were in grief as they respectively thought of the Lord's people in the Jewish Harvest and in the Parousia (1). They respectively let the earth-tending leaders in Great and Little Babylon have the Old and New Testaments in charge respectively (2). Their respective captors required them to declare the respective Truth messages, even their respective devastators required them to be joyful in declaring a teaching of their respective reaping times (3); but how could they declare their respective truths in a strange sphere of teaching and spirit (4)? Nevertheless, they respectively vowed not to forget the respective spheres of Jesus' rulership over His people; rather would they forget their chief power and work, than so to do (5); and rather would they be speechless in their respective times, if they did not prefer their respective spheres of Jesus' rulership over His people to their greatest joy (6). Their respective attitudes were prayers that God might keep in mind the civil powers' course toward the respective spheres of Jesus' rulership over His people, as they urged its respective complete overthrow (7). Their respective attitude toward Great and Little Babylon, which are to be annihilated, was that they who would treat them as they treated God's true people would be favored by God (8); and that they who would dash the little sects of both Babylons against the doctrines of the Truth would be favored by God (9).

Now for Lamentations proper. Jesus' sphere of rulership over God's people, once having many subjects, was in the Interim solitary, which was the case during the ascendancy of the Greek Catholic Church during the Smyrna period, of the Roman Catholic Church during the Pergamos, Thyatira and Sardis periods and of each sect of Protestantism after its

respective Little Flock movement was perverted into a sect. It became as a widow, when God seemingly withdrew from it. Despite the fact that it had been great among non-Christian nations and the chief sphere of God's work, it had become a serving subject in her people (1:1). Deeply did her captive people weep because of the errors in which they were involved; distress showed itself over their present teachings; among former lovers none comforted them; for their friends had betrayed them and become their enemies (2). God's more favored people were captives in Babylon, because of being overcome by temptations and service of evil. They abode among the heathen without peace. All their persecutors, those in state, church, aristocracy and Inquisition, overtook them amid great difficulties (3). The concourses of the Church as the light-giver were distressed, because clear traveling as to justification, sanctification, class standing, peace of justification and tribal growths in the 12 graces were lacking. Those who had led into the Church no more did so; the star-members and their special helpers grieved; their consecrated ones were in trouble and the Church as sphere of Jesus' rulership over God's people was in deepest sorrow (4). The Church's, especially the star-members' attackers, like Anicetus against Polycarp, Dionesius against Hippolytus, Athanasius against Arius, Jerome against Jovinian, Theodemir against Claudius of Turin, Radbertus against Ratramnus, Lanfranc against Berengar of Tours, Bernard against Peter Abelard, Rome's Innocent IV against Grosseteste, Alvarus Pelagius against Marsiglio, Courtenay against Wyclif, D'Ailly against Huss, and the main opponents of the twelve star-members of Philadelphia, were counted leaders in Babylon. Its enemies were prospered in state, church and aristocracy; for God had afflicted it for the many wrongs committed in it by its faultful members; and its members went into Babylonian captivity through her enemy, the nominal church (5). Of course, under such conditions, the

beauties of holiness were lost by its members; her leaders, having become weak because of lacking spiritual food, were easily overtaken by their pursuers (6). When the Church's members came into the power of the nominal church and had no helpers, then, in the days of their trouble and woes, they remembered the great privileges of grace, knowledge and service that the brethren of the Jewish Harvest had. Her attackers, seeing her miseries, mocked at her rests of faith (7).

The Church, which embraced crown-retainers and crown-losers, the latter greatly predominating, had transgressed much; therefore, it was removed from the sphere of Jesus' rulership over His people, and fell into dishonor of the entire class that had honored it, because they saw her shameful sinfulness; it sorrowed and retrograded (8). In its qualities was seen her sinfulness; it considered not the results of its course; hence it marvelously sank lower in wrong. None comforted it; the star-members brought its afflictions before the Lord; for the nominal church magnified itself (9). It, by its theologians, used its powers against all the Church's goodly powers, privileges and possessions; for it saw that the unregenerate entered into the Church, though God forbade them so to do (10). All its members sighed, for they sought spiritual food. To preserve their beings they had given up all their favors, privileges and possessions. The star-members of the Interim pleaded with God to take note of, and give attention to these things, recognizing that they had become vile in Babylon's sight (11). Their plight was an indifferent thing to passersby. Considering, they would recognize that none had such grief as they, done to them by their opponents, *e.g.*, those named in the preceding paragraph, but arranged for by the Lord's wrath for sin (12). God, from on high, sent destruction into the very beings of the Interim's star-members, and overcame them. He had manipulated them into traps; He had conditioned matters for their defeat, making them desolate and weak (13). Their

faultful habits were, by God's power, bound upon them; in combinations they enslaved their wills, weakening them, and delivered them to enemies (14).

He allowed to be subdued in conflict all the able men that supported the star-members, and arranged for the companies of nominal-church theologians to suppress their warrior supporters; He allowed the faithful to be greatly oppressed by trials (15). These things greatly saddened the star-members, and that because a comforter was nowhere at hand for their relief. Those whom they begat for the Lord were made desolate, because Babylon was victorious (16). The true Church longed for mercy; but none comforted her. The Lord arranged, as to His people, that her enemies surround her. The Church was avoided as defiled with heresy and evil deeds (17), yet the star-members vindicated God's justice in this, since even they were more or less rebellious as to His Truth; for successive generations of them imbibed errors that previous ones had controverted. They, by their attitude, called upon all their hearers to witness their grief at the consecrated and warriors being captured by the errors and wrong practices of their disseminators (18). They called upon friends, *e.g.*, Berengar of Tours upon his friend Hildebrand, but were by these deceived. Their main and subordinate leaders perished as such while seeking for the bread of life in the doomed and erring Church (19). Their attitude told the Lord their sorrows, disturbed sympathies and great discouragement, because of their having endorsed grievous error in Babylon. Controversy that they waged with outsiders took away supporters, and among their supporters deadly errors cut down their espousers (20). All, including their opponents, knew of their sorrows and troubles; but none offered comfort to them. They rejoiced that God had consented to their sufferings. But they knew that God would bring the day of wrath upon their class, when they will have sorrows like the Interim's star-members (21). Their attitude was that

God would, in due time, cause all their oppressors' wrongs to come up for punishment before Him and render to them as He had consented to their rendering to them for their errors of doctrine and practice, because their sorrows discouraged their hearts (22).

Chapter 2 gives a more intense description of the overthrow of the true Church by Babylonians than does chapter 1. God caused trouble to engulf His Church, as the light of the world, in His displeasure, He cast her, the adornment of His people, down from spiritual to earthly things; and remembered her not in the time of His displeasure (2:1). He has consumed all abodes of His people without pity. He consented to the overthrow of the strong teaching of His favored people in His wrath and abased them to the earth, and has consented to the pollution of the leaders and their leadership (2). In His sore displeasure He cut off the strength of His people. He drew back Jesus, His chief Favorite and Power, from the conflict with Babylonian theologians in the Interim, and consented to destructive injuries working against and devouring His people on all sides (3). He consented to their enemies' using deadly controversial weapons against them; and with power consented, as an enemy, to the overthrow of every goodly privilege, power and possession of His people by the errors and wrong practices of Babylonians, and thus destructively poured out His wrath (4). God Himself acted as though He was turned into an enemy; He consumed His people; He consented to all their main teachings being devoured, to the destruction of their strong teachings, and to the increase of His people's grief and distress (5). He consented to enemies destroying His Church as a compact company, as one plows up a garden. As to the assembly of His people as a distinct company, He had consented to its destruction. He has consented to it that the teachings of justification by faith, sanctification of Spirit, taking ones' standing before the Lord and the rest of faith be forgotten in His Church,

and has consented to make little the favored movement and the main leader (6). He has acted as if He had cast off His Church in its capacity of encouraging, *etc.*, the brethren, as if He had hated it as His meeting place with His people, as if He had surrendered the power of its main teachings to the enemy, who have defiled it by their agitations, even as to its special blessings (7). His determination was to destroy the power, the Truth, of His people. He measured out the course of attack upon them, and did not withdraw His destroying power. Therefore, under the blows of Babylonian theologians in the Interim, He consented to the weakening of her special and ordinary powers, which in their defenders lament and grow weak together (8). Those who led others into the sphere of Jesus' rulership over God's people became immersed in secular things. He consented to the destruction of the teachings and practices that held them in place. The favored movements and their leaders were scattered among heathen. The Truth as one whole was nonexistent in the faith of believers. Its expounders no more saw God's plan (9). The leaders of God's people were in the deepest mourning over these evils. The consecrated of Jesus' sphere of rulership of His people were in the deepest shame (10). The star-members lost their insight into the Truth because of their grief; their sympathies were greatly disturbed, their analytic powers had sunk to earthly subjects, because of the overthrow of God's people, and because they were but slightly developed, and the beginners fainted away in the ways of God's religious government (11). They cried out to their developers for solid and liquid spiritual food, while they fainted, as sin-wounded ones, in the ways of God's religious government, or as they died on the bosom of their developers (12).

The Interim star-members wondered as to what witness they should give the Church or as to what they might compare her; and as to what they could lay hold on as sufficient to comfort it as God's light-shiner,

since as wide as the ocean was her breach, and it was incurable (13). Its teachers had imagined fruitless and senseless things for it, but as flatterers had not pointed out its faults, to prevent its becoming a captive in Babylon, but had seen false views and things that brought exile to it (14). All passersby make signs of derision, despising and disapproval at the Church, saying, Is this the religious government that men call the perfection of holiness, and the joy of all society (15)? Inimical theologians and ecclesiastics spoke against the Church; they uttered despising and hatred. They boasted that they had completely swallowed it, that this was the time that they had expected, that they had overtaken it and witnessed its defeat (16). For the wrongs of His people the Lord had fulfilled His anciently foretold Plan and Word as to them. He caused them to be cast down without pitying them. He made their enemy, the nominal church, triumph over them, and had given them power as their opponents (17). Their hearts cried out unto the Lord as the Defense of His people as light-shiners. They entreated Him to grieve with them ceaselessly, pleading with Him not to permit His most favored people to cease to be (18). The Interim star-members exhorted the Lord's people to cry out in the night time, which the Interim was, from the beginning of each watch of the night onward, and freely to pour out their hearts before God, and to do this emphatically for the lives of the beginners in the way of God, who fainted for spiritual hunger in prominent places in the concourses of God's religious government (19). These star-members pleaded with God to think of what those were to whom He had done such things. They asked whether those who had developed the babes should in the distress consume them, even the youngest? Should the main leaders and the teachers be cut off in the Church of God (20)? Warriors and the ancients lie amid earthly things, cut off in the concourses of God's religious government. Their consecrated and their warriors are defeated by

Babylonian arguments. God, these star-members said, had cut them off in the time of His displeasure, refuted and not pitied (21). While God's people were engaged in various stages of their experiences, God called them to experience terrors on all sides, resulting in none escaping nor remaining in the day of God's anger. Yea, those whom these star-members gave the first ministries after their begetting of the Spirit as a reckoned birth, the Babylonian church consumed (22).

In chapter 3 more details of the Interim's star-members' sufferings are set forth. They recognize, *e.g.*, Wyclif, Huss, Hubmaier, Cranmer, Servetus, in fact, all of them, that they were a class that had experienced tribulations by God's chastening wrath (3:1). Providentially their ministry, from the outstart until the Sardis period, was accompanied increasingly with much error away from the Truth (2). This made them successively feel that God had turned against them; increasingly His power seemed to do this to them continually (3). God had worn out their internal and external substance; and every one of them seemed wrecked by their tribulations (4). Through the power of their adversaries He seemed to work against them, and surrounded them with the saddest of experiences and sufferings (5). They were set amid Greek, Roman and Protestant errors; as ancient dead ones (6). He made them prisoners in inescapable conditions, chained by hard conditions (7). He seemed to refuse to answer their loud supplications (8). He made their teachings come into close contact with the most subtly developed errors; and their consequent courses of argument seem unclear (9). He seemed to place them in positions where strong enemies lurked for them; and powerful adversaries hid to pounce upon them (10). His course seemed to lead them away into the errors of the Dark Ages and to make divisions amid their members, *e.g.*, Luther and Zwingli; Zwingli and Hubmaier, Cranmer and Servetus, *etc.*, making each one stand alone in desolation (11). He seemed to turn

parts of the Bible as a propelling weapon against them, and to shoot sharp sayings against them in many of their debates (12). He seemed to cause many of His sharp Bible sayings to enter their very vitals (13). Throughout the entire Interim they have been objects of ridicule and mockery to all nominal Christians, *e.g.*, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Arius, Claudius of Turin, Berengar of Tours, Abelard, *etc.* (14). He arranged for them experiences that were the keenest disappointments, and made them think unclearly with bitterest woe (15). Their powers to masticate their teachings were made inappropriate to the task, and they were covered with mourning (16). Their course became one of unrest and seeming failure (17). They feared that their strength and expectation were doomed to despair as to the Lord's help (18), as they kept in mind their tribulations and sorrows—full of the bitterness of wormwood and gall (19). They still kept them in memory and were humiliated (20). Nevertheless they kept in mind as a thing that gave them hope (21) that it was of the Lord's unfailing compassions that they were not devoured (22).

Yea, God's compassions were in every time of need new, since He was great in faithfulness (23); for God was their possession; hence their hope was fixed in Him (24). God is good to those who hope in Him, even to those who seek Him whole-heartedly (25). It is a blessing both to hope and in peace to wait for God to deliver (26), and to learn from youth up to accept and do God's will (27). In the star-members' isolation they held their peace, because they believed that their burdens were given them by the Lord to bear (28). They humbled their utterances in the hope of deliverance (29). They permitted, unresistingly, others to smite them, and received their fill of blame (30); for the Lord will not cast off His own forever (31). Though He give a cup of sorrow to His own to drink, yet He will be merciful in the abundance of His compassion (32). He takes no pleasure in striping and

tribulating the people (33). God does not approve of oppressing any earthly captive (34), of taking away a man's rights in matters pertinent to the Lord (35), and of undoing a man in his cause (36). What one can make a thing occur when God refuses to command its happening (37)? God does not speak both right and wrong (38). Why should any one murmur against punishment that comes to him for his sin (39)? The Interim's star-members exhorted to self-examination and self-proving, and then to return to God from wandering from Him (40), to prayer to the Lord above from the heart (41), to confession of sin and rebellion, which He had not forgiven (42). God was much displeased with His people and pursued them with punishment. He had cut them off from Him and not shown them pity (43); yea, He hid Himself from them that their prayers might not reach Him (44). They have been made as reprobates and off-casts from among the people (45). False religionists have caused their mouthpieces to speak against God's people, especially against the star-members (46). Fear and traps, ruin and overthrow have been their portion (47). The star-members deeply grieved for the overthrow of God's people (48). Unremittingly and unceasingly they experienced sorrow (49).

Until the Lord took note, looking down from His throne (50), their knowledge distressed their disposition on account of all God's people (51). Their theological enemies pursued them very hard, *e.g.*, Athanasius did so to Arius; Bernard to Abelard; Eck to Luther; Toplady to Wesley, *etc.*, even as hunters hunt birds (52). They had shortened their lives by their restraints and hurled their teachings at them (53). Their afflictions became so severe that they sank almost to despair (54). But they called upon the Lord out of their degraded restraint, *e.g.*, ten of the star-members of the Philadelphia Epoch, from Luther to Miller, in their blindness and restraint, bringing out the things of the Word for sectarians (55). The Lord responded

to their prayer; they pleaded that God turn not a deaf ear to their pantings and supplications (56). The Lord mercifully drew near to them when they called upon Him, and bade them not to be afraid (57). They were enabled, by God's answers, to acknowledge that God took their side as new creatures, and delivered them as such (58). They saw that God took note of the wrongs done them; therefore they prayed that He vindicate their cause (59). They recognized that God had taken note of all the acts of vengeance wrought by their opponents, and of all the latter's evil surmises against the star-members (60). They recognized that God had given attention to their many reproaches against them and all the charges that their minds surmised against them (61), even the doctrines of those who arose as opponents against them and their plots against them throughout the Interim (62). They asked God to take note of their ceasing and of their beginning to oppose the star-members; since these were the subjects of their discussions (63). The hard labors of the Interim's star-members, occasioned by their enemies' attacks and errors, appealed to God to give these adversaries a punishment commensurate with the evil deeds that they wrought (64). Their sufferings also appealed to God to mete out their opponents' deep grief; and as the bulk of these were wilful sinners, the star-members' sufferings appealed to God to devote them to condign punishment (65). These sufferings appealed to God to follow these evil-doers to a completion, and in God's displeasure to cut them off from life, since most of them were second-deathers (66).

In chapter 4 the star-members again take up the sad plight of God's captive people at the hands of the Babylonians during the Interim. The Divine things given by Jesus and the Apostles became darkened in the Interim, even those of the Most Holy. The members of the Church were scattered at the beginning of every concourse of the Church as a religious government, and thus the brethren were separated among the

sects (4:1). God's children, new-creaturely Divine vessels of grace, were disesteemed as but humans, those of human origins (2). Even the most beastly of antichrists nourished their babes; but God's people in this respect became cruelly treated, as the loveless and careless clerics forsook their young in isolation (3). The babes were allowed to starve from lack of spiritual milk; and the but slightly developed longed for the bread of life, which none broke for them (4). Those who once had the most luxurious spiritual food are deprived of food in the concourses of God's religious government; and those robed in the precious robe of Christ's righteousness partake of refuse as spiritual food (5). God's people in the long Interim were treated worse for their errors than the punishment of the sins of Christendom, overthrown quickly in the time of trouble; and none leaned on them for support (6). The star-members were of pure character in their righteousness. They were full of justice in their sacrifice and were therein developed in love (7). But their teachings were regarded as the darkest of error. They were not recognized as travelers over the concourses of God's religious government. They were regarded as starvelings, dried up and lifeless as to grace (8). Those refuted were more favored than those starved for lack of spiritual food; for these gradually weaken unto spiritual death for lack of the bread of life (9). Sects that pitied their young had, in the spiritual famine, arranged to devour their babes in grace, who became the food of the sects as God's people went to ruin under Babylonian blows (10). The Lord worked out His punishments for wrong; He meted out the stripes of His displeasure. He set destruction into operation in His Church as light-shiner, and had consented by Babylonian theologians to the overthrow of its Apostles and Prophets as its foundation (11). Worldly movements and people would not have believed it possible that an inimical state and nominal church could have passed through those who admitted people into

God's religious government (12). This was due to the sins of its alleged teachers and the errors of its alleged leaders, murderers of prominent saints (13).

They wandered in error in the concourses of God's people without insight into the Word; they defiled themselves with the murder of God's saints, resulting in men refusing to be contaminated with their defiled characteristics (14). These cried out to others of them to avoid such unclean persons, urgently pressing their charge, lest they become contaminated by the contact. These evil ones betook themselves in their flight into error to the heathen, who said among one another that such depraved characters should not be allowed in their midst (15). God's displeasure at these evil ones scattered them from one another. He held them in high disfavor; for they regarded not the true main leaders of God's people, nor favored their minor leaders (16). But as for the Lord's people, their powers of perception failed because of their delusive hope of help. They looked for help from the civil powers of the present evil world as antitypical Egypt, which could give them no assistance (17). Instead, under the lead of the apostate church, they hunted with persecuting intent God's people, so that they dared not show themselves among the concourses of God's nominal people. Their destruction approached nearer and nearer; their lives were drawing to a close; and their exit from life was at hand (18). With great speed did the persecutors of God's people go about their persecuting work, going with speed after them in the kingdoms of Satan's empire and in their isolation (19). Their teachers who ministered life to them, as the especially anointed of the Lord, the star-members, were the special objects of their false slanders, the class of whom God's people said that under their protecting ministries they would continue, even God's nominal people (20). God's people did not begrudge the joy and gladness of those in harmony with Christendom, who were protected by the secular power (*Uz, strength*). They knew that in

due time these would have to drink of the cup of God's wrath, stupefied in error and exposed as evildoers (21). In due time the Lord would complete the punishment of the sins of His people. It came gradually and progressively, having a small beginning in the Sardis period by the reformation through individuals, a large increase during the Philadelphia period through its twelve Little Flock movements and its completion during the Parousia. God would never again allow them to become captives in Great Babylon; but He would punish the errors of Christendom by permitted publicity and exposure of its sins by pertinent secular and religious truths, and by the troubles of the time of wrath would complete the exposure of its wickedness unto its standing stark naked as an evildoer (22).

Chapter 5 particularizes the chief woes of God's people at Babylon's hands during the Interim. Mindful of the blessed conditions of the Apostolic period, they, during the Interim, prayed God to consider their experiences after the Apostolic times, pleading that He give it His special attention, especially the reproaches that fell to them (1). Their Truth and their Spirit became the property of strangers who turned them into counterfeits, and their condition of justification as the Court was trodden down by aliens (2). They were motherless and fatherless, and their nourishers were bereaved of their supporters and leaders (3). They had to serve sorely for whatever refreshment they got, and for whatever warmth became theirs in a cold world of indifference to them (4). Their wills were persecuted; they were ground down by weighty burdens, and enjoyed no peace (5). They had to pledge fealty to the secular and papal and sectarian powers to be given sustenance (6). Their predecessors did evil and ceased to be; and they, their descendants, had to suffer for their errors (7). Even the lowliest tyrannized over them; and none delivered them out of their power (8). To get some of the Truth could only be at peril to life and limb, because of the controversial

arguments that the errorists made against them in their isolation (9). Their view of things was dark with error because of the frightful spiritual famine (10). They humbled the ecclesias of the Church and the consecrated in the sects of the nominal church (11). Their main leaders, by the power of their adversaries, were publicly set forth as evildoers, and their subordinate leaders were dishonored (12). The warriors were made to grind out the spiritual wheat for sectarians; and the undeveloped were given burdens too heavy for them to bear (13). The leaders had to hide away from the public and the warriors from controversial messages (14). The joys of the Truth had ceased, and conduct harmonious with it gave way to sadness, inconducive to the flourishing of the graces (15). Movements favored by God as the sign of the royalty of God's people had fallen away from them; and wretchedness became theirs for their errors (16). Therefore, their courage was weak and their perception was darkened (17). Because the Church as the light-shining embryo Kingdom was a desolation, error and wrong stalked amid their ruins (18). Yet they recognized God's eternal existence, and His royal authority perpetually (19). They asked why God had so perpetually given them no favorable attention, and had so long left them desolate (20). They prayed throughout the Interim, especially in the Philadelphia Epoch, for Him to return to them His favor, which would make them favored indeed, pleading that He might restore to them the experiences of the Apostolic Age (21). But throughout the Interim they recognized that He had quite rejected them, and was displeased with them for their predecessors and their errors and sins (22).

Since Ps. 74 and 80, as well as Ps. 137, treat of much of the same matter as Lamentations, we will close our exposition of it with a brief paraphrase of them, as we began it with a brief paraphrase of Ps. 137, paraphrasing Ps. 80 first. Both Psalms apply to the Interim first and then to the Epiphany. We will

give only the Interim applications. The Lord's people in the Interim invoked God to cause the Truth to go forth in enlightenment as their Caretaker, as the One that led the Apostolic Church in Little Flockship, and as the One who worked in wisdom, power, justice and love, as typed by the Shekinah light, the cherubim and the mercy seat (1). They prayed that God exercise His power in the Truth before His Sardis Church, before His Philadelphia Church and before the approaching Laodicean Church, that He might give them His saving power (2). They pleaded that He return to them and grant them His favor, whereby they would be saved (3). They begged to know how long it would be that God would not be displeased with His people's prayer (4). He gave them only sorrows for food and drink in large measure (5). They recognized that God made them an object of strife among those near them and that their adversaries laughed at them among one another (6). Repeating the thoughts, yea, almost the very words of v. 3, they pleaded with God to return to them, and to grant them His favor, whereby He might give them His saving power (7). Like a vine to bear fruit, God brought His people out of the present evil world and drove out sin, error, selfishness and worldliness from their minds, hearts and wills, and firmly put them into the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (8). He gave them a sufficient condition for them as New Creatures to live and prosper, developed them deeply in the Truth and in its Spirit; and they spread out over the entire sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (9). They spread over the countries of the world as a protection to them as the salt of the earth, and in each one became multiplied as developed out of the justified class (10). They became active among those sinners who restlessly developed rebellion against God and His principles and among the more orderly of the peoples (11).

They asked God for an explanation as to why the Spirit, Word and providences of God as protectors of

His people have been broken down from being such protectors, with the result that all passersby do them injury (12). They declare that the lawless man of sin, coming out from among the great ones of earth, had trampled them down to utter waste, and that the ferocious civil power of Christendom consumed them (13). They prayed earnestly to God to return to them, and to give close attention and renew His favor to His people (14) and to the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, which by Christ He filled with God's people, and to every member of them once made by God strong for Himself (15). By Babylon had God's people been ruined in destruction; they were cut down as God's people by the Babylonian theologians, hierarchy and clergy, supported by their followers. By the withdrawal of God's favor as a rebuke, God's people perish (16). They pray that God's chief power rest upon Jesus for Second Advent purposes, as the One of His chief favor, even upon Him as Adam's chief descendant whom God exalted as His Vicegerent (17). This would result in God's people no more apostatizing from Him. Then they pleaded that He might energize them, that they might pray to God and be to His glory (18). For a third time in the language of vs. 3 and 7 they entreated God to return to them, to grant them His favor, whereby He might give them His saving power. In v. 3 they address Him as God, in v. 7 as God of hosts and in v. 19 as Jehovah God of hosts, the emphasis on God being thus increased each time, but otherwise the three verses read just alike, and the repetition serves to emphasize the requests, as is also done in the progressive additions that they make as to God, v. 3 applying to the pre-Sardis, 7, to the Sardis and v. 19 to the Philadelphia period of the Interim. As we think over Ps. 137 and 80 and Lamentations in the light of the foregoing expositions, we cannot but recognize how deeply our dear Interim brethren and star-members suffered; and when we realize the small fulfilment of these three Scriptures in the Epiphany we

can also recognize the same of God's Epiphany Little Flock and the Epiphany star-member.

Ps. 74, treating of the experiences of God's people during the Interim, also gives the same general lines of thought as Ps. 137 and 80, viewed, however, from a somewhat different angle. Its divisions are the following: Vs. 1-11 treat of their mistreatment during the Interim; vs. 12-17 speak of God's works on behalf of His people during the Jewish Harvest, as the basis of their plea for deliverance, and vs. 18-23 contain a prayer for their deliverance. They asked whether God was going to cast them off in Babylon endlessly, and why His displeasure continued against them as His people, who had fed upon His Word (1). They pleaded that He remember in mercy His Church, bought by Christ's precious blood long before, His heritage that He delivered from the present evil world, His embryo religious government as the light of the world, and God's own dwelling (2). They desired that He make His delivering acts turn to His long desolated Church, even all the desolations of His sanctuary wrought wickedly by God's and His people's opponents (3). These opponents agitated fiercely in His ecclesias, and set up their creeds as teachings victorious over God's people (4). Babylon's theologians, *e.g.*, Cerinthus who opposed John, Athanasius who opposed Arius, Theodemir who opposed Claudius of Turin, Alvarus Pelagius who opposed Marsiglio, the Cologne inquisitors who opposed John Wessel, the ones here mentioned as being opposed being the five principal men of the Interim, got themselves great reputations in Babylonian church circles for using their controversial weapons against the Interim star-members and their special helpers (5). These devastated the ornaments of teaching and practice belonging to the true Church by their refutational and constructive teachings (6). They were destructive against the true Church, and with their errors defiled it, and by their misrepresentations degraded it (7). They, with

all the power of their affections and volitions, determined to destroy it, and did destroy all the true Church's ecclesias everywhere (8). The true brethren saw no more their teachings; nor for long intervals did they have general teachers; nor did they have in their midst any one understanding time prophecy (9). With deep feeling, they sought from the Lord to know how long inimical controversialists would, by their errors, reproach God, the Truth and the brethren. Especially did they plead with God over the matter of how long such foes would continue victoriously to teach things vilifying God's character. Would it last forever (10)? They were filled with questions as to why God withdrew His power, yea, even Christ Himself, from delivering them. They pleaded with God actively to send Him to work for their rescue (11). Vs. 12-17 contain statements revelatory of the Church's calling to mind God's Jewish-harvest dealings with His people ("We wept when we remembered Zion"). Then God was Zion's king, doing works of salvation everywhere in society (12). He then made a breach in the curse, so that, by justification through faith God's people passed through unscathed (13). Satan's thoughts God then utterly overthrew, and made him to be spoil for His people in their isolation (14). God then overthrew Jewish hierarchism and its effects, devastated its errors and traditions, and also those of heathen Rome (15). That was a time given over to God, even as the Interim also was in His power; for God had then given the Truth and the New Testament (16). Then God arranged the conditions of society, and used the reaping time and the trouble time of that Harvest for His purposes (17). Vs. 18-23 show that God's Interim people pleaded for deliverance, expressing in v. 18 the same thoughts as in v. 10, except that in v. 18 the nominal-church laity are also included among the blasphemers of God's character. They pleaded that, as God's guileless beloved One, their being be not given up to the many wicked ones, and

asked that God forget not His humble Church (19), pleading that He give attention to His covenant; for the erroneous and sinful parts of society were full of cruel institutions and individuals, like persecuting governments and rulers, inquisitions and inquisitors, monasticism and monks, and universities and professors (20). They prayed that God's oppressed people do not return from Babylonian captivity in shame, so that the humble and necessitous of God's people might reflect credit upon Him by explaining His plan of wisdom, power, justice and love (21). They pleaded with God to become active in defense of His own person, character, plan and work, and while so doing, to keep in mind how the man of sin misrepresented Him continually (22), pleading with Him not to forget the teachings of His opponents; for the lawlessnesses and outbreaks of His opponents against Him kept increasing always (23). Surely this Psalm describes some of the Interim's untoward experiences of God's people, and has an application to the Epiphany.

ATHALIAH AND JOASH—TYPE AND ANTITYPE
2 KINGS 11:1—12:21; 2 CHRO. 22:10—24:27

AS promised in the foreword, we treat of a specialized antitype, *i.e.*, Athaliah and Joash. From this standpoint Athaliah (*whom Jehovah afflicts*) represents the American Romanist Church from about 1881 to 1928; Jehoiada (*Jehovah knows*) usually the Christ, Head and Body, but sometimes the Head only, from about 1881 to 1932; and Jehoash, or Joash (*God-given*), the American policy of separation of state and church. The American Romanist Church, by riots, boycotts, intimidations, by securing the cancellation of leases for auditoriums, by censoring the press and by denunciation and misrepresentation of anti-Romanist propaganda, greatly limited the exercise of the freedom of press, speech, assembly and propaganda (2 K. 11:1; 2 C. 22:10). To save space we abbreviate 2 Kings to 2 K. and 2 Chro. to 2 C., as, for the same reason, we will not refer to the words commented on, but only to the number of the chapter and verse, even omitting the chapter number after its first mention, giving the Kings citations first, when used, and, if it or a Chronicles citation is lacking, indicating it by a semicolon. Therefore our brief comments will have to be studied with constant reference to the Bible, which should be kept open at the chapters and verses commented upon. Or, better still, two Bibles may be used, one opened to the pertinent passage in 2 Kings, the other to the pertinent passage in 2 Chronicles. But the doctrine of the bill of rights in the U.S. Constitution, united as a symbolic wife with the Lord Jesus, through its supporters preserved by stealth from such limitation the religious exercise of the policy of separation of state and church, which with its supporters had, however, to be protected by more or less secret methods, and thus preserved it despite the threats of the

American Romanist Church, which was in the meantime (1881-1920) in ever-increasing ascendancy (2; 11). But from 1920 to 1928 the Christ, Head and Body, strengthened the Body for the overthrow of such a condition. To this end the Christ enlisted the cooperation of the leading warriors among the four bad and the one good Levite groups, *i.e.*, (1) the Societyites, the P.B.I.'tes, the Standfasts and the Olsonites, and (2) the crown-losers in the Epiphany movement (4; 23:1). These five warrior leaderships enlisted for this purpose among the American Truth people all the crown-losers of the various groups that they could get and brought them in thought to civil, financial and ecclesiastical America (4; 2); the Christ, through the articles on Romanism in the 1922 Herald of the Epiphany coming to a solemn agreement with them as to America, civil, financial and ecclesiastical, on standing faithfully for the doctrine of the separation of state and church, which was truly expounded to them in those articles, all gathered up in the Double Herald, *i.e.*, the Sept., 1922, issue, whole number 14, which we will reproduce in the last part of this Appendix, and which He guaranteed should come to the ascendancy (4; 3).

(2) The Christ divided these into three groups, *i.e.*, (1) those who should watch and fight as to the political aspects of the questions at issue, (2) those who would be public speakers on the subjects, and (3) those who would support the Epiphany brethren in their part of the fight, with those outside of the Truth movements doing their part among the outsiders, the chief and subordinate leaders being the only ones permitted to serve in a most public capacity (5, 6; 4-6). This especial care of God's House, the Church, in connection with the pertinent doctrine was to be with the main and subordinate leaders (7:). These were especially to guard with their Truth arguments the doctrine of the separation of state and church and to refute everyone who would attempt its injury (8; 7). The five

leaderships, even the main and subordinate leaders, did as the Christ, Head and Body, charged, including all who served in the Church, whose spiritual ministries were not interrupted during this quasi-secular and religious conflict (9; 8). The Christ, Head and Body, gave to the five leaderships the pertinent offensive and defensive writings (spears and shields) of our Pastor and the pertinent writings based on our Pastor's writings (Double Herald, Elijah's Letter and John's Rebuke [bucklers], 10; 9). The Epiphany brethren, the only ones fully equipped for the conflict, as the guard of God's House, covered in their part of the conflict the full features of the controversy as it involved the Church, its sacrificial humanity and the doctrine of the separation of state and church (11; 10). The participants in the fight so placed, the Lord Jesus, as Head of the priesthood, set forth the Truth on the separation of church and state, gave it the right and power to be in the ascendancy, and with the underpriesthood qualified it thereto, expressing their hearty approval by their services and the desire of their heart that it would prosper (12; 11). The pertinent proclamations of the Epiphany brethren and of outsiders, *e.g.*, anti-Romanist orders, societies, etc., and anti-Romanist authors, editors, lecturers, etc., came to the attention of the American Romanist Church; and in hostility she came against these, even in their religious standing (13; 12). Here she witnessed the doctrine of the separation of state and church set forth as starting out to be in the ascendancy, even as was customary in such cases, the Truth leaders and their announcements in support of the pertinent ascendant doctrine and many secularist defenders of the pertinent doctrine rejoicingly proclaiming it. Thereupon she grossly violated Truth and righteousness in her protests; and she who was traitorous to the Constitution's bill of rights charged with treason those who defended its provisions against her treasons against them (14; 13).

(3) Thereupon the Christ, Head and Body, charged

the Truth leaders not to refute her on religious, but on secular grounds, her dabbling into politics, *i.e.*, to refute political Romanism, and charged them to refute with their religious and secular Truth everyone that arose to support her (15; 14). This charge was carried out, the leaders and their followers avoiding to attack her religious doctrines, and thus letting her pass beyond these to her secular politics, and in relation to such secular doctrines they refuted her (16; 15). The Christ, Head and Body, united the people and the doctrine of the separation of state and church into an agreement with the Lord to stand as His people on this matter, as He also united the people and this doctrine into an agreement (17; 16). These events marked the years 1922-1927. It will be recalled that the American hierarchy, led therein by the pope, sought in the person of Al Smith to seize the American presidency, and thus its governmental machinery, and thus get more political power, but the consequent anti-Romanism agitation of real Americans—"the religious issue"—of the 1928 presidential campaign broke up the hierarchy's elaborated religious structure in its power-grasping and lording aspects over the American people, made impotent its exponents in their propaganda, shattered their pertinent political doctrines and killed the hierarchy in its pertinent ambition and activity (18; 17). This was followed by the Lord Jesus' arranging for more servants of the general Church to be put into the office of pilgrims, auxiliary pilgrims and evangelists, according to the Bible and according to the Lord's arrangements made through that Servant, as can be seen in the ever-increasing numbers of such reported in our annual reports (;18), and He also set up in official positions brethren to keep unclean Levites away from the fellowship of the Faithful (;19). The Lord used the fivefold Levitical leaderships, the refuters and the faithful Epiphany brethren, all of whom were in the places of prominence and influence in their respective groups, and also participating non-Truth

people, to take the doctrine of the separation of state and church from its ascendant religious position, by way of the Epiphany brethren, to its proper ascendant secular position, which it thereupon occupied (19; 20). This happy result, occurring during Mr. Hoover's administration (1929-1933), caused real Americans joy and thus on secular ascendant grounds these by the pertinent secular truths refuted the American Romanist Church, and on this subject peace prevailed (20; 21). These four years were indeed famine years for the Romanists so far as gaining special privileges in American political offices and influence are concerned.

(4) While the starting of Joash's reign is put chronologically in the seventh year of Jehu's reign, and while in the antitype this time feature is true in the two parallels above mentioned, yet we are not to understand the relation to be such from the standpoint of the separate and unrelated fulfillments, one of which we are now studying, and others of which have this same peculiarity in common with it. The policy of the separation of state and church had a particularly trialsome time as its ascendancy period; it grew out of that doctrine implied in the Oath-bound Covenant which requires that the Church be separate from the world (21; 2 K. 12:1; 2 C. 24:1). This policy was by its adherents well administered as long as they continued under the teaching influence of the World's High Priest (2; 2). Nevertheless, the sects of Christendom were not during its ascendancy taken away, and the multitudes continued to perform their religious services in these sects (3;). As helpers of this policy the World's High Priest gave it two supporting classes: (1) sympathetic Truth people and (2) sympathetic non-Truth people, through whom it developed stronger and weaker supporting movements (;3). The disposition of this policy in its adherents was to restore the privileges and powers of the Church from the desolations wrought by the adherents of the wicked American Romanist Church in diverting these privileges and

powers to the Romanist hierarchy's structure (;4, 7). The World's High Priest and this policy in its adherents suggested to the main and subordinate Truth leaders whom they had assembled for this purpose that they enlist the human all of the consecrated and seek to win other believers to consecration, so that as many as possible would bestow of their human all to restore to the Church its desolated privileges and powers, a thing that they were charged to hasten with fitting zeal, this feature of the work being mainly committed to the main leaders to superintend, but the main and subordinate leaders, lacking the necessary zeal, did not hasten this work, with the result that it lagged (4, 5; 4, 5). Indeed, during a long period (1922 to about 1929) there was gross lack of zeal displayed by the main and subordinate Levite leaders among Truth people; and, resultantly, the others were grossly lacking in zeal to repair the true Church in the indicated respects (6;).

(5) Noting this lack of zeal, the policy of the separation of state and church, in its adherents, gathered the World's High Priest in His Body members and the main Levite leaders and asked them why they were not inciting the consecrated to carry out their consecration and the justified to consecrate according to the Lord's Word on behalf of repairing the breaches in the Church (7; 6). It, in its adherents, forbade these to take for their own advantage of the human all of the consecrated; instead it charged them to make their own and the other consecrateds' own available to recover the Church from the ill effects of the American Romanist Church's ascendancy (7;). Thereupon the main Levitical leaders agreed not to make selfish uses of their own and their brethren's human rights and privileges, and agreed to refrain from attempting to do the work that belonged to the Little Flock specifically (8;). According to the pertinent doctrine's demand, they set forth the doctrine of consecration in harmony with the thought of the sacrificed humanity

of Christ and the Church, connecting it with the doctrine of justification as it belongs to the prospective Youthful Worthies; and the main leaders, who occupied themselves with the doctrines of justification and consecration, induced responsive ones to consecrate (9; 8). This led to a general proclamation of consecration and a winning of Youthful Worthies (;9). This resulted in a joyful consecration of the abler and less able of the responsive ones, even to a completion (;10). And as these consecrations greatly increased, the special representative of the antitypical king and the special representative of the Church's High Priest took these consecrated ones into their special charge, set them in their ecclesias and continued to present the doctrine of consecration in its relation to that of justification, continuing this course right along, with the result that many consecrations were made and carried out (10; 11). The antitypical king and the High Priest made the human all of the consecrated available for the use of the repairers of the breaches in the Lord's house, by enlisting the services of those who wrought in matters of doctrine and ethics and of refutations and corrections for the repair of the Church (11, 12; 12). The Levitical leaders, however, did not develop the doctrinal, preceptorial, refutational, correctional or proclamational Divine truths (13;), since they superintended the consecration works on the Church (14;). Nor did they require a strict accounting from the workers, who, put upon their honor, wrought faithfully (15;). But the main leaders accepted for their needs such parts of the consecrations as were given them for their personal needs, which, therefore, did not go to the general upbuilding work of the Church (16;).

(6) In this way the work on the Church progressed to a completion as to repairing the Rome-made breaches; and the true Church was set forth properly and in strength (;13). The parts of the consecrated human all, *e.g.*, mental acquisitions and abilities, not so used were presented before the antitypical king and

the High Priest, who through His Epiphany messenger developed the doctrinal, ethical, refutational and correctional Divine truths for the use of the Church and the antitypical Levites in the ministries given them severally to perform; and under the superintendence of the World's High Priest all ministered with these in the Church continually during the pertinent activities of the World's High Priest (;14). But these activities came to an end, about the Summer of 1932. And the pertinent activities of the World's High Priest in relation to the separation of state and church were honored by the believers as being in harmony with that Servant's ascendant teachings, because of their inherent and active goodness for God's people, for God and the true Church (;15, 16). But after such activities had come to an end, American political and religious leaders gave the doctrine of separation of state and church lip service merely, and advised a course that corrupted it. This set in during the 1932 presidential campaign, when political leaders, like Messrs. Roosevelt, Morley, Tugwell, etc., and religious leaders, like Cardinal Mundelein, Hughes, priest Coughlin, etc., as representatives of the Romanist hierarchy, corrupted and undermined the practice of the separation of state and church (;17). Consequently these and their supporters pursued a course that abandoned the true Church in its pertinent principles and works, practiced symbolic harlotry between the State and the Romanist Church, and accepted certain of the latter's doctrines, particularly autocracy in the state and hierarchical influence over the officials of the state, which has been resulting in the Lord's displeasure coming upon America and its civil and religious powers because of these sins (;18). Our longsuffering and loving God did not utterly forsake America for these wrongs; but through the Epiphany movement, the antitypical Elisha (the good as distinct from the Rutherfordian Societyites) and other Truth people's movements the Lord has sent pertinent teachings, rebukes and corrections to America,

to bring it back to the proper practice of the separation of state and church, but, alas! America in its ruling, political, financial and religious classes has refused to heed these teachings (;19).

(7) Our exposition has now brought us up to the present; and from here on we will in this study take up things that are to occur in the very near future. Under the influence of God's Spirit the Epiphany messenger in his office as such will write and publish in the form of an Extra Edition of the July 15, 1940, Herald of the Epiphany, Whole No. 121, an exposure of the pertinent evils, an expostulation against them and an announcement that America's forsaking the Lord in this matter has brought a continuance of the depression upon it, and, worst of all, its forsaking by God for its forsaking Him (;20). This will result in the American Romanist Church conspiring with the American Federation of Churches (in this general act these seem also to be pictured by Herodias and Salome), and, at the charge of the state (in this general act it seems also to be pictured by Herod), hurling false teachings and charges at him, *e.g.*, charging him with being an intolerant bigot, a stirrer up of religious prejudice and strife, an evil-doer, a false prophet, a fifth-columnist, a traitor to his country and to Christianity, and thus will effect the suppression of his influence and activity as a Divinely-used mouthpiece to the public (v. 25 shows that the rest of the priesthood will at the same time be cut off from public mouthpieceship, thus likely completing the picture as typed by the beheading of John the Baptist). This will be done publicly, before the nominal people of God (;21). Thus will be proven that there will be forgotten the Lord Jesus' goodness to America in its policy of the separation of state and church, when the corrupted and misled adherents of that policy cause to be cut off His special representative from his mouthpieceship to the public. The latter while being so cut off will call attention to the fact that the Lord is regarding this

matter, and will make requisition therefore [see Dr. Young's better than the A. V. rendering] (;22). Quickly will the Lord's wrath express itself for the cutting off of the true Church from public mouthpieceship; for after antitypical Hazael has defeated antitypical Jehoram (Hazael giving Jehoram many wounds, 2 K. 8:28, 29), it will require antitypical Joash (Jehoash) to pay for its support of antitypical Jehoram against antitypical Hazael by everything short of war; and after the latter's overcoming the papacy for similar support of antitypical Jehoram, it will set its face against political, financial and ecclesiastical Joash (17;) and make a campaign against these ruling classes in their disloyalty to the practice of separation of state and church. They will come against antitypical Judah and Jerusalem and cut off their political, financial and ecclesiastical leaders from among their adherents (;23).

(8) In antitypical Hazael's paganism he will devastate the good religious things of America benevolently independent, America evilly reactionary, America apostately autocratic and America properly separate from church. Furthermore, antitypical Joash, ecclesiastical, financial and political, will be required to pay to antitypical Hazael an immense indemnity, which will undoubtedly include its immense gold and silver reserves*, to bribe antitypical Hazael to raise its siege of antitypical Jerusalem, political, financial and ecclesiastical, by compliance with which the latter will secure the former's raising of the said siege (18; 23). With only a small host will the former by God's retributive justice accomplish these things, despite the latter's immense opposing resources in men and materials, all because of the latter's apostasy from pure Americanism on the separation of state and church and its cutting off of God's mouthpiece—the true Church—from

* Later, we found that the American people were deprived of many of their liberties by the bureaucrats, forced thereto by conditions arising from antitypical Hazael's war course, and they thus paid the indemnity.

its public ministry for protesting and expostulating against, and forecasting Divine retribution for, that apostasy (;24). And when antitypical Hazeal will leave these apostates from true Americanism, these will be in greatest distress, disunion and impotency. Yea, former supporters of these apostates in their apostasy, the Lord raising them up thereto to wreak vengeance for their cutting off the true Church from its public ministry, will conspire against them, while they, greatly wounded, will be taking a rest on some fortified theory of theirs, and will overthrow them (20; 25). These conspirators will be certain clericalistic members of the Federation of Churches and certain autocratic members of the Romanist Church, but the policy of separation of state and church will be respected as one in harmony with that Servant's teachings, but not with all due honor on account of its apostasy in its adherents (21; 26, 25). The historical acts of this policy, especially of its various subdivisions, of its furthering the work of the Lord's people before its adherents forsook it and of the great indemnity put upon its adherents, in some cases are and in other cases will be recorded by American historians (19; 27). Another American policy is typed by Amaziah, the successor of Joash (21; 27). We now reproduce Herald No. 121, which was used to give a testimony against the cooperation between the state and the Romanist Church in America.

IS THERE A QUASI-ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE
ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION AND
THE ROMANIST CHURCH?

Do you know that, next to Israel during the Jewish Age, America has been God's national favorite?

Do you know that the Bible in one of its prophecies addresses America—"Ho! land of shadowing wings [land of God's special protection], which is beyond [west of] the rivers [the Nile's mouths] of Ethiopia [Improved Version]"—in language that indicates its being a special object of Divine care (Is. 18:1)?

Do you know that America's history demonstrates that of all modern nations, it has been the one most favored by God in material, social, international, civil, political and religious respects?

Do you know that the special favor of God upon America has been due to the fact that America's principles of human liberty in harmony with the law, and of human equality before the law, believed in and acted out by Americans generally as the fundamental principles of Democracy, more nearly than the principles underlying any other form of government express God's highest ideal of the principles that should underlie government, as can be clearly seen in God's making these principles the expression of Israel's government between man and man under the Mosaic law, and as was exemplified in Israel's history until, rejecting God's highest ideal of government for them, they insistently demanded from, and were reluctantly given by, God a monarchy?

Do you know that America, apart from the government in Israel before the Israelitish monarchy, has had the most noble, righteous, beneficent and glorious government ever instituted—a government of the people, for the people and by the people?

Do you know that it was because America lived truer to these ideals than any other modern nation, that God made her His special ward among the modern nations, and that this accounts for His giving her independence from Britain, His freeing her from the destruction of the Napoleonic wars and from Europe's racial and national envies, rivalries, grudges, hatreds, revenges, suspicions, self-aggrandizements, imperialisms, etc., His bringing her safely as a nation, made wholly free, out of the trying experiences of the Civil War, His making her a beacon light to the nations, a refuge to the oppressed, a helper to the helpless, a cornucopia to the industrious, and the headquarters and the main field of activity for the greatest religious

work ever carried on in this earth since the days of Christ (Is. 18:1-7)?

Do you know that among these ideals are those expressed in the Bill of Rights embodied in the U.S. Constitution, and that not the least of these ideals is the Constitutional provision guaranteeing the separation of state and church, which implies the prohibition of everything involved in, or smacking of the union of state and church?

Do you know that this principle was maintained, generally speaking, inviolate up to the time of the Arthur administration (1881-1885), since when, and up to 1921, gradually and increasingly there arose a working cooperation, a *quasi*-alliance, between our public officials and the Romanist church?

Do you know that the Romanist church's acts toward and of that *quasi*-alliance, and her ambition "to get America," with her ultimate design to effect an actual union of the state and herself in America, are seen in the following things increasingly done during the years 1881-1921: (1) training her American members to believe in the union of state and church, (2) contrary to her history and principles expressing great admiration for Democracy and the institutions of American Democracy, (3) influencing her members to vote as a bloc, as she directs, (4) putting her members as such into political office, (5) putting her dependables, whether Romanists or not, into strategic positions in all kinds of public capacities, (6) using her orders, political clubs, societies, etc., to secure her pertinent ambitions, (7) entering into deals and bargains with statesmen, politicians and officials, (8) creating an atmosphere compelling aspiring statesmen, politicians and officials to recognize and advance her designs, (9) using national, state and municipal officials to give her favors, publicity and prestige, (10) seeking through legislative, judicial and administrative agents to overthrow her opponents and their use of the freedom of press, speech, propaganda and assembly, (11) manipulating

for her interests, prestige and designs the instruments of publicity—newsgathering agencies, the press, movies, radio, lecture platform, professorial chairs, etc. (12) wheedling from national, state and municipal funds financial aid for her hospitals, schools, Indian missions, etc., (13) stimulating Romanist immigration, urbanizing and citizenizing her immigrants rapidly and sending them to the polls to vote in her interests; and (14) cultivating her parochial schools, and attempting to de-Americanize and devitalize our public schools with a measure of success?

Do you know that sensing the drift of these fourteen things, patriots from 1922 to 1928 set into operation counteractive measures, culminating in the agitation against the Romanist hierarchy's 1928 presidential candidate, Al Smith, whose defeat they accomplished, because they believed that the hierarchy sought through his election to seize control of the U.S. governmental machinery?

Do you know that the four years, 1929-1933, of Mr. Hoover's administration were famine years for the Romanist hierarchy, during which years the hierarchy would, at the political trough, "fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat and no man gave unto him"?

Do you know that the hierarchy, starved as to special U.S. political privileges during Mr. Hoover's administration and from their experience with Mr. Roosevelt's favoring them during his N.Y. governorship, knowing that with him as president they would "come to their own," as they put it, gave him the Romanist vote in a practically solid bloc in the 1932 election, as they did again in 1936 and would do it a third time, if he runs?

Do you know that the pertinent facts of Mr. Roosevelt's administration and those of the Romanist church during it prove that that church has "come into its own" in and from a *quasi*-alliance with him and certain members of his administration, *i.e.*, a working

understanding, a close cooperation, between them, more patent by far than the earlier *quasi*-alliance between that church and American statesmen, politicians and office-holders?

Do you know that after priest Coughlin, who vouched for the fact, had interpreted to him the labor encyclicals of popes Leo XIII and Pius XI, he in his Detroit speech during the 1932 campaign, in giving his views of a new deal for labor, asserted that they were sanctioned by these popes, "the highest religious authority on earth," which statement solidified the vote of the hierarchy and their following for him?

Do you know that his course abounds with acts that prove that the American Romanist church through its main representatives, *e.g.*, Cardinal Mundelein, has been his chief adviser since 1932?

Do you know that at the advice of the hierarchy he advocated the New Deal in both of his presidential campaigns, and has since his first election introduced various forms of it into Congress and made a subservient Congress enact them as "must legislation," both in its autocratic features and in its benevolent features, the former of which are plainly unconstitutional, and the latter of which are very praiseworthy?

Do you know that he appointed many prominent Romanist university professors and priests to high and influential offices on various of his boards and administrations, particularly on certain boards that have to do with labor matters, *e.g.*, Walsh, Ryan and Haas, a thing that was formerly unheard of, he doubtless reasoning and that rightly, that they, as priests and Romanist university professors, would have commanding influence in conciliating striking or near-striking labor, whose leaders often are Romanists?

Do you know that he has appointed to key positions (from Rome's standpoint) Romanists, like Mr. James Farley as postmaster general, Messrs. T. J. Walsh and F. Murphy as attorney generals, the latter to the U.S. Supreme Court, Mr. J. P. Kennedy as the

ambassador to Great Britain and priest O'Hara, president of Notre Dame University, as a U.S. delegate to the Pan-American Congress at Lima, Peru?

Do you know that he has advanced to various political offices, particularly to various of his bureaus, a disproportionate number of Romanists, as gestures to the Romanist church?

Do you know that he told "Elder Statesman" C. Michelson that if he did not appoint a Romanist (F. Murphy) to the Supreme Court in the place of deceased Romanist P. Butler, the Romanists would raise tumultuous protests?

Do you know that to appoint fit persons, regardless of denominational affiliations, to public office is unobjectionable to one imbued with real Americanism; but that to appoint any one to public office because of his denominational affiliations, particularly if the appointment is urged or given as such because of that denomination's past or future support or boycott, is highly objectionable, since it smacks of the union of state and church?

Do you know that he has lost no opportunity to praise, and that in over-eulogistic terms, the Romanist church, members of her hierarchy, priests and prominent laymen, *e.g.*, Cardinals Mundelein and Hayes, Archbishop Curley, Bishops Sheil and Walsh, priest Coughlin, Messrs. Smith, Kennedy, Walker, etc., the Franciscan Fathers for their work in the Mississippi Valley, the Catholic Notre Dame, Carroll, etc., universities, *etc.*?

Do you know that he has especially honored and continues especially to honor Romanist hierarchists, priests, university professors and prominent laymen *as Romanists* on many occasions, *e.g.*, Cardinal Mundelein, whom he entertained as house guest at the White House and at his Hyde Park mansion, often closeting himself with him, seeking his counsel, causing U.S. Ambassador to Italy, Mr. Philips, his counselor and the U.S. naval attaché to meet him on his

steamer at its arrival in the Bay of Naples, taking him off the steamer before it reached its wharf into a U.S. naval boat, taking him to the flagship of the U.S. fleet where its U.S. Rear-Admiral and other naval officers and crew stood at attention as he came aboard, having the Rear-Admiral entertain him at a feast on his flagship, after which he boarded the train at Naples for Rome, accompanied by the U.S. ambassador, his counselor and naval attaché as his escort of honor all the way to Vatican City, and arranging for similar honors at Rome for him and Cardinal Dougherty on the occasion of their arrival for the election of Pius XI's successor?

Do you know that often he entertains such at White House meals, and not infrequently attends their functions?

Do you know that he, a Protestant and a president of a country whose constitution frowns upon a union of state and church, frequently sends personal representatives of his to special Romanist occasions, *e.g.*, he sent Mr. Farley as his personal representative to the jubilee of the New York archdiocese, where Cardinal Hayes presided, whose ring was kissed by the kneeling Mr. Farley while the latter acted as the president's personal representative; that he sent an aide as his personal representative to Cardinal Mundelein's funeral; that he sent Mr. Farley as his personal representative to the New Orleans' Eucharistic Congress, where Mr. Farley, while acting as such, kneeling, kissed Archbishop Rummell's ring, and knelt before Cardinal Mundelein seated on a throne as a prince of the Vatican state and that he also sent our Romanist Ambassador to Britain, J. P. Kennedy, as his personal representative, to the coronation of Pius XII, where, while acting as the president's personal representative, he, kneeling before the pope and kissing his ring, got the pope's blessing?

Do you know that, at the hierarchy's and other Romanists' urging, he approached Mexico diplomatically

to seek amelioration for the Mexican Romanist hierarchy and church from the Mexican government, that, at the urging of the hierarchy, he, under the coaching of Dr. Walsh, viceroy of the Jesuit Georgetown University, insisted on Russia's making certain concessions to the papacy before he would enter diplomatic relations with Russia, and that, at the demand of the hierarchy, knowing that the Spanish rebels could get all needed munitions from Germany and Italy, and that the Loyalists could get such only from America, and that only if the embargo were lifted, he prevented the lifting of the embargo on arms for Spain, and thus in part occasioned, as per the American hierarchy's plan, the overthrow of a Democracy, the Spanish Republic, by the Fascist rebels?

Do you know that at his and Mr. Hull's blessing, as "amateur diplomats" with a *quasi*-mission for the U.S., Romanist Bishop Ryan of Omaha and Dr. M. S. Sheehy, head of the religious educational department of the Catholic University (Washington, D.C.), made a *quasi*-diplomatic trip to the South American republics, after which Dr. Sheehy submitted to the U.S. State Department a confidential report of their "amateur diplomacy"?

Do you know that it has been widely reported in the U.S. press, *e.g.*, The New York Times, that in 1932 he promised the hierarchy that, if elected, he would open diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the Vatican as soon as public opinion in America could be brought about to it?

Do you know that, conditions not warranting it during his first term, he was reported to have promised it again during his 1936 campaign for re-election?

Do you know that he has been reminded of this promise as a political debt by various members of the hierarchy, especially by Cardinal Pacelli, now Pius XII, who, according to The New York Times' Rome correspondent, Mr. Arnaldo Cortesi, visited the U.S. during the 1936 campaign to secure from Mr. Roosevelt

the fulfilment of this promise (mark the psychological time chosen for the cardinal's visit); and the press reported that this was one of the things discussed by him and Mr. Roosevelt when the former visited the latter at his home after his election?

Do you know that one year later, in 1937, Cardinal Enrico Gaspari, nephew of the Cardinal Gaspari who with Mr. Mussolini negotiated the Vatican Treaty in 1929, according to a wireless dispatch from Rome to The New York Times, the information having been "learned from good sources at the Vatican," came to America to prepare "the juridical status for the possible opening of diplomatic relations between the State Department and the Holy See"?

Do you know that the press reported that Cardinal Mundelein, during his last stay at the White House as house guest, just before his last visit to Pius XI, urged Mr. Roosevelt to fulfill his long-standing promise to effect diplomatic relations with the Vatican, in anticipation of which the pope built a \$550,000.00 mansion in "embassy row" at Washington for his nuncio?

Do you know that the secular press announced, and the papal press in America and Rome hailed the appointment of Myron Taylor as his personal representative to the Vatican as a step toward the U.S. entering diplomatic relations with the Vatican?

Do you know that, in harmony with his promise, this appointment seems to be a feeler, a trial balloon, to enable him to weigh how public sentiment would react to the thought of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the Vatican?

Do you know that, if this is his thought, he has learned that his course of appointing Mr. Myron Taylor as his personal representative to the Vatican has met with the official protest of the president of the Federation of Churches as such and of the supreme governing bodies of the Methodist, Baptist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Evangelical, Adventist, etc., churches, as

well as of very numerous secular and religious publications and of multitudes of men and women prominent in public life?

Do you know that his claiming to send Mr. Taylor to cooperate with the pope in peace efforts is unreasonable, since the pope's strong partisanship against Germany and for the Allies disqualifies him in the estimation of informed people from being an influence for peace with Messrs. Hitler and Mussolini?

Do you know that, among many others, Dr. G. A. Buttrick, the world-renowned president of the Federation of Churches, and Dr. C. C. Morrison, the able editor of the *Christian Century*, charge him with wanting to make Romanists think that Mr. Taylor is his ambassador to the Vatican, which lists him as such in its schedule of ambassadors accredited to the pope, and at all times treats him as such, and to make Protestants think that Mr. Taylor is his personal representative, not ambassador?

Do you know that the following acts prove that he furthers the Romanist schemes to draw financial help from the government: he secured financial grants for the National Youths' Administration, which has been created at the advice of, and largely in the interests of that church; he allocated huge sums to help the churches, the Romanist church being the only one to accept such, while Protestant denominations refused them; in an address at Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., in 1936 he stated that he had allocated \$400,000,000.00 for education, which sum was distributed mainly among Rome's parochial schools, colleges and universities; he secured, through a commission, the end of the hierarchy's opposition to the U.S. allocating money to the public schools, by its promising them money from the same source for their parochial schools; he favored in 1937 the Harrison-Fletcher bill, so drawn as to include parochial schools, authorizing \$350,000,000.00 to be allocated to education in the U.S.; and he sent a bill to Congress in 1939 asking

for \$1,000,000,000.00 for public and private (which includes Romanist) schools?

Do you know that in carrying out the autocratic features of the New Deal, which the hierarchy advised, he sought to force, likely at the hierarchy's advice, the adoption of a code on the press that would have largely destroyed the freedom of the press, a thing greatly desired in her interests by the Romanist church, an effort that was finally dropped only after years of unrelenting resistance from the press?

Do you know that on likely occasions he elaborately advertises the Romanist hierarchy and church, as can be seen from his pertinent addresses, letters of felicitation and informal sayings?

Do you know that he showed that he put the judgment of the hierarchy and the Romanist church above that of the Supreme Court, as can be seen from his scolding it for its decisions against autocratic features of the New Deal advised by the hierarchy?

Do you know that it is inexpressibly painful to be compelled, though in the interests of America, to detail the above matters disparaging to our president, deservedly beloved because of his kind heart, generous deeds and other noble characteristics?

Do you know that prominent members of his administration work hand-in-glove with him in this *quasi*-alliance with that church?

Do you know that, above all others, Mr. Farley, his postmaster general, cooperates with him in this course?

Do you know that in pursuance of this policy Mr. Farley has dismissed thousands of non-Romanist, and appointed Romanist postmasters in their place, otherwise very largely Romanized the U.S. Post Office service and caused a bill to be introduced into Congress, which passed it, making it almost impossible to remove such Romanist postmasters, by exemptions in their favor as to civil service examinations, etc.?

Do you know that he makes the dedicatorial ceremonies for some new post offices Romanist celebrations,

as can be seen in the case of the dedication of the Philadelphia post office?

Do you know that he assured the Romanist members of the New York City post office that his first concern as postmaster general was to care for them and their fellow-Romanist post office employees, and that his acts prove that he has kept his word?

Do you know that he has built the Democratic National machine largely after the model of Tammany Hall, which is the New York hierarchy's political machine?

Do you know that he makes it a point to be present at all the more important Romanist occasions, like visiting popes, partaking in hierarchical celebrations, funerals, congresses, conferences and honoring popes and other hierarchs, even by kneeling and kissing, as the U.S. postmaster general, their rings?

Do you know that a similar course has marked other members of Mr. Roosevelt's inner circle of colaborers, like Messrs. Kennedy, Walker, Tugwell, Hopkins, Welles, (James) Roosevelt (as his secretary), *etc.*, *e.g.*, having private audiences with popes, taking prominent places at Romanist celebrations, *etc.*?

Do you know that Mr. Sumner Welles frequently, but secretly dines with the pope's ablegate at Washington, claiming in justification that he gets from him very valuable information, especially on South American affairs, a thing kept up despite the protests of defenders of the principle of separation of state and church.

Do you know that Senator Wagner at a Romanist function stated that he drew his inspiration for the Wagner Labor Act from the labor encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI?

Do you know that out of respect Congress adjourned at the death of Pius XI, a thing that resulted in widespread protest, and that members of Congress as such attend high Romanist functions, are given prominent

places there, and certain Senators accepted membership on a Romanist anti-Communist committee.

Do you know that the above acts of the Roosevelt administration prove that there is a *quasi*-alliance, *i.e.*, a working understanding, a close cooperation, of it and the Romanist church?

Do you know that acts of the Romanist church, especially of her hierarchy and others of her leading representatives, prove that on her part there is a *quasi*-alliance—working understanding with the Roosevelt administration?

Do you know that the hierarchy and other leading mouthpieces and organs of that church vociferously, widely and uncontradictedly have claimed that the New Deal originated in the labor encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI, and that it was by them recommended to Mr. Roosevelt as originating in these encyclicals?

Do you know that that church has repeatedly and successfully exerted pressure on the Roosevelt administration to further its policies in international matters, *e.g.*, in matters as to Mexico, Russia, Spain and the embargo, as shown above?

Do you know that that church, as a church, dabbles in national, state and municipal politics, as is seen from her course in elections, her introducing through underlings bills into Congress, the appearance of her representatives before Congressional committees and her introducing through underlings bills into state legislatures and municipal councils, patent examples of which are her New Deal recommendations, her making candidates declare their stand on state support of her parochial schools, and her course through Tammany in New York City?

Do you know that she systematically, wherever possible, seeks to make raids on national, state and municipal funds to support her parochial schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, orphanages and old folks'

homes, which also smacks of a union of state and church?

Do you know that in very many states and municipalities she has succeeded in getting such support, as well as free bus rides, text-books (of her own creation and selection) and special health service for her parochial schools, as she has, as shown above, succeeded in getting very much financial help from the national administration in certain of these respects?

Do you know that she demands pledges from candidates for such support and threatens to, and actually does, boycott at elections candidates who will not promise such aid, especially in state and municipal elections, *e.g.*, in Ohio and New York City?

Do you know that she carries on propaganda in America in favor of union of state and church, not only in her schools, colleges and universities, as her text-books prove, but in press, pulpit and platform, and that at times by her highest mouthpieces, *e.g.*, Pius XII in a recent letter to the American hierarchy advocated this doctrine and his ablegate in the U.S. did the same thing in an address recently?

Do you know that she causes her members to vote in a bloc in elections, *e.g.*, her hierarchy, other leading mouthpieces and press boasted of electing Mr. Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936, and for his favoring her, will doubtless do it again, if he runs again?

Do you know that the fact that she controls the vote of the vast bulk of her members causes many a politician to dance at the crack of her whip, and to fall all over himself to do her will?

Do you know that if it is in her interests, she flaunts the Constitution's Bill of Rights in its pledges of freedom of speech, press, propaganda, as can be seen in her tacit approval of Mr. Hague's flaunting these in Jersey City, in her boycotting papers, magazines, etc., that print anything objectionable to her, in her members, with her tacit approval, breaking up meetings where anti-Romanist lectures are given or are to

be given, and in her underlings introducing many bills and ordinances against the exercise of liberty of press, speech and propaganda, as witness recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court?

Do you know that anent the unconstitutionality of the autocratic features of the New Deal, the Jesuit magazine misnamed *America*, one of the ablest and most influential Romanist organs in America, editorially set forth the thesis that "the Constitution should be junked to legitimate the New Deal"?

Do you know that the public press reported that through her hierarchy she secured from Mr. Roosevelt during the 1932 campaign and again during the 1936 campaign the promise to establish diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the Vatican, a promise that the press reported he was to fulfill as soon as public opinion in America could be brought about to it?

Do you know that she praises Mr. Roosevelt on all possible occasions, *e.g.*, claiming through Cardinal Mundelein that in two years he did more for her than other presidents in 60 years?

Do you know that the pope sent him his blessing in 1933, congratulated him at his election in 1932 and 1936, and assured him that he prayed for him, his family, mother and administration, which blessings and prayers, we trust, will not have the same results as had the popes' blessings and prayers for the two Spanish armadas, Austria in the Thirty Years' War, royalty, aristocracy and clergy in the French Revolution, France in the Franco-Prussian War, Poland, Belgium and France in the present war, Spain in the Spanish-American War, especially Cervera's fleet, and the Central Powers in the World War, which results seem to prove the popes' blessings and prayers to be a liability?

Do you know that the Romanist church seeks to make it appear that she is the one prop of the U.S. government and the one indispensable church in America, by having the most prominent statesmen, politicians,

office-holders and unofficial but outstanding citizens present as conspicuous guests, with pertinent press notice, at her special functions, which she advertises widely?

Do you know that she advertises herself by overweeningly large, laudatory, illustrated and widespread publicity, and thereby seeks to make the impression that she is the one and only worthwhile religion in America, worthy to be united with state?

Do you know that she, in her hierarchy, struts about in state at congresses, conferences, political gatherings and patriotic celebrations, as the special guest of honor, where she expects and gets special attention, *e.g.*, at the recent Republican National Convention, at Philadelphia, where and after Cardinal Dougherty delivered the invocation, the temporary chairman began his address as follows: "Your eminence, the Cardinal Dougherty, Mr. Chairman, Convention delegates and ladies and gentlemen, etc."?

Do you know that she worms her way into reading masses as integral parts of special celebrations, *e.g.*, at various places where the Centennial of Texas was celebrated, at the Sesquicentennial of the Constitution at Philadelphia, where in the stadium, preceded by a parade of 100,000 Romanists, Cardinal Dougherty solemnized a mass before 100,000 Sesquicentennial celebrants?

Do you know that the insincere and self-seeking character of such performances appears when it is remembered that Pius IX's Syllabus of Errors, an ex cathedra ecumenical utterance, hence from the Romanist standpoint, infallible, condemns as erroneous every one of the principles of the Constitution's Bill of Rights, and that the hierarchy and Romanist church favored the Romanist Mexican oppressors against the Texan patriots in their war?

Do you know that for self-advertisement the Romanist church capitalizes on the reputations of great and prominent Protestants by offering them university degrees

and honors, to impress upon the public her greatness and liberality, *e.g.*, the president, secretary of state and other cabinet members, ambassadors, great scientists, inventors, educators, etc.

Do you know that she specializes on seeking to place her priests, educators and prominent laymen into prominent governmental positions, *e.g.*, in cabinets, administrations, political committees and bureaus and legislative, judicial and executive offices, whereby to further her designs on America she has honeycombed political America with her dependables in strategic positions?

Do you know that she systematically boycotts unfavorable radio stations and programs and movies by worked-up, packed, chain phone calls, wires and letters, *e.g.*, Judge Rutherford's broadcasts, the New York movie on the Spanish war exposing Franco's butcheries, and the movie at Providence, R. I., called *Strange Cargo*, all this to fasten her control on radio and screen?

Do you know that now that Cardinal Mundelein, her liaison officer with the president, is dead, she is grooming Archbishop Spellman for her liaison officer with him?

Do you know that, following the lead of Cardinal Mundelein, she has been loudly advocating support of the Roosevelt policies, most of which originated in her according to her claims?

Do you know that she claims to be his special adviser?

Do you know that she in many ways puts herself above the law, even as Archbishop McNichols of Cincinnati declared at a meeting of the National Catholic Welfare Conference a couple of years ago—that there is no obligation to obey unreasonable laws, she reserving the right to decide which laws are reasonable?

Do you know that in the interests of parochial schools she as a fixed policy has sought to injure the public schools, *e.g.*, fought the reading of the Bible

and the offering of the Lord's prayer there, and then, after accomplishing these purposes, has denounced them as "godless," "irreligious" and "sink holes of hell"; for years forestalled the national government's helping support the public schools, only lately relenting thereon after being promised a part of the money granted therefore; for years fought, and that successfully, various bills authorizing the creation of a secretary of education as a member of the president's cabinet; among other things, sought to forestall it by the arrangement of a secretary of welfare in its stead; denounced public schools as infidel, dangerous, inefficient and wicked, a thing that she especially does at the opening of each school year; bores from within by filling boards of education and teaching staffs with her dependable adherents, who, in their double allegiance as to the U.S. and the pope, a foreign king, have given her the preference therein and lowered the standards of the public schools, *e.g.*, by providing in many cases inferior text-books and freak and unfit courses that divert time and attention from vital matters?

Do you know that she greatly resented the Supreme Court's decisions against the autocratic features of the New Deal, as a repudiation of the labor encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI?

Do you know that it has been widely reported that she by her special mouthpieces advised the president's court-packing plan?

Do you know that she is responsible for the introduction of very many similarly-worded bills in Congress, state legislatures and municipal councils intended to abridge the liberty of the press, mails, speech and propaganda, to silence criticism of her?

Do you know that she causes to be introduced into legislative bodies bills intended to cripple her opponents and benefit her?

Do you know that to pave the way for her coveted union of state and church her mouthpieces doll her up

as supremely beautiful and attractive, invent Romanists as participating in or doing alone great feats in American history and in general doll her up as the one prop and indispensable church for America?

Do you know that by subtle manipulation she has succeeded in placing her adherents or dependables as a majority on national and state committees, to her great advantage?

Do you know that she has gotten immense influence with the executive and legislative branches of our national government and with the legislative, executive and judicial branches of many state and municipal governments?

Do you know that she pretends to regard highly the U.S. Constitution, with which, especially in its Bill of Rights, papal principles and history are in violent opposition?

Do you know that she seeks to intimidate all who displease her by their activities, *e.g.*, our first lady for becoming a patroness of the movement that sought American homes for Loyalists' children made homeless and orphaned by Franco, *The Catholic News* voicing her opposition to Mrs. Roosevelt's pertinent activities in this threat: "If she does not disavow such activities, she will find herself in an embarrassing situation"?

Do you know that she seeks to intimidate the press, lecture platform, radio and movies by boycotting and worked-up, packed, mass phone, wire and letter propaganda on the part of her adherents and dupes along lines mentioned above?

Do you know that she seeks to dominate the labor movement and veteran organizations and the army and navy chaplaincies by advancing her dependables to key positions therein?

Do you know that, contrary to her former policy in America, she even seeks to control secret societies by boring from within?

Do you know that she has been seeking to organize a Romanist political party of her own in America, as

she did in Spain, Germany, Belgium, Italy, Austria, etc., though her influence in the Democratic party has decreased her pertinent activity?

Do you know that she is seeking to mould America after her ideas, to which end her hierarchy issued a 9,000-worded plan embodying, among other things, the following: (1) bringing back God into the government (her way of wording a union of state and [Romanist] church), (2) organizing capital and labor into the closed-shop guilds of the dark ages (under clerical control) and (3) regulating by Romanist theories property, labor, security, wages and the social order, *i.e.*, she seeks to put the U.S. government and social order into the papal straitjacket.

Do you know that her above-mentioned acts not only prove that she is in a *quasi*-alliance with the Roosevelt administration, *i.e.*, a working understanding, a close cooperation between them, but also that she performs in America acts that smack of a union of state and church, and that she is definitely working to create in America a union of state and church with herself as the church united with the American state?

Do you know that the Bible designates as symbolic fornication such a *quasi*-alliance and church activities that smack of a union of state and church, as well as an actual union of state and church, and sets forth the Romanist church as typed by the profligate, idolatrous and persecuting Jezebel, who was, contrary to God's law, united in marriage with Ahab, the type of autocracy (Rev. 17:2-16; 18:3, 9; 19:2; 2:20-23; 1 Kings 16:30, 31)?

Do you know that the Romanist church is under God's abhorrence and special condemnation (Rev. 2:20-23; compared with 1 Kings 21:23-25; 2 Kings 9:30-37; Rev. 18:3-24), which will during the fast-approaching Armageddon be shortly consummated in her complete and eternal destruction, and that all that support and further her are heaping guilt upon themselves

before the Lord, which must bring Divine retribution (Rev. 2:20-23)?

Do you know that the Bible designates the papacy by the following names: That Wicked One, The Man of Sin, The Mystery of Iniquity, The Son of Perdition (2 Thes. 2:1-9), The Antichrist, *i.e.*, counterfeit Christ (1 John 2:18; 4:3), The Abomination that Maketh Desolate (Dan. 11:31; 12:11), The Abomination of Desolation Spoken of by Daniel the Prophet (Matt. 24:15) and The Beast (Rev. 13:1-8) and that, therefore, they sin greatly who support and further it?

Do you know that, therefore, the Roosevelt administration and all who support its supporting and furthering the Romanist church are sinning greatly before the Lord?

Do you know what makes this sin especially detestable to the Lord is this fact: that the Church is Christ's Espoused, who is to keep herself symbolically chaste, *i.e.*, separate from all worldly alliances, as she so waits to become His Bride at His Second Advent (2 Cor. 11:2; Rev. 19:6-8; 21:9, 10), that the Romanist church has forsaken such chastity, *i.e.*, separation from worldly alliances, and has in symbolic fornication become united with the state in some cases, and in others has joined a *quasi*-alliance with governmental administrations, and thus as Christ's Espoused has become a symbolic harlot, rejected by Christ as His prospective Bride (Rev. 17:3-6, 15, 16, 18; 19:2, 3)?

Do you know that the Roosevelt administration by the guilt of symbolic fornication with the Romanist church has incurred God's disapproval, which, among other ways, has punished it by the failure of most of the New Deal policies, by giving it up, unhelped by Him, to its ill-advised Romanist advisers and by prolonging the depression in America unto the present, long after Britain, France, Germany, Italy recovered from the depression?

Do you know that its persisting in this course of symbolic fornication means that it has forsaken the Lord, evidenced by its forsaking certain Divinely-pleasing ideals of government that America formerly cherished, and that its forsaking God has resulted in God's forsaking it (2 Chro. 24:20)?

Do you know that, its having forsaken God in these particulars and God's having, as a result, forsaken it, it has by Him been abandoned to papacy's counsels, which with others have prevailed upon it to take such an unneutral stand toward the totalitarian powers as has aroused great resentment in them against it?

Do you know that such a course toward the totalitarian powers might naturally result in one or more of them attacking America, if and after they defeat Britain, and that if they do attack America and are victorious, which its present abandonment by God, we fear, presages, America will, as a Divine punishment for its above-mentioned sins, doubtless have to pay that power or those powers an indemnity so huge as to stagger imagination?

Do you know that for over 18 years THE HERALD OF THE EPIPHANY, by exposing Rome's worldwide political doings, but especially her political dabblings in America, has sought to draw away our beloved country—America, so long God's favorite among the nations, but now, alas, abandoned by Him—from entanglements with the Romanist church, in which activities over 4,000,000 copies of its issues have been circulated, and that by these protests, as well as by those of other magazines, papers, books, booklets and pamphlets, God has been expostulating against the evil, and must resort to the rod, if reformation sets not in?

Do you know that ultimately by God's returning favor on repentance, good will come from these misfortunes to America and to all other countries, which, after recognizing the Romanist church to be a human source of their evils, will forever destroy it out of their midst in the fast-approaching Battle of Armageddon

(2 Thes. 2:3, 8; Rev. 16:14, 16; 2:20-23, compared with 2 Kings 9:30-37; Rev. 17:5, 16—18:24)?

[Editor's Note: Do you know that our exceedingly able, gifted, practical, God-fearing and mother-honoring President Truman has followed in President Roosevelt's footsteps in his dealings with the Vatican?]

Having published the first part of Herald No. 14 in the form of Extra 23 under John's Rebuke in EC 446-467, we omit it here. We start with the second part of the Double Herald (whole No. 14) subheaded:

ANTI-CHRIST'S IDENTITY AND RISE

Do you know that the Scriptures refer to the one and self-same character by the following terms: "That Wicked One," "The Man of Sin," "The Mystery of Iniquity," "The Son of Perdition" (2 Thess. 2:3-8), "The Anti-Christ" (1 John 2:18; 4:3), "The Abomination that maketh desolate" (Dan. 11:31; 12:11), "The Little Horn" (Dan. 7:8, 21), "The Abomination of Desolation" (Matt. 24:15), and "The Beast"?—Rev. 13:1-8.

Do you know that it was to be during the Gospel Age—the last period of "the present evil world"—that Anti-Christ was to be revealed?—2 Thess. 2:3-8; 1 John 2:18, 19.

Do you know that according to prophecy the second coming of Christ was to be preceded by Anti-Christ's appearing, prosperity and withering?—2 Thess. 2:3-8.

Do you know that some believe that Antichrist is an individual, and that his coming is yet future?

Do you know that Antichrist—having had his small beginning—his begetting—in Apostolic times, and coming to his great end at Christ's Second Advent—a period of at least nearly nineteen hundred years—cannot be an individual and literal man, since no individual

and literal man lives so long?—2 Thess. 2:7, 8; 1 John 4:1, 3.

Do you know that this fact, that Antichrist has existed from the days of the Apostles—at which time he was begotten—until now proves that Antichrist is some self-perpetuating System, whose successive members have represented him before the successive generations of the Gospel Age?

Do you know that the word Antichrist is compounded from the Greek words *anti*, meaning instead of, and *Christos*, meaning Christ, and that the word Antichrist literally means instead of Christ, *i.e.*, a substitute Christ, hence a counterfeit Christ?

Do you know that the Antichrist is, therefore, a counterfeit of the true Christ?

Do you know that there is a great Antichrist and many lesser antichrists?—2 Thess. 2:3-8; 1 John 2:18.

Do you know that the True Christ consists of Jesus the Head and the Church His Body—a company that has in its successive members been present in the world during the Gospel Age, and that is set forth in the Bible as a "*new*," a "*perfect Man*" in implied contrast to the "*Man of Sin*"?—1 Cor. 12:12, 14, 27; Gal. 3:16, 29; 1 Cor. 15:23; Rom. 12:4, 5; Eph. 1:22, 23; 2:15; 4:4, 14.

Do you know that the Church—Christ's Bride—shares His name, Christ, according to some of the passages just cited, for the reason that a bride shares her husband's name.

Do you know that unless we understand The Christ to be one Body, consisting of many members—Jesus the Head-member and the Church the Body-members—we are unprepared to understand, as a counterfeit of The Christ, the great Antichrist, who, as we have seen, must be a System, consisting of many members, having a head-member and many body-members?

Do you know that as the true Lord is the Head of

The Christ, so a false lord must be the head of the Antichrist—the counterfeit Christ?

Do you know that as the true Church is the Body of The Christ, so a false, an apostate Church, must be the body of the Antichrist—the counterfeit Christ?

Do you know that it is just because a false lord is set forth as the true Head, instead of the true Lord Jesus, the true Head—and that it is just because a false church is set forth as the true Body, instead of the true Church—the true Body of Jesus Christ, the true Head—that the counterfeit head and body constitute the Antichrist—the counterfeit Christ?

Do you know that we must therefore search for one false head who is put in the place of Jesus as Head of the Church, and for one false church which is put in the place of the true Church as the Body of Christ, if we would find out just what is the great Antichrist?

Do you know that the Bible, History and Reason prove that the Antichrist already has come, and has sat in the temple of God, and has been revealed and smitten, though his final destruction is yet future?

Do you know that there is especially one System in the world whose workings reach back from our times to those of the Apostles, whose head falsely claims to be the head of the true Church and whose body members falsely claim to be the true Church?—2 Thess. 2:7; 1 John 4:3.

Do you know that this System must be the Antichrist?

Do you know that this System is the Papacy, in which the pope as its head is the counterfeit of Jesus the true Head of the true Church, and the Roman Catholic Church as its body is the counterfeit of the true Church, the Body of Christ?

Do you know that the Bible, History and Reason prove that the Papacy is the great Antichrist?

Do you know that this does not mean that individual Roman Catholics are antichrists, many of whom are godly people and real children of God; but it does

mean that the Papal System as such—not an individual—is the Antichrist?

Do you know that the Bible teaches that the Antichrist would have its rise out of, through and amid a falling away—an apostasy—from the true Christianity, introduced by Christ and His Apostles?—2 Thess. 2:3, 7; 1 John 2:18, 19; 4:1, 3.

Do you know that it started in the unholy ambition of certain leaders to gain the position of preeminence and power in various churches, even while the Apostles lived?—3 John 9-11; 2 Thess. 2:4, 7.

Do you know that the zeal of the Apostles and their faithful helpers to maintain the true organization, teachings and practices of Christianity greatly curtailed the unholy ambition and influence of such leaders?—Acts 20:20, 24, 27-31; Gal. 2:4, 5; 2 Pet. 1:12-15.

Do you know that these ambitious ones became more successful after the Apostles fell asleep?—Acts 20:29, 30; 2 Pet. 1:14, 15, compare with 2:1-3, 15; Matt. 13:25.

Do you know that during the second century they undermined the organization of the true Church, especially by two things, the first of which was the dividing of the Church into two classes: (1) the clergy, as the ruling class, and (2) the laity, as the subject class?

Do you know that during the second century they also undermined the organization of the true Church by a second thing—the dividing of the clergy into two classes: (1) the ruling clergy, to whom, contrary to apostolic usage—according to which the words elders and bishops, or overseers, apply to the same persons and office (Acts 20:17, 28; Phil. 1:1)—they limited the name bishop; and (2) the subordinate clergy, to whom they limited the name elders, presbyters, which latter word was later corrupted in form and meaning into the word priest?

Do you know that during the third century the bishops gained more power, and began to be considered

the successors of the Apostles, and that it was especially through the influence of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage in Africa, who died in 258, that the doctrine of apostolic succession was introduced?

Do you know that late in the third century the more powerful bishops became known as archbishops and metropolitans, having under them all of the clergy of their respective districts and provinces?

Do you know that in the fourth century the five most powerful of the metropolitans—those of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople and Rome—developed into patriarchs—first, or chief fathers—and the superiors of all bishops in their respective sections of the world?

Do you know that during the fifth century the position of supreme ecclesiastical authority became an object of rivalry and contention between the bishop of Rome and the bishop of Constantinople?

Do you know that the Roman emperors during the sixth century, beginning with Justinian, 533 A.D., acknowledged the supremacy of the bishop of Rome as Pope, over all the clergy and churches of the Roman Empire and of the world?

Do you know that this fact and certain events occurring within six years from its beginning "set up" the Papacy in power as the Man of Sin, in the year 539 A.D.?

Do you know that the above-described gradual apostasy from the original organization of the Church completely perverted the Divine organization of the Church?

Do you know that the falling away—the Apostasy—affected not only the organization, but also the teachings that Jesus and the Apostles gave the true Church?

Do you know that during the second century, mainly through the teachings and activities of certain converted heathen philosophers, the doctrinal truths of the Church began to be corrupted through the introduction of heathen philosophical views?

Do you know that during that century they began to introduce the Pagan doctrine of the condition of the dead, and to undermine confidence in the Millennium?

Do you know that during the third century the philosophical theologians and ambitious clergy began to undermine the Scriptural teachings on the relation and unity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, by introducing an unscriptural view of their relation and unity; continued to corrupt and deny the Scriptural doctrine of the Millennium; perverted the present mission of the Church, which is to gather the Elect from the world for joint-heirship and rulership with Christ *after* His Second Advent, for the conversion of the world, into the mission of converting and reigning over the world *before* Christ's Second Advent; and introduced into the Church from heathendom its views on the punishment of sin and began to teach errors on various phases of baptism?

Do you know that during the fourth century they rejected the true doctrine of the relation and unity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and established by aid of the civil power the false teaching on that subject; wholly rejected the doctrine of the Millennium as following Christ's Second Advent, and the true mission of the Church during the Gospel Age, in favor of its converting and reigning over the world before Christ's Return; united Church and State in an unholy and, to the Church, degrading alliance for the conversion of the world and the Millennial Reign before Christ's Return; and developed further the previously mentioned errors and the magical effect of external rites?

Do you know that during the fifth and sixth centuries, in addition to placing increased emphasis on the above-mentioned errors, further errors on the person of Christ were introduced; purgatory, and the mass, as a sacrifice for sins committed after baptism—the greatest of Catholic errors—began in their first principles to be taught; errors on grace, free will, predestination,

and the Lord's Supper began to spread; and errors on the Second Advent, the end of the world, the Judgment Day, the resurrection of the dead, the rewards of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked increased?

Do you know that in addition to these organizational and doctrinal corruptions, during these six centuries there set in very many corruptions in, and evil additions to the practices introduced into the Church by Christ and the Apostles, all of which corruptions and evil additions led to dead formality instead of living spirituality in the Church?

Do you know that these corruptions of, and evil additions to primitive Christian practices include auricular confession, penances, monasticism, asceticism, fasts, feasts, worship of saints and their relics and images, pilgrimages, processions, and that they include elaborate and heathenish ceremonies in worship, regalia, vestments, buildings, festivals, weddings, deaths, funerals, lustrations, incense, crucifixes, etc., etc., etc., and that they fostered increasing ignorance, superstition, credulity, etc., etc., etc., none of which are traceable in the Bible, but all of which were more or less present before the end of the sixth century?

Do you know that all of these features of the apostasy led to a terrible lowering of the standard of life in the Christian Society, Church and Family?

Do you know that out of, through and amid all of these corruptions of Church organization, doctrine and practice, *i.e.*, out of, through and amid the above-described great apostasy from primitive Christianity, the Papacy—the Antichrist—developed, even as St. Paul and St. John declared it would develop out of, through and amid an apostasy?—2 Thess. 2:3; 1 John 2:18, 19.

Do you know that the above-mentioned facts of the great apostasy are authentic History's corroboration of the fulfilment of St. Paul's and St. John's prophecies respecting the rise of the Antichrist—the Papacy, as

the counterfeit Christ—out of, through and amid a great falling away from primitive Christianity?

Do you know that Reason assents to the conclusion that a System with the nature, origin, character, doctrine and history—harmonious with the Biblical forecast—of the Papacy's rise has all of the earmarks of the Antichrist?

Do you know that, additional to the Scriptural, Historical and Reasonable evidence respecting Papacy's rise, showing it to be the Antichrist, there are many other lines of proof for the same fact derived from Scripture, History and Reason respecting Papacy's course *after* it was set up in 539 A.D.?

Do you know that it is necessary for us to acquaint ourselves with at least an outline of these facts in order that we may properly take our part in the Drama of the Ages now being enacted on the stage of ominous World-events in their relation to Christ's Second Advent, the Deliverance of the true Church from the world, and the establishment of God's Kingdom throughout the earth?

Do you know that Christ's Second Advent cannot now be delayed because of Antichrist's coming, since the latter has already come?

Do you know that in harmony with Biblical usage, both in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and in the Greek of the New, human *notables* and *rulers* are sometimes meant by the Hebrew word *elohim* and the Greek word *theos*, both of which are usually translated by the word God?—Gen. 23:6; Ex. 7:1; 21:6; 22:8, 10, 28, compare with Acts 23:5; Ps. 82:6, compare with John 10:34, 35; 1 Cor. 8:5.

Do you know that the following is the literal translation of 2 Thess. 2:4: "Who opposes himself against, and highly exalts himself over, every one called a God [human ruler] or an *augustused* one [one treated as an Augustus, the highest title of the Roman emperors, *i.e.*, any one to whom fealty is sworn and homage is given as the highest civil ruler], so that he seats himself

[as an intruder and usurper pushes his See] into God's Temple [the Church, 1 Cor. 3:16, 17] exhibiting himself that he is a God [a mighty ruler]?

Do you know that in 533 A.D. Justinian, the Roman Emperor, publicly and by an imperial rescript recognized the Bishop of Rome as the head of all the clergy and of all the churches?

Do you know that he sent in 535, to Sicily, and in 537, to Italy, his army under Belisarius, who in his war with the Goths in Italy was so successful that by 539 he had freed Rome and Italy from their power, which resulted in the Pope's becoming in civil, as he had already been in religious affairs the chief power in Rome and its adjacent territory?

Do you know that accordingly from 539, the year of the Gothic empire's fall in Italy, must be dated the beginning of the civil power of the popes as temporal rulers?

Do you know that from shortly thereafter with ever increasing emphasis various popes as the head of the Antichrist, supported by the clergy, the body of Antichrist, came, while grasping for civil power, into conflict with civil rulers—"opposing himself against ... everyone called a god [civil ruler] or an augustused one?"

Do you know that this manifested itself first against the Roman Emperors' Italian exarches whose capital was at Ravenna, then for several centuries against the Longobard rulers, then for centuries against the rulers of the Holy Roman Empire, and then for centuries against every other European ruler who would not be subject to the Papacy?

Do you know that in such activity the Man of Sin fulfilled the prophecy of 2 Thess. 2:4: "Who opposes himself against ... every one called a god [civil ruler] or an augustused one ... exhibiting himself that he is a god [civil ruler]?"

Do you know that gradually from 539 onward the Antichrist claimed higher and higher prerogatives for

himself, until he claimed the supreme place on earth, not only in religious, but also in civil matters?

Do you know that these claims and their realization reached their summit especially in the reign of Pope Innocent III., 1198-1216 A.D., and that they were clearly set forth as a matter of faith necessary for salvation, in the infamous bull, *Unam Sanctam*, issued by Pope Boniface VIII., 1294-1303 A.D.?

Do you know that in these claims and their realization the Antichrist likewise fulfilled the prophecy of 2 Thess. 2:4: "and highly exalts himself over every one called a god [civil ruler] or an august one ..., exhibiting himself that he is a god [civil ruler]?"

Do you know that the meaning and realization of Antichrist's claims to supremacy in political matters over all secular rulers are best illustrated in the activities and successes of Pope Innocent III, who brought back to Papal control the temporarily freed Papal States, brought Sicily under the Papal suzerainty, interfered in the elections of German emperors until his tools and partisans were elected, compelled the King of France to regulate his domestic life according to his views, induced the Spanish king to pay him tribute as his *political* superior, sanctioned the overthrow of the Greek and in its place the establishment of a Latin empire at Constantinople, subject to him, ordered the king of France to enforce his interdict and commands against England, forced England under John Lackland to become a Papal fief, paying tribute twice annually to him, formerly protested against the cornerstone of civil liberty, the Magna Charta, additionally gained political control in Portugal, Poland, Livonia, Sweden and Bulgaria, and finally, a few months before his death, received homage at the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215 A.D., from over 1500 assembled prelates and from the ambassadors of almost all the kings, princes and free cities of Christendom, not only as head of the Church, but also as

supreme lord and judge of all kings, princes and peoples?

Do you know that these claims and their realization are in most striking contradiction to God's Word and the example of Jesus and the Apostles, which inculcate the subjection of all of Jesus' followers in secular matters to the civil powers until the end of "the present evil world"?—John 18:33-37; Matt. 20:20, 21, 24-28; Mark 10:42-45; Luke 22:24-27; Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:1-7; 1 Pet. 2:13-15.

Do you know that when the Mystery of Iniquity—The Antichrist—first began to work, and for several centuries afterward, there was something in the way that hindered the self-exalting and power-grasping clergy in the early Church from gaining what proved to be the goal of Antichrist—religious and political supremacy over mankind?—2 Thess. 2:6, 7, see Revised Version.

Do you know that the hindering thing was the Pagan Roman Empire, with a heathen Roman Emperor at its head?

Do you know that one of the official titles of the Roman Emperor was Pontifex Maximus—greatest, or chief priest?

Do you know that the Roman Emperor had this title because he was the supreme head of the religion, as he also was of the government, of the Roman Empire—things implied in his official titles?

Do you know that as long as the Roman Emperors had and used these powers as the head of the Pagan Roman government and religion, there was a hindrance in the way of Antichrist's obtaining supremacy in State and Church?

Do you know that Antichrist could gain such power only if the hindrance was taken out of the way, *i.e.*, if Pagan Rome would become what proved to be Papal Rome, and if the heathen Emperor would become what proved to be a Papal Emperor subject in religion and government to Antichrist?—2 Thess. 2:6, 7.

Do you know that the self-exalting and power-grasping clergy in the second, third and fourth centuries increasingly as time went on made most extraordinary efforts at the so-called Christianizing of Pagan Rome?

Do you know that they greatly lowered the standards of Christian doctrine and practice, and adopted many heathen views, practices and customs to facilitate the conversion of Pagan to what was growing into Papal Rome?

Do you know that when the size of their following warranted it they made special efforts to win over rulers and to impress upon them their need of the clergy's support?

Do you know that this sometimes led to their winning the confidence, favor and support of certain rulers, and sometimes to their stirring up the fears, envy and opposition of other rulers, up to 313 A.D., when Emperor Constantine openly espoused the side of the self-exalting and power-grasping clergy and their party, by which Antichrist experienced his birth?

Do you know that such a course on the part of the clergy was one of the causes of arousing certain Pagan Roman emperors to persecute all Christians?

Do you know that by 313 A.D. Antichrist succeeded in putting a so-called Christian emperor on the throne of Rome in the person of Constantine, and thus took out of the way one of the features of the hindrance (a heathen emperor as the head of the State) to Antichrist's supremacy in government and religion?—2 Thess. 2:6, 7.

Do you know that shortly afterward Constantine made a partial counterfeit of Christianity the religion of the Roman Empire, by uniting Church and State, and thus a second part of the hindrance (the Pagan religion as the religion of the Empire) was taken out of the way?—2 Thess. 2:6, 7.

Do you know that when Emperor Justinian in 533 decreed the pope to be the head of all the clergy and

the Church, as a direct consequence a third part of the hindrance (the right of the Emperor to the office of Pontifex Maximus—Chief Priest) in the way of Antichrist's ambition for supremacy was taken out of the way?—2 Thess. 2:7.

Do you know that when in 539 Belisarius, Justinian's general, freed Rome and Italy from the control of the Goths he not only removed the final part of the hindrance to Antichrist's exercising political authority, but also laid the foundation upon which immediately the Pope began to build that temporal power which in due time enabled Antichrist to exercise supremacy in governmental matters?

Do you know that many, yea, the majority, of those who wrought on the development and in the interests of Antichrist did so piously and conscientiously, under the delusion that they were thereby enhancing God's glory and gaining His approval?

Do you know that Antichrist's phenomenal success in attaining supremacy in Church and State, so perseveringly and cunningly sought after for many centuries, was at every step favored and furthered by Satan?—John 14:30; 2 Thess. 2:9, 10.

Do you know that of all devices formed for deceiving, enslaving, oppressing and injuring mankind Antichrist is easily the chief, and as such is the very climax of Satanic cunning and ingenuity?

Do you know that Antichrist is thus proven to be the supreme product and the highest representative of Satan's Empire among men?—John 14:30.

Do you know that Satan first offered the faithful Christ the supremacy in the earth on sinful conditions; and failing to win Him thereto, sought and won the unfaithful Antichrist on those conditions for that position?—Luke 4:5-8.

Do you know that Satan was one of the most attentive listeners to the teaching and preaching of Jesus and His Apostles, and that after having learned all that he could from them he very diligently studied

every part of the Old and New Testaments, even as a counterfeiter scrutinizes every part of genuine money; and that from such study he constructed his counterfeit of The Christ, His teachings, practices and organization, and palmed off his counterfeit: the Papacy, its teachings, practices and organization?

Do you know that it took centuries for Satan to work out and palm off the Papal religion as the counterfeit of the true Christian religion?

Do you know that among other things he had to work out a theory of the primacy of the Pope, in the Antichrist, as a counterfeit of the primacy of Jesus, in The Christ, Head and Body?

Do you know that he began the work of palming off his counterfeit primacy during the second century, through the Judaizing heretics called the Ebionites, through whose Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles he set forth the fable of a Bishopric of St. Peter for 25 years at Rome?

Do you know that there is no sure evidence that St. Peter was ever at Rome, much less that he ever was the Roman bishop?

Do you know that this fable of the Ebionites was adopted as a part of Roman Catholic tradition, and that early in the third century the seat of the Roman bishop began to be called the See of St. Peter?

Do you know that in the fourth century the Roman bishop was considered, in his capacity of being one of the five patriarchs, as the first among equals?

Do you know that in the fifth century Satan began to spread misinterpretations of Matt. 16:16-19; Luke 22:31, 32; John 21:15-17, to the effect that they taught that Jesus conferred the primacy of authority among the Apostles upon St. Peter, despite the fact that apart from the keys— (1) the power of opening an entrance for the Jews, at Pentecost, and (2) the power of opening an entrance for the Gentiles, in Cornelius' home, into the Church, Jesus conferred upon all the other Apostles the same authority as upon

St. Peter (Matt. 18:18), and despite the fact that Jesus taught that none of the Apostles was to be over any other Apostle?—Luke 22:24-26.

Do you know that when the claim was made that the Bishop of Rome was the successor of St. Peter as *the prince of the Apostles*, and therefore was the chief of the patriarchs, the other four patriarchs disputed the claim?

Do you know that when for the first time the claim was in the fifth century set forth that not as the first among equals, but as the superior over the four other patriarchs and all other prelates, the Roman Bishop was the head of the Church, this claim was disputed on all sides as an entirely new teaching?

Do you know that gradually this claim gained adherence for assertions and reasons like the following: The Roman Bishop was the successor of St. Peter; he was Bishop of Rome, the most famous city of the world; he had charge of the graves of Sts. Peter and Paul; he was independent of the court intrigues at Constantinople; he was always orthodox; he was usually able and active; he had the solid backing of the Western churches against the rival and divided claimants in the Eastern Church; each group of controversialists in the theological conflicts of the Eastern Church sought his favor and decision against their opponents; his clients always in the end won out in these controversies; the continued growth of the Western and decrease of the Eastern Church; the abandonment of the Western Christians to their fate by the Government at Constantinople during the wandering of the nations; and the paternalism of the Roman Bishop toward the people amid the sufferings due to the wandering of the nations?

Do you know that none of these assertions and reasons is of Divine sanction?

Do you know that Innocent I. (402-417), Coelestin I. (422-432), Leo I., the Great, (440-461) and Gregory I.,

the Great, (590-604) were the most influential Roman Bishops in effecting the acceptance of the primacy of the Roman Bishop as head of the Church?

Do you know that Leo I., the Great, in 445 succeeded in securing the legal recognition of the primacy of the Roman Bishop over the Western Church, and that in 451 he protested not without effect against the 28th canon of the Council of Chalcedon which declared the Bishop of Constantinople and the Bishop of Rome to be equals?

Do you know that it was in the sixth century that the Bishop of Rome arrogated to himself the title of Pope—Papa—as exclusively his, though this title had for several centuries been common to all bishops?

Do you know that in order to prove the primacy of the Pope as head of the Church the following unprovable propositions must be proven: (1) that St. Peter was the head of the Church; (2) that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome; (3) that both as Apostle and as Bishop of Rome St. Peter was head of the Church; (4) that St. Peter was to have a successor as head of the Church; (5) that St. Peter's successor as head of the Church had to be the Bishop of Rome; and (6) that the Pope, as Bishop of Rome, is St. Peter's successor as head of the Church?

Do you know that Satan not only counterfeited The Christ—Jesus the Head and the true Church His Body—by the Antichrist, in which the Pope is the Head and the Roman Catholic Church the Body, but also in the Papacy he counterfeited almost everything else that is a part of genuine Christianity?

Do you know that in doctrinal matters Satan through the Papacy set forth a counterfeit teaching for almost every doctrine of the Bible?

Do you know that in harmony with this procedure Satan through Antichrist has set forth counterfeit doctrines on the Bible, on tradition, on God, on the relation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, on Jesus Christ,

on the Holy Spirit, on angels, on man, on sin, on man's fall into sin, on the penalty of sin, on death, on hell, on purgatory, on the Ransom, on the Abrahamic Covenant, on the New Covenant, on repentance, on faith, on justification, on consecration, on self-denial, on sanctification, on baptism, on the Lord's Supper, on confirmation, on penance, on matrimony, on ordination, on extreme unction, on the Church, on the Gospel Age work, on the priesthood, on the saints, on their sacrifice, on the last day, on time, on eternity, on the last judgment, on the Millennium, on the resurrection, on the end of the world, on heaven, on eternal life, and on eternal death?

Do you know that the ascetic practices of the Papacy, as seen, for example, in monastic life and the celibacy of the priesthood, are some of Antichrist's counterfeits of the self-denials inculcated in the Bible?

Do you know that the bulk of Papacy's saints are Antichrist's counterfeits for the faithful Body members of The Christ?

Do you know that the Papal sacrifice of the Mass is Antichrist's counterfeit of the true sacrifice that the faithful Body of Christ has been making of themselves throughout the Gospel Age?—Rom. 12:1; 1 Pet. 2:5; Heb. 13:15, 16.

Do you know that the infallibility of the Pope is in Antichrist Satan's counterfeit of the infallibility of our Lord Jesus?

Do you know that the college of cardinals is in Antichrist Satan's counterfeit of the more prominent servants of Jesus among men as the antitypes of Israel's seventy judges—the Sanhedrin?

Do you know that the Papal reign from 799 to 1799 is in Antichrist Satan's counterfeit of the Millennial Reign of The Christ?

Do you know that as the Pope and the hierarchy counterfeit Jesus and His Church, so monks and nuns, as the intermediaries between Antichrist and the Catholic

laity, counterfeit the Ancient and Youthful Worthies as the Millennial intermediaries between The Christ and the world of mankind?

Do you know that the Papal laity are in Antichrist Satan's counterfeit for the Millennial subjects of The Christ?

Do you know that Purgatory is Antichrist's counterfeit for the Millennium, when The Christ will purge the earth from the curse and obedient people from all imperfection and sin?

Do you know that Papacy's doctrine on the penalty of sin is Antichrist's counterfeit for the symbolic lake of fire—the second death?

Do you know that counterfeitedly many of the true saints and martyrs of God (Rev. 17:6; 18:24) have been in Antichrist treated by Satan as the Millennial incorrigibles?

Do you know that the tortures to which the true saints and martyrs of Jesus were subjected are in Antichrist Satan's counterfeit of the judgments of the Lord that will in the Millennium teach earth's inhabitants righteousness?—Is. 26:9.

Do you know that the above discussion does not dilate on clerical immoralities and other wrongs since these, having existed in all ages and classes, cannot prove Papacy to be Anti-Christ?

Do you know that if the Roman Hierarchy were as chaste and good as angels, Papacy would yet be the Anti-Christ because of counterfeiting the Christ in His organization, doctrines and practices?

Do you know that it is just because Antichrist in his teachings, practices and organization is so complete a counterfeit of The Christ in His teachings, practices and organization that Satan has by Antichrist attained his greatest power, influence, and success in the world?

ANTI-CHRIST'S DARK REIGN

Do you know that after 539—when the Ostrogoths were overthrown in Italy—the Italian exarch, the political

representative of the emperor in Italy, having made Ravenna his capital, the Pope gradually began to assume the functions of a civil ruler at Rome and in its suburbs?

Do you know that Gregory I., the Great (590-604), said that the one who occupied his office as Bishop of Rome discharged the functions of a civil ruler and of an ecclesiastical shepherd, and that at times it was difficult to determine to which of these capacities some of his acts belonged?

Do you know that Gregory II. (715-731) successfully encouraged the revolutionary remnant of the Exarchate of Ravenna to come under his political leadership?

Do you know that the Popes' controllership of this territory was through the gift of Pepin, the king of the Franks, legally confirmed in 755?

Do you know that Charlemagne in 774 renewed and enlarged this gift of his father Pepin, and thus confirmed the Pope in his temporal power over the Papal States as a fief of the Frankish Empire?

Do you know that in this way the Papal States rose?

Do you know that the Popes were not content thus to be subject to the Frankish Empire?

Do you know that the aim of the Papacy was absolutism, in State and Church?

Do you know that it is a doctrine of Antichrist that of Divine right every human being should be subject in all things to the Papacy?

Do you know that in the ninth century there were only two hindrances to Papal absolutism—the supremacy of the Frankish emperors over the Papal States in matters of State, and the claims of the Frankish metropolitans to independence in the Church?

Do you know that through the greatest forgery of all history—the forged decretals among the so-called Isidorean decretals—the Papacy overcame the Frankish metropolitans' opposition to Papal absolutism in the Church?

Do you know that it was also through these same forged decretals, especially through the part of them that treats of the so-called donation of Constantine—which sets forth the fable that Constantine the Great, 330, out of gratitude for Pope Sylvester's curing (?) him of leprosy, surrendered to the Pope as a gift the whole of the Western part of the Roman Empire as the Pope's civil domain, placing upon the Pope's head the imperial crown, and thereupon left Rome and built Constantinople as his capital over the Eastern part of the Roman Empire—that gradually the Popes overcame the supremacy of the emperors and kings and became the chief civil power in the earth?

Do you know that Papacy's contentions for supremacy in civil matters caused many conflicts and wars?

Do you know that to secure such supremacy among other things the Papacy excommunicated unsubmissive kings and emperors, placed interdicts—prohibition of all rites of the Church—over entire countries, absolved subjects from their oaths of allegiance to their kings and emperors, and aroused the former to revolution against the latter, resulting in some of the latter losing their thrones?

Do you know that one of the most drastic cases of Papacy's acts along these lines occurred when Hildebrand, as Gregory VII., 1073-1085, excommunicated Henry IV. of Germany, released his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and compelled him, when penitent, to do penance by fasting and standing almost naked for three days in the bitter cold of January in the court of the castle at Canossa, where Gregory was then visiting, before that haughty and self-willed pontiff deigned to receive into his presence and absolve the royal penitent?

Do you know that even Catholic theologians now admit that the Isidorean decretals are forgeries in those parts of them that make these extravagant claims of power in Church and State for the Pope?

Do you know that a good and true cause does not require or have forgeries as its basic credentials?

Do you know that powers secured by such fraudulent claims and used for such fraudulent purposes must have been invented by Satan and intended by him for use in his own interests?

Do you know that the powers so gained were used more effectually than other powers ever were used against God, His servants and mankind?

Do you know that such uses stamp them as of Satan's invention, and therefore prove that Papal absolutism in Church and State is of Satanic origin?

Do you know that Antichrist still claims by Divine right the authority to reign in secular and religious matters over all rulers and peoples of the earth?

Do you know that according to the International News Service the present Pope, Pius XI., on Sept. 9, 1921, shortly after his elevation to the cardinalate, publicly made, at Milan, Italy, the following declaration: "The Vatican must be considered, not an international power, but a supernatural power. ... The world must consider Italy as the second country in importance and Rome the universal capital, because the Pope resides there."

Do you know that the reason why the Pope does not now do to the nations and rulers what among others Gregory VII. did to them in the eleventh century, and what Innocent III. did to them in the thirteenth century, is not for lack of will so to do, but only for lack of power to enforce his will so to do?

Do you know that the Scriptures treat of the desolating abomination as an especially wicked thing?—Dan. 11:31; 12:11; 8:13; Matt. 24:15.

Do you know that this desolating abomination is Antichrist—the Papacy?

Do you know that the expression of Matt. 24:15: "the abomination of desolation ... *stand in the holy place,*" is practically synonymous with the expression

of 2 Thess. 2:4: "*he sitteth in the temple of God*"—the true Church?

Do you know that St. Matthew's expression, "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation ... stand in the holy place," is synonymous with St. Mark's expression (Mark 13:14): "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation ... standing *where it ought not*," and that this latter expression proves Antichrist to have no right whatever to be in the Church—that he is there only as an intruder and usurper?

Do you know that Papacy, the Antichrist, teaches that the sacrifice of Jesus atones for only the original sin of man and his actual sins committed before baptism?

Do you know that Antichrist teaches that the sacrifice of the mass atones for all actual sins committed after baptism, whether those who have committed such sins are now living or dead?

Do you know that Papacy teaches that when in the mass the priest in the consecration service utters over the bread and wine the words, This is My body—this is My blood, the bread and wine are changed into the actual flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, which the priest then offers as an unbloody sacrifice to God for the sins of the living Catholics and of the dead in Purgatory?

Do you know that by the doctrine of the Mass the daily—the continual—sacrifice, the continual efficacy of the one Ransom sacrifice of our Lord Jesus to cleanse us from all sin (1 John 1:7), was taken away by the Antichrist?—Dan. 8:11-13.

Do you know that the Ransom-Sacrifice is the place, or foundation, of the Sanctuary—the Church—Dan. 8:11.

Do you know that the doctrine of the Mass is the most abominable feature of the Papacy, because it is subversive of the foundation of Christian doctrine and practice—the Ransom?

Do you know that the doctrine of the Mass with

its concomitants of Purgatory and indulgences has been the mint whereby Antichrist has coined inexhaustible treasures through the fears and superstitions of its deluded adherents?—Dan. 8:12, margin.

Do you know that it is Antichrist's doctrine of the Mass which makes Antichrist the "desolating abomination"?

Do you know that the Bible also calls Antichrist—the Papacy—a "little horn"?—Dan. 7:8, 11, 24, 25; Dan. 8:9-13, 23-25.

Do you know that in Biblical symbols a horn represents a power—a kingdom or a king?—Dan. 7:7, 8, 24; Dan. 8:3, 5, 8, 9, 20-23; Rev. 17:3, 12.

Do you know that the two-horned ram of Dan. 8:3, 4 represents the Medo-Persian Empire?—Dan. 8:20.

Do you know that the one-horned he-goat of Dan. 8:5-8 represents the Grecian Empire under Alexander the Great the conqueror of Medo-Persia?—Dan. 8:21.

Do you know that the four horns which took the place of the one great horn (Dan. 8:8) represent the four kingdoms into which the Empire of Alexander was divided?—Dan. 8:22.

Do you know that one of these four divisions was Alexander's original kingdom—Macedonia—and that the Roman ambassadors acknowledged the subjection of Rome to the victorious Alexander as a part of his Empire—at that time especially Macedonia?

Do you know that it is for this reason that the "little horn" of Dan. 8:9-13 represents first Pagan and then Papal Rome as having come out of one of the divisions of Alexander's Empire—that of Macedonia?

Do you know that the waxing great against (margin) the host of heaven and overthrowing them (Dan. 8:10) represents the conflict in the ecclesiastical heavens whereby the Pope contended with all rival religious claimants, and gained the victory over them in the contention for the primacy?

Do you know that the expression (Dan. 8:11),

"He magnified himself even to the Prince of the Host," means that the Pope would exalt himself to Christ's place as the Head of the Church, and as the rightful Ruler of mankind?—Rom. 14:9.

Do you know that Dan. 8:23-25 treats of the Papacy and is an explanation of Dan. 8:9-13, even as Dan. 8:19-22 is an explanation of Dan. 8:3-8?

Do you know that Dan. 7:7, 8, 19-26 gives a more minute picture of the Papacy in its relation to the Roman Empire than is given in Dan. 8:9-13, 23-25?

Do you know that the four beasts of Dan. 7:3-8 represent in their respective order the four universal Empires—Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome?—Dan. 7:17; 2:31-35, 36-43.

Do you know that the ten horns on the head of the fourth beast—the Roman Empire—(Dan. 7:7) represent the ten nations that would establish a seat of government and exercise rulership on Italian soil—the original territory of the Roman Empire?

Do you know that those ten nations, with the year of the end of their rule on Italian soil, are the following: (1) the Western Empire, 476 A.D., (2) the Heruli, 489, (3) the Ostrogoths, 539, (4) the Exarchate of Ravenna (representative of the Eastern Empire), 751, (5) the Longobards, 774, (6) the Franks, 870 (the French in later periods ruled more or less on Italian soil), (7) the Austro-Germanic Holy Roman Empire, 1806 (Austria later ruled in parts of Italy), (8) the Normans, 1194, (9) the Spaniards, 1714, and (10) the present Italian kingdom?—Dan. 8:24.

Do you know that apart from these ten nations the Papacy is the only other government that had a seat of government and exercised rulership on Italian soil?

Do you know that Papacy, therefore, must be the "little horn" of Dan. 7:8, 11, 20, 21, 24-26?

Do you know that the three horns (Dan. 7:8) that were plucked up by the roots—utterly destroyed—

before the Papal horn came up were the Western Empire, which fell in 476, the Heruli, who fell in 489, and the Ostrogoths, who fell in 539, on whose ruins Papal civil power was built?

Do you know that the Papacy conspired successfully for the successive overthrow of each of these three governments?—Dan. 8:24.

Do you know that as symbolized by the eyes and mouth of the "little horn" the Papacy—Antichrist—is especially marked by his deep and subtle knowledge (eyes) and great utterances (mouth)?—Dan. 7:8; 8:23.

Do you know that Papacy in his scholars is deeply learned, as evidenced in their many books, in subtle, Satanic perversions and in minute accuracies of all branches of human knowledge, especially in those serviceable to his interests, as symbolized by the manlike eyes of the "little horn"?—Dan. 7:8.

Do you know that Papacy's utterances (the mouth of the "little horn") are great—self-exalting—in their teachings, claims and objects?—Dan. 7:8.

Do you know that some of these great claims for the Pope as Papacy's head are set forth in the 62 blasphemous Papal titles which were arranged by Monsignor Capel, one of Papacy's prominent writers, and of which we submit a number as samples: Most Divine of all Heads, Holy Father of Fathers, Pontiff Supreme over all Prelates, Overseer of the Christian Religion, the Chief Pastor, Pastor of Pastors, Christ by Unction, Heir of the Apostles, Abel in Primacy, Noah in Government, Abraham by Patriarchate, Melchisedec in Order, Aaron in Dignity, Moses in Authority, Samuel in Judicial Office, Peter in Power, High Priest, Supreme Bishop, Prince of Bishops, Key-bearer of the Kingdom of Heaven, Pontiff Appointed with Plenitude of Power, Vicar of Christ, Head of the Holy Churches, Chief of the Universal Church, Bishop of Bishops, that is, Sovereign Pontiff, Ruler of the House of the Lord, Apostolic Lord and Father of

Fathers, Chief Pastor and Teacher, Physician of Souls, Rock against which the proud gates of hell prevail not, Infallible Pope, Head of all the Holy Priests of God?

Do you know that among other "great things" that the "little horn" has claimed as the Pope's titles the following are some examples: Prince of the Universe, Lion of the Tribe of Judah, Priest and King who is to be adored by all people, and who is very like unto God?

Do you know that Ferrari's Ecclesiastical Dictionary—a standard Roman Catholic work—says the following of the Pope under the word *Papa*, article second: "The pope is ..., as it were, God and the vicar of God ..., is crowned with a triple crown as king of heaven, of earth and of hell. ... He is above angels. ... Angels ... could be judged and excommunicated by the pope. ... *He occupies one and the same tribunal with Christ* ... The pope is, as it were, God on earth, the only prince of the faithful of Christ, the greatest king of all kings, possessing the plenitude of power, *to whom the government of the earthly and heavenly kingdom is entrusted*. ... The pope is of so great authority and power that he can *modify, declare or interpret* the Divine law. ... The pope can sometimes *counteract* the Divine law by limiting, explaining [away], etc.?"

Do you know that their canon law in the gloss denominates the Pope—"our Lord God?"

Do you know that next to Satan Antichrist has exalted himself more than all other beings and systems combined?

Do you know that the Revelator (Rev. 13:5, 6) prophetically describes the Papacy—Antichrist—as having a mouth speaking great things, and that he declares that in such speaking he blasphemes God and God's name—character, plan, works and office—agreeing on this point with the prophecy of Daniel that we have just been considering?—Dan. 7:8, 25.

Do you know that Papacy's—Antichrist's—claims in teaching, practice and ambition, some of which we have briefly mentioned, are these blasphemies?

Do you know that such high self-exaltation must some day meet the deepest humiliation, and that such blasphemies must some day be repudiated?—Luke 14:11; Rev. 18:1-24; Jer. 51:44, compare with Rev. 17:5.

Do you know that the Bible also prophesies that the Papacy—Antichrist—would change—pervert—God's times and laws?—Dan. 7:25.

Do you know that according to this passage the times that Papacy changed are certain dispensational periods of God's Plan?

Do you know that in fulfillment of the prophecy of Dan. 7:25 the Papacy claims that the period of her power and reign over the nations—approximately from 799 to 1799, which was a part of the Gospel Age—was the Millennial reign of Christ and His saints mentioned in Rev. 20:4-6, whereas the Bible teaches that this reign will follow the Gospel Age and Christ's Second Coming?—Acts 3:19-21; 15:14-17; Dan. 7:13, 14, 18, 22, 27.

Do you know that in fulfilment of the prophecy of Dan. 7:25 the Papacy—Antichrist—teaches that the period of the breaking and removal of its power to reign over the earth is the "little season" of Rev. 20:7-9, which the Bible teaches is to come after the Millennium?

Do you know that in Papacy's changing these times—dispensational periods of God's Plan—it has given us a counterfeit Gospel Age, a counterfeit Millennium, and a counterfeit "little season" following the Millennium, thereby again furnishing proof that the Papacy is Antichrist—the counterfeit Christ?

Do you know that in Dan. 7:25 God has given a prophecy that the Papacy would change—pervert—God's laws?

Do you know that this means that the Antichrist—the Papacy—would pervert God's doctrinal, preceptorial, promissory, hortatory, prophetic and typical ordinances and arrangements, to many of which perversions we have previously referred?

Do you know that in fulfilling this prophecy Papacy—the Antichrist—has perverted—counterfeited—practically every feature of true Christianity?

Do you know that this prophecy proves God's foreknowledge of Papacy's terrible perversions of Truth and Righteousness?

Do you know that the Bible foretells the great craftiness, hypocrisy and cunning of the Papacy?—Dan. 7:8; 8:25; 11:27.

Do you know that by the two kings of Dan. 11:27 the ecclesiastical power and the civil power in Christendom, prior to 539 A.D., are meant?

Do you know that at that time both of these rulerships sat at the table of power, each ambitiously seeking to deceive the other as to its real intentions, and to take to itself supremacy in the other's sphere?

Do you know that by such a course the Papacy introduced the usually mendacious practice that is now called diplomacy?—Dan. 8:25.

Do you know that no system ever caused craft to prosper so greatly as did the Papacy?—Dan. 8:25.

Do you know that Papacy's dealings in dark expediency and secret diplomacy with rulers and nations, individually and collectively, have been more hypocritical, cunning, deceitful and selfish than those of all other similar dealings combined?

Do you know that the craft, hypocrisy and cunning of Papacy have created Jesuitism, than which nothing more deceitful and unconscionable was ever invented among men by human or Satanic ingenuity?

Do you know that as Jesuitism is the child of Papacy's craft, cunning and hypocrisy, so is it the truest representative of Papacy's spirit and practice?

Do you know that by such hypocrisy, cunning and deceitfulness Papacy has counterfeited Christian tactfulness, which Jesus said should always be harmless?—Matt. 10:16.

Do you know that the Papacy—Antichrist—has always degraded individuals in proportion as they have come under its influence?—Rev. 17:2; 18:2, 3; 19:2.

Do you know that Papacy's degrading influence has also been national, in that in the same proportion as nations have been under Papacy's influence they have been lowered in civilization, education, freedom, prosperity, and other elements of national greatness?—Rev. 18:3.

Do you know that the thoroughly Catholic nations—Spain, Mexico, the Central and South American countries, Austro-Hungary, Poland, Bavaria—are examples of Papacy's degrading national influence?—Rev. 19:2.

Do you know that even in preponderantly Protestant countries the great majority of murderers and other notorious criminals are subjects of the Papacy?

Do you know that the Papacy prospers in proportion as it keeps nations and individuals in ignorance, and that therefore the countries of Christendom where illiteracy is greatest are Papal countries?

Do you know that Papacy educates the laity only where Protestant competition forces it to do so for self-protection?

Do you know that Papacy by teaching its people numberless superstitions has deeply degraded them mentally and religiously?—Rev. 17:2.

Do you know that by teaching the principle of unquestioning obedience to its commands and by inculcating blank, unreasoning acceptance of its teachings Papacy has greatly degraded its subjects mentally, morally and religiously?

Do you know that in the very nature of the case Papacy by its exaltation of the hierarchy and subjugation of the laity cannot but degrade its subjects, as all history attests that it has done?

Do you know that many Papal institutions, like the confessional, pilgrimages, indulgences, masses, purgatory, monastic vows, asceticism, the celibacy of the priesthood, monasteries and nunneries are from the nature of the case directly degrading in their influence on the majority of their users?

Do you know that the Papacy by having taken the Bible and its teachings away from its people has taken from them the greatest incentive to mental, moral and religious elevation (John 17:17), and by teaching them its own errors gives them the most effective means to their degradation?—Rev. 17:2; 19:2.

Do you know that the Papacy, since 539 A.D., has incited more wars than all nations combined?

Do you know that by arousing the nations of Christendom to enter the crusade against the Mohammedans to recover the so-called Holy Sepulchre the Papacy caused many millions of people to lose their lives?

Do you know that for centuries after the kings of Christendom saw the folly of the crusades the Papacy sought, happily in vain, to arouse the nations to further crusades against the Moslems?

Do you know that the Papacy, to further its own political and religious ambitions has embroiled nations in war?

Do you know that the Papacy was directly responsible for the wars against the Waldensians, Albigensians, Hussites, the Huguenots and the Netherlanders, because of their relinquishing the Papal faith?

Do you know that the Papacy aroused Charles and Philip of Spain to war against many Protestant countries, like England, Holland, Germany and Denmark?

Do you know that the Papacy, to crush Protestantism, instigated the Thirty Years' War, in which many millions of people perished?

Do you know that for about 125 years after the Reformation began there was scarcely a war in Europe that the Papacy did not incite?

Do you know that Papacy then sought—unsuccessfully in some cases—to incite still other wars?

Do you know that since that time the Papacy has had more or less to do in occasioning and inciting other wars?

Do you know that Papacy's intrigues with Austria respecting the Romanizing of Servia's state religion occasioned the World-War?

Do you know that its doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings contributed mightily to the starting and continuing of the World-War?

Do you know that, leaving the World-War out of consideration, careful historians charge the Papacy with the responsibility of destroying 50,000,000 lives through the wars that it has fomented?—Dan. 8:24.

Do you know that this proves that Papacy—next to Satan, who through introducing sin into our race (John 8:44) murdered the whole human family—is the arch-murderer of all history, and has by its course regarding war greatly degraded the peoples?

Do you know that Papacy would now foment any war that it thinks would result in its interests or in the overthrow of its enemies, and that this means that it would be glad to cripple by war every Protestant country—including America and Britain?

Do you know that by such a course as to war Papacy has in part fulfilled the prophecies which speak of its cruelty and destructiveness?—Dan. 8:23-25.

Do you know that Papacy—Antichrist—is the chief foe of civil and religious liberty on earth?—Dan. 7:21, 24, 25; 8:10, 12, 13, 23-25; 11:33; Rev. 13:6, 7.

Do you know that, in the passages cited after the previous question, by the expression "saints" and "sanctuary" the faithful followers of Christ are meant; that by the expressions "host of heaven" and "stars" religious teachers are meant; and that by the expression "the host" the remainder of the people of Christendom—the laity—are meant?

Do you know that these passages foretell Papacy's antagonism to civil and religious liberty and its persecution of its opponents and its oppression of its subjects?

Do you know that Papacy's claim of being the final authority on religious and civil questions, and its demand of absolute obedience to its teachings and commands, from their very nature are destructive of religious and civil liberty and are promotive of religious persecution and civil oppression?

Do you know that Papacy—Antichrist—*as such* must be subversive of religious and civil liberty, oppressive to its subjects and murderous to its opponents, especially its religious opponents—the so-called heretics?

Do you know that in the Dark Ages through Papacy's influence and teachings religious and civil liberty were non-existent?

Do you know that with fierce and unrelenting hatred and unexampled and demoniacal cruelty it sought to crush every effort to obtain civil and religious liberty?

Do you know that Innocent III., the most powerful of the popes, protested against the Magna Charta—the palladium of civil liberty?

Do you know that the Papacy is the greatest foe of a free press, free speech, free assemblage, free opinion, free conscience and free schools?

Do you know that through the cruel, so-called "Holy" Inquisition, Papacy for centuries sought, and that with temporary success, to destroy religious and civil liberty?

Do you know that by many wars, assassinations and other monstrous crimes fomented by the Papacy it sought to destroy religious and civil liberty?

Do you know that by almost every other dishonorable and criminal method it likewise sought to stifle religious and civil liberty?

Do you know that the Bible is the greatest Charter

of religious and civil liberty and the Beacon-Light of civilization?—John 17:17; Ps. 119:130; Matt. 5:13-17.

Do you know that in proportion as the principles of the Bible prevail, in that proportion religious and civil liberty and a noble civilization prevail?—John 8:31, 32.

Do you know that Papacy's doctrines, practices and organization have been completely refuted by the Bible?—2 Thess. 2:8; Rev. 13:3, 12.

Do you know that for this reason the Papacy has relentlessly sought to suppress the reading of the Bible among others than her mouthpieces?—Dan. 8:12.

Do you know that in harmony with this principle the Papacy has hindered and persecuted the translation of the Bible into living languages?

Do you know that so far as possible the Papacy kept the Old and New Testaments—God's two Witnesses—covered with the "sackcloth" of dead languages during the long period of her power?—Rev. 11:3.

Do you know that by dark crimes the Papacy hindered the translation and spread of the Bible until, during the last century, through the Bible Societies, backed by the spirit of true liberty, fraternity and equality, it was effectually prevented from further successful hindrance of the good work?—Rev. 11:3-13.

Do you know that for the common people to have been found with Bibles in the vernacular during Papacy's ascendancy meant persecution, and frequently death, through the "Holy" Inquisition?

Do you know that the Papacy has made bonfires of multitudes of Bibles on the plea that the Bibles of heretics were mistranslations?

Do you know that the standard Protestant Bibles are better translations than the standard Papal translations?

Do you know that within the last twenty-five years Papal priests in the Philippines, under the jurisdiction

of Arch-Bishop Dougherty—now Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia—publicly burned thousands of Bibles as a warning to their flocks?

Do you know that the Papacy has cursed with blood-curdling imprecations the Bible Societies for translating and spreading the Bible?

Do you know that the Papacy never gives the common people the Bible unless forced thereto by Protestant competition?

Do you know that the Catholic laity may have the Bible only by special clerical permission, and then usually only when annotated with grossly misleading Papal comments?

Do you know that these facts prove that the Papacy fears the Bible as its greatest foe?

Do you know that the Papacy has not only proscribed the Bible, but all other books that, more or less deriving their light from the Bible, teach differently from the Papacy?

Do you know that the Papacy keeps a double list of such books—called the index of prohibited books and the index of expurgated books—the former being totally prohibited to its adherents, apart from special dispensations, and the latter permitted only after certain papally disapproved parts are deleted?

Do you know that the above are only a few of the ways in which the Papacy has "cast down the Truth to the ground" and trodden down the saints and the laity?—Dan. 8:12, 13; John 17:17.

Do you know that the Bible repeatedly and emphatically prophesies that the Papacy would oppose and persecute God's faithful people—the true saints?—Dan. 7:21, 25; Dan. 8:11-13, 24; Dan. 11:33; Rev. 13:6, 7; Rev. 17:6; Rev. 18:24.

Do you know that especially for 1260 symbolic days, *i.e.*, 1260 literal years—539 to 1799 A.D.—Papacy, in harmony with prophecy, did this very thing?—Rev. 11:2, 3; Rev. 12:6; Rev. 13:5; Dan. 7:25.

Do you know that the Papal persecutions of the saints were from every standpoint immeasurably more severe than were the Jewish and Pagan—Roman—persecutions of the saints?

Do you know that the Jewish and Pagan persecutions of the saints were intermittent, more or less lenient, restricted usually to individuals, often perfunctorily carried out, more or less humane in methods, and usually largely escapable, whereas Papal persecutions of the saints were continual for many long centuries, cruel in the extreme, *diabolic in method*, directed not only against individuals, but also against whole communities and nations, fanatically systematic and in most cases entirely unescapable?

Do you know that the longest non-papal persecution—that of the Roman Emperor Diocletian—lasted ten years, while Papal persecution lasted for more than twelve hundred years?

Do you know that Papal persecution began, on the basis of information pried out of penitents in the confessional, with a persistent worrying and annoying of the dissenting saints along religious, social and civil lines, in ways calculated to wear them out?—Dan. 7:25.

Do you know that as Papacy gained more influence with the rulers it increasingly induced them to persecute the dissenting saints, whom it caused to be stigmatized as heretics?

Do you know that Papacy used this ever-increasing influence with the State to cause laws to be passed making it a civil crime to hold and spread what often was Truth struggling to maintain a foothold, but what Papacy was pleased to call heresy?

Do you know that in this way the Roman Catholic Church caused the Civil Power to persecute saints.

Do you know that in such doings that Church antityped the heathen and wicked Queen Jezebel, and that the Civil Power antityped King Ahab of Israel, through whom Jezebel persecuted Jehovah's prophets,

and that the persecuted saints antityped those persecuted prophets?—Rev. 2:20; 1 Kings 16:29–19:14.

Do you know that even before the year 539 Papacy influenced the Emperors Constantine, Valentinian, Gratian, Theodosius, Arcadius and Honorius to pass penal laws against heresy, Constantine passing two, Theodosius fifteen, Arcadius twelve, and Honorius eighteen, all of which are to be found in the Theodosian, or Justinian codes?

Do you know that while from 539 onward the civil powers, incited thereto by the Papacy, persecuted dissenting saints, it was especially since early in the thirteenth century, through Innocent III., 1198-1216, who authorized the so-called "Holy" Inquisition, 1204, that the persecution of the heretics—usually God's saints—by the so-called "Holy" Inquisition and by national crusades took on a form of ruthlessness unequalled in human history, not excepting the ruthlessness of the World-War?

Do you know that Papacy, sometimes by threats, sometimes by flattery and sometimes by rewards—bribes—aroused the persecuting fury of rulers, armies and civilians?

Do you know that the Papacy offered these prospective murderers of God's saints plenary indulgence—full release—from purgatorial sufferings, if they would make some who actually were God's saints suffer even unto death?

Do you know that the most cruel and revolting tortures were applied to the saints by the Inquisitors in their efforts to induce them to "recant"?

Do you know that the following are some of the things that the "Holy" Inquisition did to exterminate God's saints, and with them God's Truth—scourging them; stretching them on racks 6 and 8 inches longer than their natural sizes; disjuncting their bones; breaking their teeth with hammers; cutting out their tongues; slicing off their cheeks; cutting off their ears, lips and noses; gouging out their eyes; pouring melted

lead into their empty eye-sockets, into their ears and down their throats; pulling out their nails with hot pincers; cutting off their fingers, toes, hands and feet; cutting off the breasts of women; ripping open pregnant women and tearing from them their unborn infants, which they sometimes would then burn at the stake with their prospective mothers; torturing with special instruments the most sensitive parts of the human body; skinning, boiling, roasting and burning them alive; forcing urine and excrement down their throats; breaking their arms by sudden raising and letting them fall not quite to the floor with chains attached to pulleys in the ceilings and tied to their hands, which were forced back of them, while 300 pound weights were attached to their feet; forcing them to submit to the embraces of a machine called the "kissing virgin," which was covered with horseshoe nails and knife blades whose points entered the bodies pressed against the machine; applying thumbscrews and Spanish boots to them, the former crushing their thumbs and the latter lacerating their feet and legs up to the knees; impaling them; pulling their bodies apart by tying their feet with long ropes to two horses which were then made to run at full speed in opposite directions; stripping them and tying them to fleet horses which dragged them until dead over rocky fields; casting them off of eminences upon spears below; beheading and disemboweling them; burying them alive; torturing and murdering their nearest relatives before their eyes, etc., etc., etc.?

Do you know that the victims of the "Holy" Inquisition, under 45 of its "Holy" Inquisitor-Generals, totaled 347,704 men and women, besides many others tortured by other "Holy" Inquisitor-Generals?

Do you know that the "Holy" Inquisition hired physicians to watch its victims undergoing torture, so that the physicians could stop the tortures just short of killing the victims, in order that after somewhat of

convalescence the tortures could again be applied to the partly cured and highly sensitive victims?

Do you know that not only did Pope Innocent III. authorize the "Holy" Inquisition, but he offered a plenary indulgence—full release—from purgatorial sufferings to all who would join in the crusade against the Waldenses and Albigenses of France and Italy?

Do you know that in response to his call a half million men from France, Germany and Italy joined the crusade and devastated entire provinces?

Do you know that at Beziers, 1209, they slaughtered 60,000 men, women and children; that at Lavaur, 1211, they slaughtered thousands of others; and that in one day in the province of Languedoc alone they devastated cities, towns and country, slaughtering over 100,000 Albigenses?

Do you know that on that day the crusaders attended mass in the morning, and throughout the rest of the day devastated Languedoc and murdered its inhabitants?

Do you know that the Papal clergy publicly thanked God for the "victory" over these "heretics"?

Do you know that under Charles V. and Philip II. of Spain, in the Netherlands alone 100,000 Protestants were martyred by Papal instigation?

Do you know that following the example of Charles and Philip of Spain, and instigated thereto by the Papacy, the French kings, Francis, Henry, Charles and Louis XIV., fiendishly persecuted the French Protestants—Huguenots—in various provinces of France, slaying them by the hundreds of thousands, and exiling over a million of them, sparing neither men, women nor children, and that with indescribable tortures?

Do you know that among others of these massacres that of St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572, begun by treachery to the Protestants, carried out with extremest cruelty and destroying approximately 70,000 people, was instigated by Papacy?

Do you know that both the Pope and the French king had medals struck in commemoration of this infamous massacre, as if it were something of which one should boast?

Do you know that the Pope had a picture of the St. Bartholomew massacre hung in the Vatican, bearing the inscription, "The Pontiff approves the fate of Coligny"—the French Protestant leader and French Admiral, who was treacherously invited to a royal wedding ostensibly arranged for the reconciliation of the French Catholics and Protestants, but really intended to bring all the prominent French Protestants to Paris for what turned out to be St. Bartholomew's massacre?

Do you know that Coligny's head was severed from his dead body by the French queen's order, then embalmed and sent by her as a trophy to the Pope, while the Parisian populace dragged the trunk of the body through the streets of Paris?

Do you know that after receiving Coligny's embalmed head the Pope had the above-mentioned picture hung in the Vatican?

Do you know that Antichrist in 1641 called upon the Irish to enter a war of religion to kill or exile Protestants, and that in Ulster alone 154,000 Protestants, men, women and children, were either killed or exiled, amid utmost barbarity?

Do you know that O'Neil, the Irish primate, called the massacre "a pious and lawful war," and that Pope Urban VIII. granted plenary indulgence to its executors as "gallantly doing what in them lay to extirpate and wholly root out the pestiferous leaven of heretical contagion"—Protestantism?

Do you know that the above facts as well as hosts of others almost as atrocious are so well authenticated that even Papal historians are forced to admit their truth, though trying to mitigate the force of them?

Do you know that by these massacres during 1260 years the Papacy forced the faithful followers of Christ into the symbolic wilderness—isolation—out of

which the faithful emerged with large and sure freedom only from 1799 onward?—Rev. 12:6.

Do you know that by these as well as by other methods of Satan "it was given to him [the Papacy] to make war with the saints and to overcome them" and to "wear out the saints of the Most High"?—Rev. 13:6, 7; Dan. 7:25.

Do you know that it is for these reasons that Antichrist—the Papacy—is described as "drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus"?—Rev. 17:6.

Do you know that this blood is now on Papacy's hands and calls for vengeance, which very shortly will be executed in the destruction of the entire Papal system?—Rev. 6:9-11; Rev. 18:24.

Do you know that the Papacy—Antichrist—would reenact these persecutions here in America, if it only had the power, as within the last 50 years in Mexico, Central and South America it has aroused mobs to kill Protestant missionaries?

Do you know that the Papacy curses every one to eternal torment who teaches or practices contrary to her theories and practices?

Do you know that the Papacy has cursed the faithful followers of Christ with blood-curdling curses?

Do you know that in the Romish Pontifical the following is only one of Papacy's authorized curses against Protestants: "May God Almighty and all His saints curse them with the curse with which the devil and his angels are cursed! Let them be destroyed out of the land of the living! Let the vilest of deaths come upon them, and let them descend alive into the pit [of eternal torment]! Let their seed be destroyed from the earth—by hunger and thirst and nakedness and all distress let them perish! May they have all misery and pestilence and torment! Let all they have be cursed! Always and everywhere let them be cursed! Speaking and silent let them be cursed! Within and without let them be cursed! From the crown of the head to the

sole of the foot let them be cursed! Let their eyes become blind; let their ears become deaf; let their mouths become dumb: let their tongue cleave to their jaws; let not their hands handle; let not their feet walk! Let all the members of their body be cursed! Cursed let them be, standing or lying, from this time forth forever; and thus let their candle be extinguished in the presence of God, at the day of judgment! Let hungry wolves devour their corpses! Let the devil and his angels be their companions for ever! Amen, Amen; so be it; so let it be"?

Do you know that it was not God's Spirit that dictated this curse?—Matt. 5:43-45.

Do you know that only Satan and his chief earthly representative—Antichrist—could pour out such a curse?

Do you know that a religion whose spirit draws up and authorizes such a curse must have been invented by Satan and must be the basest kind of a counterfeit of true Christianity?

ANTI-CHRIST'S REVELATION—SMITING—END

Do you know that some of the Scripture passages that treat of the development of the Papacy to its greatest height of exaltation speak of its being revealed later in its true character and of its being then smitten by the Truth?—2 Thess. 2:6, 8; Rev. 13:3, 10; Dan. 7:26; Dan. 8:25.

Do you know that the time for Papacy's revealment as the Antichrist of the Bible was the period of the Reformation?—Dan. 11:32-35; 2 Thess. 2:8.

Do you know that the Reformation proceeded through two phases, the first being characterized by unorganized, or undenominational movements, from 1309 A.D. to 1498 A.D., the second being characterized by organized, or denominational movements, from 1517 A.D. to 1846 A.D.?

Do you know that both of these phases of the Reformation emphasized, and proved from the Bible with historical corroborations, the fact that Papacy is

the Antichrist of the Bible, and thus they revealed the Man of Sin as such?—2 Thess. 2:6, 8.

Do you know that St. Paul, by the expression, "spirit of His mouth," in 2 Thess. 2:8, meant the power of the Truth as given in the Bible, which is God's figurative mouth—that through which He speaks to us?—2 Thess. 2:8, compare with Rev. 1:16; 2:16; 19:15, 21; Is. 49:2; Eph. 6:17.

Do you know that St. John by the second use of the term "sword," in Rev. 13:10, also means the Truth given in the Bible?—Eph. 6:17.

Do you know that the Truth as contained in the Bible is the great weapon by which the Lord according to prophecy has revealed and smitten Antichrist as such?

Do you know that History proves that such a predicted revelation and smiting of Papacy has taken place?

Do you know that Marsilius of Padua, one of the ablest men of the fourteenth century, began in 1309 to learn the Biblical principles that enabled him to recognize the Papacy as Antichrist, usurping power in both Church and State?

Do you know that by 1324 he had so thoroughly learned these principles as to have written in 90 days a large book entitled *The Defender of the Peace*, which from Scripture, Reason and History disproved Antichrist's claims of power and authority in Church and State?

Do you know that even to this day Marsilius' book is a standard on the subject that it discusses?

Do you know that Marsilius had as colaborers certain of the ablest scholars of his day, including men like John of Jandun, Michael of Cesena, general of the so-called schismatical Franciscans, and William Occam, the foremost theologian and philosopher of his time?

Do you know that in the literary war waged by these

against the defenders of the Papacy the latter were thoroughly refuted, and thus Papacy began to be revealed as Antichrist?

Do you know that John Wiclif of England, the ablest theologian and philosopher of his day, especially from 1378 to the end of 1384 attacked the Papacy as Antichrist with unanswerable power, and greatly added to the Scriptural arguments on this subject advanced by Marsilius?

Do you know that he started from the basis that no religious doctrine or practice should be permitted in the Church unless it be proven to be Biblical?

Do you know that this principle moved him to reject most of Papacy's doctrines and practices as erroneous?

Do you know that multitudes in England under his teachings rejected the Papacy and its chief doctrines and practices?

Do you know that Wiclif increased greatly the revelation of Papacy as Antichrist, and assisted in its smiting?

Do you know that in 1391 John Huss of Bohemia became interested in Wiclif's writings and shortly afterward began his career as a reformer, sealing it in 1415 with a martyr's death at the stake, to which a Papal council condemned him?

Do you know that he manifested the Papacy as Antichrist to hundreds of thousands in Bohemia?

Do you know that John Wessel of Holland was used by the Lord to make still more manifest as of Antichrist not a few of the Papal doctrines?

Do you know that he laid down as basic the four cardinal principles of the Reformation by sects as it was developed from 1517 to 1846?

Do you know that Jerome Savonarola in Italy likewise wrought fruitfully in the work of manifesting the Papacy as Antichrist and shared in its smiting until his death as a martyr in 1498?

Do you know that all of the reformers hitherto

mentioned led unorganized—undenominational—reformatory movements which, one and all, contributed a share in the work of revealing the Papacy as Antichrist and in smiting it with the Word of God?—2 Thess. 2:8.

Do you know that this class of Reformers are a part of those referred to in Dan. 11:33 as "they that understand among the people shall instruct many, yet shall they fall by the sword and by flame, by captivity and by spoil?"

Do you know that the next verse, by the expression "They shall be holpen [assisted] with a little help," refers to the Reformation by sects begun in 1517 by Luther, and ended in 1846 by Miller in the Second Advent movement?

Do you know that the following are the four fundamental principles of the Reformation by sects—usually called the Protestant Reformation: (1) The Bible is the sole source and rule of faith and practice; (2) Justification is by faith alone through the merit of Christ; (3) Christ alone is the Head of the Church; and (4) all and only the Faithful are Priests.

Do you know that the Lutheran church placed the chief emphasis on justification by faith alone as against the Papal doctrine of justification by faith and works?

Do you know that the Presbyterian church placed the chief stress on the Bible as the sole source and rule of faith and practice as against the Papal doctrine of tradition as a source and rule of faith and practice?

Do you know that the Episcopal church placed the chief emphasis on the sole Headship of Christ in the Church as against the headship of the Pope?

Do you know that the Baptist church placed the chief stress on the exclusive priesthood of the Faithful as against the Papal doctrine of its priesthood?

Do you know that the Congregational church stressed the doctrine of the equality of all the brethren in the Church as against the Papal doctrine of the superiority of the priests to the laity?

Do you know that the Methodist church stressed the doctrine of consecration and heart religion as against the formalism of the Papal religion?

Do you know that the Disciple church emphasized the doctrine of the Apostolic organization of the Church as against the doctrine of the Papal organization of the Church?

Do you know that the Advent church stressed the doctrine of eternal life to be gained in the resurrection of the dead at Christ's Second Advent as against the Papal doctrine of eternal life being inherent in man?

Do you know that other denominations stressed other important truths?

Do you know that the above-mentioned churches wrought out the Reformation by sects, or denominations, from 1517 of 1846?

Do you know that each of them stressed an important truth as against a Papal error?

Do you know that it was by the truths that they emphasized against Papal errors that they both revealed the Papacy as Antichrist and smote it with the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God?

Do you know that this smiting was the means by which the Lord consumed much of the Papal power in Church and State?—2 Thess. 2:8; Rev. 13:3.

Do you know that before this revelation and smiting began the Papacy was almost omnipotent in Church and State?

Do you know that when it was finished the Papacy's power in Church and State was very largely consumed?

Do you know that the advocacy of the principle of liberty in the Church from the Papacy led to the advocacy of the principle of liberty in the State from the Papacy?

Do you know that as sisters Religious Liberty and Civil Liberty supported one another against Papal absolutism—the ancient ravisher of both?

Do you know that with the support of Protestantism many nations cast off the Papal political power,

e.g., Britain, all Scandinavia and Holland, and most of Germany and Switzerland?

Do you know that other countries and certain provinces obtained temporary freedom from Rome politically, but were later by bloody wars and Jesuitical intrigues forced into subjection to it by Austria, Spain and France?

Do you know that as the principles of religious and political liberty gradually spread, the Papacy's political power, even in Papal countries, gradually diminished?

Do you know that it was the French Revolution and especially Napoleon—1789 to 1809—that broke forever the spell of Papal political authority over the nations?

Do you know that France was for a thousand years Papacy's most dependable ally?

Do you know that through France above all other nations Papacy exercised its political power to the subversion of Truth and Righteousness throughout Europe?

Do you know that France above all other nations at Antichrist's instigation persecuted and warred against movements protesting against the Papacy, like the Waldenses, the Albigenses, and the Huguenots?

Do you know that the Papacy could depend on France when it could depend on no other nation?

Do you know that France was as drunken by Papal doctrine as any other nation on earth?—Rev. 17:2; 18:3; 19:2.

Do you know that this extreme subserviency to Papacy on the part of France prepared the latter to strike Papacy the hardest blow of all history, once France learned that she had been deceived, wronged and exploited by Papacy?

Do you know that the wrath of revolutionary France poured itself out in stripping the Papacy of all its vast French wealth and privileges, in abrogating its services, in massacring or banishing those of its clergy who refused to wed, in freeing its monks and

nuns from monastic life and institutions and in banishing from social and political life everything derived from Papacy?

Do you know that Napoleon Bonaparte more than any other individual broke Papacy's civil power?

Do you know that he and his generals four times, from 1796 to 1808, invaded the Papal States, exacting the first time a large indemnity, the second time a still larger indemnity and a part of the Papal territory, the third time abrogating entirely the temporal power of the Pope, setting up a Republic in its stead, and taking Pius VI. to France as a prisoner, where he died the next year, 1799, and, when later the Pope received again a part of his temporal power, at the fourth invasion taking away every shred of it from him, in 1808-1809?

Do you know that Napoleon's disregard and defiance of the Papacy's anathemas and claims of Christ's Vicarship and his rough handling of and trampling upon the Papacy not only broke the temporal power of the Pope, but also the superstitious dread of the Papacy which the bulk of Europe had felt?

Do you know that despite a precarious assumption of temporal power by the Papacy, which it arrogated to itself, as a ward either of France or of Austria, and which was finally ended by Italy in 1870, the Papacy has scarcely since Napoleon's time dared breathe aloud the claims of supremacy over the kings of earth of which it formerly boasted?

Do you know that when the final settlement of the Napoleonic wars came the Papacy despite its wishes was not even invited to send representatives to the Peace Congress at Vienna, in 1815-1816, as it also was snubbed in the same way by the Peace Congress at Paris in 1919-1920?

Do you know that this proves that the civil rulership of the Papacy is broken, despite Papacy's political intrigues to have it restored?

Do you know that almost all the States of Europe that had been united with the Papacy as the State religion have in their midst separated Church and State and have destroyed Papacy's civil power in their lands?

Do you know that the curtailment of Papacy's civil power and the casting off of their union with it on the part of the European States is what is meant by the "ten horns" of the symbolic "Beast" making the Catholic Church desolate and naked, and eating her flesh?—Rev. 17:16.

Do you know that before long these same nations will "burn her with fire"—destroy the Papacy entirely?—Rev. 17:16; 2 Thess. 2:8.

Do you know that Papacy's present diplomatic activity and increased influence among the nations is her final boasting—"I sit as a queen," etc.—immediately preceding her final and complete destruction?—Rev. 18:7.

Do you know that Napoleon was an unconscious instrument in God's hands to ruin Papacy's temporal power and break the spell of superstitious dread of the Papacy that hung like a dark cloud over the nations, and that his activities in this and other respects are described in Dan. 11:29, 30, 36-45?

Do you know that in Dan. 11:2-45 there is a prophecy of world events from the days of Cyrus of Persia, 536 B.C., until Napoleon's death, 1821 A.D.?

Do you know that in this section of Scripture the King of the North stands, first for the Grecian Empire in its Syrian subdivision especially, then for its successor, Rome, and then for Rome's successor—the European Concert of Powers?

Do you know that "the King of the South" is Egypt?

Do you know that Dan. 11:5-17 treats of the conflicts between Alexander's successors, especially in Syria, and the Egyptian rulers until the time of Cleopatra?

Do you know that from there onward the prophecy touches only on the more prominent persons and events of history connected with the two great invasions of Egypt by the King of the North before Napoleon's invasion—the third great invasion—also on the conflict between the civil and clerical power in Christendom, on the activities and the persecution of the saints and on the Reformation until, apart from verses 29 and 30, which are thrown in parenthetically, it describes Napoleon's activity in verses 36-45?

Do you know that verse 17 treats of Rome's occupation of Egypt by Julius Caesar and Mark Antony and of their relations with Cleopatra, queen of Egypt?

Do you know that verses 18 and 19 treat of Augustus' and Antony's quarrel as Rome's and Egypt's representatives, verses 17-19 describing the first great invasion of Egypt from the North?

Do you know that verse 20 refers to Augustus Caesar, the tax-gathering Roman Emperor (Luke 2:1-3), and that verses 21-24 refer to Tiberius Caesar, under whom Jesus Christ—"the Prince of the Covenant" (verse 22)—was crucified?

Do you know that verses 25-28 treat of the second great invasion of Egypt from the North, that under Emperor Aurelian, when Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, a descendant of Cleopatra, claimed and exercised authority over Egypt?

Do you know that verses 29, 30 treat of Napoleon's invasion of Egypt—the third great invasion of Egypt from the North—and are thrown in parenthetically to give the connection and contrast between the first and second invasions, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the third great invasion of Egypt from the North?

Do you know that verse 36 treats of Napoleon's wilfulness, his ambition to outstrip every other ruler—"god"—his commands, proclamations, indignities, etc., against the Papacy—"the god of gods," ruler of rulers

—his marvelous prosperity until he would complete the ruin of Papacy as the thing determined by God?

Do you know that verse 37 describes Napoleon's disregard of the Papacy—"the god [ruler] of his fathers"—and his disregard of the Protestant denominations—symbolic "women"—his disregard of all civil rulers and his exalting himself above all other rulers?

Do you know that verse 38 describes military power as Napoleon's "god," and describes the rewards he gave those who manifested great military ability and success?

Do you know that Napoleon, though a great administrator, was, according to verse 39, especially noted for his military power and for the rewards and positions he gave his successful military supporters?

Do you know that his Egyptian campaign, 1798, 1799, is described in verse 40, when not only Egypt fought him with their horsemen, but almost all Europe declared war on him, and Nelson, the great English Admiral, destroyed his fleet, Aug. 1, 1798, in Aboukir Bay, as shown in verse 30?

Do you know that verses 40 and 29 and 30 enable us to fix the date when the "time of the end" began as 1799—which is by these verses shown to have begun on Napoleon's return to France, Oct. 9, 1799, from Egypt's third invasion from the North?

Do you know that verses 40-43 show his victorious invasion of Palestine, his keeping close to the Mediterranean Sea coast, his humbling Egypt and its contiguous countries?

Do you know that the "tidings out of the East and North" (verse 44) refer to the news that Napoleon received in Egypt of a coalition of Britain, Russia, Naples, Austria and Turkey declaring war upon him?

Do you know that this news, according to verse 44, caused him to return to France "at the time of the end," and to begin his series of wars to subjugate all Europe to himself?

Do you know that verse 45 describes his temporary

residence in Palestine in 1799, his ultimate defeat and his abandonment on the part of all?

Do you know that Napoleon as the man of destiny (Dan. 11:36) was the Divinely appointed instrument in pouring out Divine retribution on the Papacy, in making the world safe from its political power and the people free from its persecuting fury and from its "Holy" Inquisition, which he destroyed?

Do you know that from this standpoint Napoleon's work as a political reformer—despite his evident infidelity, barbarous ruthlessness and insatiable ambition—resulted ultimately in great good for religious and civil liberty?

Do you know that the Bible prophesies the duration of the period of Papacy's power to persecute the Lord's people and to oppress its enemies and opponents?

Do you know that the Bible gives this period in symbolic language in which a day stands for a year, a month for 30 years, and a "time," a year, for 360 years?—Dan. 7:25; Rev. 11:2, 3; 12:6; 13:5?

Do you know that so understood these passages prove that the duration of Papacy's power to oppress and persecute would be 1260 years, and that this would be the period of her power?

Do you know that the Papacy was "set up" in power in 539 A.D., and that its power ended in 1799 A.D., when Pope Pius VI. died a captive of Napoleon in France—period of 1260 years?

Do you know that the fact that *independent* Papal civil power ended in 1799 was acknowledged by Pius VII. who, succeeding Pius VI., became Pope in 1800, and who immediately issued a statement declaring it to be the Divinely imposed duty of every human being—therefore of the Pope also—to be subject to the civil rulers of his country?

Do you know that the period from 539 to 1799 was the Biblically foretold time—the 1260 years—of Antichrist's reign over the nations?

Do you know that since 1799 the Pope's rule—intermittent at most—has been merely nominal, because whenever after that date he exercised the semblance of political power it was as the ward of France or Austria, and not as a fully independent political sovereign?

Do you know that the end of Papacy's long period of power synchronized with the beginning of "the time of the end," as shown above, and that before the "time of the end" is completed Papacy will be out of existence?—2 Thess. 2:8; Rev. 17:16, 17.

Do you know that one of Papacy's doctrines is that it is *semper idem*—always the same?

Do you know that, though facts disprove this doctrine in many particulars, it certainly means that if Papacy had the power it would do again what it did to the kings, nations and saints from 539 to 1799?

Do you know that the *semper idem* doctrine of the Papacy means that it is plotting for a restoration of its temporal power?

Do you know that Papacy's efforts at making the nations feel that it is their indispensable bulwark against radicals is a part of its intrigues to regain temporal power?

Do you know that Papacy still agitates for the restoration of the States of the Church to its power?

Do you know that these aspirations of the Papacy will never be realized?—Rev. 17:16, 17.

Do you know that Papacy's present political and diplomatical prominence and influence are the immediate precursor of its annihilation?—Rev. 18:7, 8; 2 Thess. 2:8.

Do you know that "'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wish'd?"—Rev. 18:20.