



**QUESTIONS, ANSWERS**  
**AND REMARKS**  
**on the**  
**OLD TESTAMENT**  
**By**  
**DANIEL SOMMER**

## EXPLANATION

We think it necessary to give a brief word of explanation concerning the readability of the volume you now hold. The reader will note that a great deal of the copy in this book is far below par. Some is almost closed in, while other of it is far too heavy or open. Indeed, very little of it will compare with good printing by today's standards. The reasons for this are several.

The copy is reproduced from the original printing by lithography. This necessitated "shooting" the original copy and making photographic negatives from which offset plates were made. To obtain clear, readable copy by this method of printing, the copy from which the negatives are made must be good black or red copy on white background. The book is a reproduction of many copies of the old American Christian Review which no longer is printed. The newsprint on which the original was printed had become brown with age, so much so that it was virtually impossible to get copy good enough to reproduce at all. Too, the original printing was an inferior job by today's standards--some copy was extremely heavy with too much ink, while other of it was so light and washed out that it was impossible to pick up clear image. As a consequence, most of the copy in this book is far below standard.

The reader will note also that some copy runs "up-hill," and some "down-hill." This could not be avoided if the right and left hand margins were to be kept any where near straight on the page. We felt this to be more important than the lines running exactly straight across the page. We therefore straightened the margins and let the lines run where they would.

The deficiencies in mechanics of the publication is the reason the excellent material can be placed on the market for the low price advertized. New copy could have been made and an attractive book put into the hands of the readers, (the material is certainly worth that treatment) but of course the book would have cost more than twice the present advertized price.

It is excellent material that will aid greatly the Bible student in acquiring a fuller appreciation of the principles of righteousness revealed in the Old Testament.

Published by  
THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN COMPANY  
P.O. Box 470 -- Lufkin, Texas

**CLICK NAME OF BOOK TO GO TO COMMENTS**

**GENESIS  
EXODUS  
LEVITICUS  
NUMBERS  
DEUTERONOMY  
JOSHUA  
JUDGES  
RUTH  
I SAMUEL  
II SAMUEL  
I KINGS  
II KINGS  
I CHRONICLES  
II CHRONICLES  
EZRA  
NEHEMIAH  
ESTER  
JOB  
PSALMS  
PROVERBS**

**ECCLESIASTES  
SONG OF SOLOMON  
ISAIAH  
JEREMIAH  
LAMENTATIONS  
EZEKIEL  
DANIEL  
HOSEA  
JOEL  
AMOS  
OBADIAH  
JONAH  
MICAH  
NAHUM  
HABAKKUK  
ZEPHANIAH  
HAGGAI  
ZECHARIAH  
MALACHI**

**QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND REMARKS  
ON THE OLD TESTAMENT  
By Daniel Sommer**

Prefatory Notes:--"The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." "As for God, his way is perfect: the word of the Lord is tried: he is a buckler to all that trust him." "For the word of the Lord is right; and all his works are done in truth."

These statements of the psalmist David, with all else recorded in the Old Testament, Paul says in Rom. 15:4, were written for our learning. This being true we should all permit such statements to teach us that the Divine Volume we now begin to investigate is perfect in thought and expression of thought. There may be defects in translations we use, but when holy men spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit they set forth God's truth in human language chosen with Divine precision.

The volume we are about to begin investigating is commonly called The Bible. The word Bible is from the Greek language and means "book". The Bible is therefore simply The book. The Greek word for Bible is, in plural form, twice found in Rev. 20:12, applied to the entire volume of Sacred Writings because applied to "the books" by which mankind will be finally judged.

The Bible is divided into two departments, commonly called Old Testament and New Testament. The Old Testament was first written in the Hebrew language; the New Testament was, with possible exception of Matthew's record, first written in the Greek language. From those languages many translations have at various times been made into many different languages.

The Old and New Testaments are sometimes called the Old and New Covenant Scriptures. A testament means a will expressed, or an expression of will. A covenant means an agreement. The Old Testament law or will was presented to the Jewish nation, formerly called Israelites, for acceptance. When the Jews accepted that will they entered into covenant relation with God. The New Testament is presented to both Jews and Gentiles under the Gospel Age for accept-ante, and all who accept it wholeheartedly enter into covenant relation with God.

Teaching set forth in both Old Testament and New consists chiefly of history, law and prophecy. In order to understand law or doctrine of the Bible we must first understand history as found in the Bible. Then in order to understand Bible prophecy we must understand both Bible history and doctrine. This is the order of teaching found in both Testaments. History comes first, then law or doctrine, and then prophecy. This order must be observed by all who would study the Bible understandingly. To study prophecy, or even law, while ignorant of history found in the Bible will result in confusion. All erroneous views, of either Bible doctrine or prophecy, are, chiefly, result of ignorance concerning Divine history. Those who understand what is set forth in Divine history--written by Inspired men or endorsed by them--are thereby enabled to understand what Divine law means and even what it must mean. Then those who understand both history and law found in the Bible can, as a rule, determine what Divine prophecy means, and, in many instances, what it must mean. Divine history so restricts Divine law and prophecy that the Divinely intended meaning is easily made evident to those who know what Divine history sets forth.

Old Testament Scriptures consist of 39 distinct documents, commonly called books. Seventeen are history, 5 are poetic, and 17 are prophetic. The first of the historic documents incorporates law given to the patriarchs--those servants of God who lived before the Jewish law was given. The next four documents incorporate the law God gave the Jews. All other his-torte documents mostly consist of records of God's dealings with Jews and of their conduct toward him. The poetic books set forth some history and certain repetitions of law. One is somewhat prophetic, and all of them chiefly consist of descriptions of human and Divine attributes made manifest through outworkings of God's law among mankind. The prophetic books are chiefly poetic in style, but their distinguishing marks consist of prophecies concerning Jews and all other ancient nations in regard to temporal affairs, also prophecies concerning Christ, the Gospel Age, the Millennium, and of final destiny of both righteous and wicked.

The New Testament consists, first, of five historic works, which incorporate some of Christ's law with certain prophecies, and then consists of 22 epistles or letters which incorporate some history, much of Christ's law, and most of the New Testament prophecies. The last book of the New Testament is not commonly classed with the epistles, yet is evidently a letter addressed to seven churches in Asia. It is a letter which chiefly consists of prophecy.

In causing the Bible to be so given and arranged in book form, that most of its history comes first, that most of its law comes next, and that most of its prophecy comes last, God has shown special benevolence by regarding the constitution of the human mind in its power to learn. Prophecies of the Bible are more difficult to be understood than are the laws, and then laws of the Bible are more difficult to be understood than is history therein found. Therefore what is easiest comes first; what is more difficult comes next; and what is most difficult comes last. But as neither prophecies nor even laws of the Bible can be understood without history therein recorded, it is evident Divine benevolence is further manifest in giving history as the first part of both Old Testament and New. Divine history is not only the easiest part of the Bible to be understood, but it is most important because it is necessary for mankind in order that they understand all other parts of the Bible. No one can possibly understand either laws or prophecies of the Bible who does not first understand its history, and all errors mankind have made in regard to both Bible law and prophecy are the outgrowth of ignorance in regard to Bible history as given within records of the Bible itself--history written by Inspiration or, at least, endorsed by Inspiration.

Considered as a volume the Bible is found to be the written revelation of God to man, and of man to man, It was intended to reveal God to mankind, and mankind to themselves, so as to bring them into willing obedience to the Divine will. Therefore it is a religious rather than either a scientific or political revelation. Yet when either scientists or statesmen reach the right conclusion they are always with the Bible. Mankind are right religiously, morally, socially, domestically, scientifically, politically, and even financially, when they are in harmony with the Bible; and they are wrong in all those particulars when they differ from the Bible. As an illustration of this it may be stated that when scientists did not know the blood of all animals is their life, and did not know this material world is round and revolves in space, they held views contrary to the Bible on those subjects. But when they learned the blood of all animals is their life, also that this world is round and revolves in space, then they were in harmony with the Bible. From these conclusions they will not need to change because they are right. But scientists might have reached such conclusions much sooner if they had only read Gen. 9:4, Lev. 17:11-14 and Deut. 12:23 on the blood question; and had

they read Job 38:13, 14 on the earth's motion, and had they read Isa. 40:22 in regard to its shape, as those scriptures are found in the Common Version of the Sacred Text. As another illustration, it may be stated that while scientists had not concluded the earth was for a period covered with water they were not in harmony with the Bible, but when they reached this conclusion they were in accord with what the first chapter of the Bible says on this subject. These several statements, taken separately or together, indicate that in every instance that the Bible has mentioned natural law it has stated a fact in advance of all scientific conclusions thereon. "As for God, his way is perfect: the word of the Lord is tried: he is a buckler to all those that trust in him" (Psa. 18: 30).

Now I wish to speak of the Inspiration by which the Bible comes to us. There are three views of Divine inspiration:--The first and highest view is that holy men of God spoke and wrote divinely chosen words as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; the second and lower view is that holy men were given Divine thoughts but selected their own words in expressing them; the last and lowest view is that all men who do anything good or great are Divinely inspired so to do. This last view is nothing less than infidelity concerning the doctrine of Divine inspiration as set forth in the Bible, for it ignores most, if not all, that is Divinely declared on the subject. The second or middle view of Inspiration is contrary to Scripture and leads to infidelity. There is abundant evidence that Inspired men wrote words of prophecy when they did not understand their meaning. Thus, instead of ideas being Inspired without words, it seems at least up some instances words were Inspired without ideas. That is to say, in some instances, words were given to men by the Holy Spirit, but it was not revealed to them what those words meant. As a notable instance take the case of the Apostle Peter when, on the day of Pentecost mentioned in Acts 2, he said the Divine promise was "to them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord\_ our God shall call." In light of what Acts 10 reveals, no one can believe Peter understood what was meant by the words he used in Acts 2:39. This conclusion is further confirmed by the fact that Inspired men sometimes spoke languages they had never learned. In such instances they could not possibly select words in which to express their ideas. Finally Paul says, of things given of God, "which things also we speak, not in words man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth" (1 Cor. 2:1-3). Some imagine that, to the conclusion just stated, they find objection in the fact that Inspired men did not always express themselves in the same words. Such imagination borders on the frivolous, for it assumes the Holy Spirit could not express the same truth in different words as occasion might require.

What I have thus far submitted on this subject is not intended to convey the idea that all words in the Bible--even in the original text---were inspired by, the Holy Spirit. Many of those words were not inspired. For instance, Solomon said he "sought to find but acceptable words" (Eccl. 12:10). This shows his writings were not verbally inspired. Besides, there's no evidence the books of Kings and Chronicles were written by inspired men. But they are records that were kept, specially the Chronicles, even as court records are now kept in any civilized country. Yet the fact that the entire Old Testament existed in the Hebrew language when Christ was on earth, and the fact that he endorsed it as a record, without criticism, shows it was endorsed by Inspiration. This shows that, as certainly as that Christ is the Son of God, the Old Testament is correct in history, law and prophecy. But even this endorsement does not mean we shall find no discrepancies--apparent errors--in our English translations. It simply means the books, as they existed in the Hebrew Text when Christ was on earth, were endorsed by him, and thus were endorsed by Inspiration. When we come to the New Testament we find Paul disclaims Inspiration for certain of his writings. Only 2 verses of 1 Cor. 7 does he attribute to the Lord; all the rest he declares were written by permission, or

according to his own judgment as a Christian (1 Cor. 7, 10, 11).

Some people speak doubtfully concerning the Bible because it was long in keeping of the Roman Catholic Church. They seem to fear it might not have been all preserved, or might, in some way, have been changed. In regard to such doubts I first state they have never troubled me, for I rely on David's statement in Psa. 12, "The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth purified seven times." Then adds, "Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever." Such assurance leads me to believe God has kept his word from being corrupted. Besides, I recollect the prophet Daniel informs us he was safe in a den of lions, and his three friends were safe in a fiery furnace. This leads me to believe the Bible was safe even in the hands of Roman Catholics. But the Jews preserved the Old Testament text in its integrity, and Greek Catholics have taken care of the whole Bible. Therefore we're not indebted to Roman Catholics as the only custodians of the Divine records.

As a further remark on Inspiration I mention that some seem in doubt about the New Testament because of what infidels say concerning different manuscripts which were originally made, and from which those were selected which were decided on as constituting the New Testament. But such doubt is overwhelmed by the fact that a certain heathen emperor, Diocletian, proclaimed emperor of Rome, A.D. 284 was, in the year 303, induced to begin persecution against Christians and their sacred writings. This resulted in the most learned men among Christians carefully examining all manuscripts in order to determine which bore the marks of Inspiration. No one was willing to die rather than give up documents not inspired of God, but many were willing to die rather than give up even one document Divinely inspired. Therefore it may not be too much to say the Inspiration of every book of the New Testament was decided on and sealed by the life's blood of a thousand martyrs. Moreover, that occurred when testimony was within reach by which Inspiration, or its lack, could be proved by tracing documents concerning Christ and his Gospel to their authors. In light of such historic facts there is no reason for doubt on the part of those who wish to believe the New Testament, nor is there reason for criticism on the part of skeptics. Thus it was that persecution resulted in separation of spurious documents from the genuine, and David's address to God in Psa. 76:10 was fulfilled, "Surely the wrath of man shall praise Thee: the remainder of wrath shalt Thou restrain."

With truth of remarks I have thus far made impressed on all our minds, I trust we are prepared to begin the most important investigation in which it is possible for us to engage. We should all be filled with deepest humility and highest reverence of which we're capable. As we enter our investigation we should regard ourselves within hearing distance of God, and be ready to learn all he has said. All curiosity, and disposition to reach after things not revealed, should be banished from our minds and, as nearly as possible, we should feel as Moses must have felt when God said to him by an angel, "Put thy shoes off thy feet, for the place where thou standest is holy ground." Later God instructed Moses to write thus: "The secret things belong to the Lord our God: but those things revealed belong to us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law." What I have just repeated is in Deut. 29:29, and in 5:22 of that same book we find this: "These words the Lord spake to all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more." These last words, "and he added no more", show God intended the Jews to stop where he stopped. God desired what he said should be revered and his silence be respected. In Deut. 4:2 God said, "Ye shall not add to the word I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it." In harmony with this

Solomon wrote, in Prov. 30: 6, "Add thou not unto his words lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."

One other remark, with certain explanations, I wish to make. Bear in mind, reader, that I am not your teacher. We are as a company of learners or disciples of Christ and he is our Teacher. I am supposed to be an advanced pupil in Christ's school, and as such I am to help you through the Bible, his book. The Old Testament referred to him and was made in view of him, and the New Testament came from him. He is the central figure in whom the two Testaments meet. He is Fulfiller and Endorser of the Old Testament, and Author of the New. If, as an advanced pupil in His school, I can show you what our Divine Teacher has fulfilled, endorsed, commanded, promised, threatened, or has in any manner said, then my work will be done. And though I do not request you to forget me, yet I earnestly entreat you will never quote me on any religious question, If I show you what the Scriptures say on a subject, then say what that scripture says, any part of the age, lasting Gospel which is God's power to save. We cannot re-create history by fantastic use of historic terms. Nominal attempt to do so is based on traditional error of Romish origin by men who came in after Paul's departure. The divinely appointed Eldership ended soon after Paul's departure. "Faithful men" and women constitute the sum total of Christian personnel on earth today, regardless of what else religious parlance may call them.

Either specifically or in principle, I trust I have covered our brother's questions. Are there other questions?

## **QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND REMARKS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT By Daniel Sommer**

**Genesis, chapter 1**--A statement of creation of the heavens and the earth, also of origin of animal and vegetable kingdoms, likewise of origin of sun, moon and stars. Latter part of the chapter mentions man, of dominion and first command God gave him, also of what God ordained to, be his food, and food for beasts, fowls and creeping things. Then is found God's estimate of his works. The chapter ends with mention of the sixth day.

Is there any mention in this account of Creation of origin of the waters and of the atmosphere? No, but Exo. 20:11 informs on this subject.

What does "firmament" mean in this chapter? Marginal reading of the text indicates the Hebrew word here translated "firmament" means "expansion".

Are marginal readings always reliable? No; but, as the Old Testament was first written in Hebrew language "Heb." is sometimes placed before a marginal reading, of the O.T. Then the reading is generally reliable because it gives one of the first meanings of the Hebrew word it is intended to explain. And, as the New Testament was first written in Greek, "Gr." is sometimes placed before a marginal reading in the N.T. Then such reading as generally reliable because it gives one of the first meanings of the Greek word intended to be thereby explained. The words "that is" are sometimes placed before a marginal reading in both Old and New Testaments; then the reading is generally reliable. But when "or" is found before



a reading, it is seldom or never reliable but merely a human opinion.

What should we say to those who suppose the earth was created millions of years before the period mentioned as "the first day"? Exo. 20:11 forbids such supposition. Besides, those who would study the Bible with reverence should avoid suppositions, but confine themselves to limitations of Divine testimony.

What did God call the "firmament" or expansion he had made? He called it "heaven".

Do we find evidence He made more than one such expansion? Chap. 2:1-4 indicates He did, for there we find the word "heavens". Besides, the Hebrew text of Gen. 1:1 authorizes the plural form "heavens" and certain later translations so give it. Then 2 Cor. 12 mentions the 3rd "heaven", and calls it "paradise". Thus there are at least three expansions or heavens, the 1st is just above the earth and in which fowls fly (see v. 20). The 3rd is paradise; but what the 2nd is called we are not informed. We should read Deut. 29: 29 and refuse to speculate.

How many evidences in this chapter that "day", herein found, means what we now mean by that word? There are several. First it is said God called the light "day" and the darkness "night". Next it is said of 6 days, in succession, that each consisted of "evening and morning". All this is as we designate such periods now. If we count from noon one day 'til noon the next, with the night intervening, such period will be a day.

But is there not another reason for regarding "day": in the sense we now use it, given in what is here said about "lights" God made? Yes, it is said He made "lights" to divide day from night, and that they should be for signs and seasons, days and years; also that He made "two great lights":--one to rule the day, the other to rule the night. Now look at Gen. 2:2, 3, and can we not here find another reason for believing "day" means the same, when used in regard to Creation, that it means now? We find "the seventh day" in those verses. And is not the 7th day mentioned in Jewish law, and its length given as length of any other day? It is there mentioned and its length there indicated. Then as the week is a divinely ordained and designated-period of time, and its length is given in Jewish law as consisting of 7 literal days of equal length, what must be our conclusion in regard to the first week of this world's history? That it was just as long as every other week has since been, and each day of that first week was as long as every other day has since been, excepting the one day mentioned in Josh. 10:12-14. Thus we find in discrimination between "day and night", the calling of the light period "day" and the darkness "night", and in each of six statements here given concerning "evening and morning", and in what is said about the "two great lights", and, finally, in what is said about "the seventh day" --we find in all these taken together, not fewer than 10 evidences that "day" when used in regard to the creative and formative period of this world's history meant the same that is now commonly meant by that word. In addition we should bear in mind this is what "day" means throughout the Bible when nothing different is indicated in the text. But in Gen. 2:4 and other passages "day" is clearly used as meaning a period of time more than one common day, and this is evident by the connection.

What shall we say of so-called scientists who suppose at least each of the first three days mentioned in this chapter meant a period of a million years or more? We should say they ought not to charge their Creator with the disorder and incongruity of making the first week consist of seven days, three of which separately consisted of a million years or more while the other four consisted severally of 24 hours each.

But what should we say in opposition to the "gradual deposit theory", which some have supposed in order to explain existence of trunks of trees in the earth, sometimes 100 feet or more below the surface? We should tell them existence of those trees confutes the "gradual deposit theory", specially when we consider some of the mentioned trees are in near or about perpendicular position. Trunks of trees could not have resisted ravages of the atmosphere through hundreds of years, to say nothing of thousands or millions, while deposits were being gradually formed so as to cover them. Moreover, in Arctic regions animals from much warmer climate have been found incased in ice with undigested food in their stomachs. Such fact indicates they were thrust suddenly from their native region to the ice-bound region. Same indication is certain concerning every tree found in the earth. Deposit of earth which covered such tree must have been suddenly made.

But what should we answer if asked when such sudden changes were made? We should refer to the great flood mentioned in Gen. 6, 7, 8 chapters. Waters then prevailed on the earth 150 days, which gave time enuf to work all the wonders with which scientists are not astonished, at least, so far as deposits and encasements of earth or stone are concerned, but which are not explained by volcanic eruptions or earthquakes.

What should we answer the one who says if God made the moon to rule the night, why is it that part of the time there is no moon for us and we are left in darkness? We should answer that God did not propose to make either sun or moon that would rule with same power at all times in the same place.

But what of the criticism that there is no light independent of the sun, and thus that Moses' statement that there was light before the sun was made, is erroneous? It is like all other criticisms by skeptics. The Creator, who was able to bring into existence such a world as this, could create light in particles and afterward concentrate those particles into one or more great light-bearers. He understands his own business and is able to manage it exactly aright. Besides, there are among scientists accounts of discovery of light as an independent substance.

What did God do for man when he created him more than he did for lower orders of creation? He made man in His own image and, as chap 2:7 states, he "breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life." (And what else?) God gave him dominion over all lower orders of creation, even over the earth, which he was commanded to subdue.

But did God give man anything when He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life? By reading Zech. 12:1 we may learn it is implied God gave man his "spirit". Yes, and the mentioned verse confutes the doctrine that man is entirely material, or nothing more than a material body, for it shows the spirit of man is distinct formation within him. God declares of himself that he is the one who stretches forth the heavens, lays the foundation of the earth and forms "the spirit of man within him."

But what do "us" and "our" mean in Gen. 1:26? Those words imply some one else was present when God made man. (Who was that one?) John 1:1-3, 14 show the one present in Creation with Jehovah is the Word of God, revealed in the New Testament as God's Son.

Was God pleased with his creative and formative work? He was:--pronounced it good, and very good.

What ought we to answer those who wish explanation of v. 7 about dividing of the waters under the heavens from those above the heavens, and inquire whether waters above the heavens are still there? In answer it should be stated a certain uninspired writer, who has published much on the subject, says those waters that were above the heavens all came down at time of the flood; but a certain Inspired writer named David said there were "waters above the heavens" in his day (see Psa. 148:4). Moreover, David speaks of waters above "the heavens", which means not only above one open firmament but above two or more. Then, as "paradise" is called "the third heaven" (2 Cor. 12), we are without Divine information on this subject except as "water" is mentioned in Luke 16:24. But as this does not concern our welfare we should read Deut. 29:29 and be satisfied.

What shall we say of so-called "scientists" who say this earth was originally a burning mass which revolved in space and from which sun, moon and stars were thrown off? We should ask who furnished material for such a mass? who set it afire? who caused it to revolve? who ordered it to cool? If they fail to answer in regard to what they presume and assume we are justified in ignoring their theories.

But what should we answer those who conclude the earth was peopled before Adam and Eve were brought into existence, and base their conclusion on the word "replenish" in v. 28 of this chapter? We should inform them that Hebrew scholars unite in declaring the word translated "replenish" means "to fill, make full, fill with", and is the same word that is translated "fill" in v. 22. By itself considered that word doesn't mean "replenish" in sense of re-fill. Translators of the Sacred Text have not always been careful to use most appropriate words to set forth ideas they have received in studying the original text, and readers have not always been careful to use common sense and common honesty in considering what a translation of the Sacred Text sets before them. Both translators and readers of God's Word should always consider Psa. 12:6, 7.

**Genesis, chapter 2** mentions God's work in creative and formative periods, then states He planted a garden for man, placed him therein, gave him two commands, gave him privilege of naming every living creature on earth, made him a helpmeet, states what Adam said concerning her, and ends with statement of condition of Adam and his helpmeet.

Does not the declaration "on the seventh day God ended his work" imply he did some work that day? it might thus imply were it not for connection in which it is found. Next verse says "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it because in it he had rested from all his work." Then Exo. 20:11 states "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day."

What is set forth in next paragraph? Reference is made to what is recorded in the previous chapter; also that no rain had fallen on earth but it was watered by a mist; finally mention is made that when God formed man's body of the dust He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man then became a living soul.

How many commands does this chapter inform us God gave Adam in the garden of Eden? Two. One affirmative, the other negative. In one He told what he should do, in the other what he should not do.

Who named the lower orders of creation? Adam.

When Eve was brought to Adam did he recognize her relationship to him? He did.

Is language of Adam concerning his wife endorsed by the Savior? It is in Mat. 19:5, 6.

What should then be said of those who pretend to believe in Christ as God's Son but reject the story of Adam and Eve as set forth in this chapter? We may say they are infidels but have not reason enough to know their condition. For if Christ endorsed the story recorded concerning Adam and Eve, and that story be untrue, then He endorsed a falsehood. But if He endorsed a falsehood then his pretension to Divinity is proved false. Nevertheless it may be said that to declare all those infidels who reject a record Christ endorsed would be unjust reproach on their faith and unmerited compliment on their reasoning.

**Genesis, chapter 3** records the story of the first sin committed on earth, and its results in separating man from God, dooming him to a life of toil and banishing him from the garden of Eden.

Is the serpent really more cunning than any other of the lower orders of creation, or was it because the devil entered the serpent that it was very cunning? It is here said the serpent was more subtle "than any beast of the field", and the Savior implied the same when he commanded his disciples to be 'wise as serpents' (Mat. 10:16).

Why is the serpent, or snake, here represented as talking to Eve and deceiving her, if the devil did the talking and deceiving? Rom. 6:19 informs us. It was thus written in order to use accommodative language. Rev. 12:9 reveals the devil is called "that old serpent," and this should satisfy us.

Why did Eve sin? Because she was deceived. Was Adam deceived? Paul says he was not. Where does he say that? I Tim. 2:14.

Why then did Adam sin? Through power of association. He deliberately decided to become subject to death forsake of his wife.

Did Christ as the second Adam do the same? In a certain sense He did. He gave up himself to die for the Church, which is called the bride, the Lamb's wife.

What should we say of those who explain wickedness of Jews and others by stating they were depraved? Such doctrine is taught, and when we hear it we should refer to the case of Adam and Eve. Seems from the record they sinned the first opportunity they had, and certainly no one has done worse since. But Eve sinned by reason of deception, while Adam sinned because of association with Eve; and on account of influence of deception and association their descendants generally have sinned ever since.

What shall we say of the statement in v. 8 that when our first parents heard the voice of God, when he walked in the garden, they hid themselves from his presence? It is implied they tried to hide themselves: and probably thought they were hidden.

But the statement says they "hid themselves", and what shall we say of it? Rom.6:19 helps us. The expression is accommodative. Thus with the statement of Josh. 10:13 concerning the sun standing still in days of Joshua.

Did the earth bring forth thorns and thistles before our first, parents sinned? Vs. 17, 18 imply it did not but that, on account of man's sin, the earth was cursed so it should bring forth thorns and thistles.

What should we say of those who declare man is entirely material--soul, body and spirit--and refer to Rom. 3:19 as proof? We should remind them Gen. 2:7 teaches man also consists of God's breath, and that Zeph. 12:1 declares God forms the spirit of man within him; which scriptures taken together, and even separately, show man is not entirely dust, nor entirely material in any other sense.

Why did God send Adam and Eve out of the garden of Eden? To prevent them from eating of the Tree of Life and living forever in their fallen condition, for then they could not have been happy, and they would have been beyond redemption.

What became of the garden of Eden? No one can tell, and Deut. 29:29 should enable us to rest content without knowing. Moreover, in 1 Sam. 6:19 is dreadful warning against trying to look into God's secret things.

**Genesis, chapter 4**, gives account of Adam and Eve as husband and wife, also as parents of two sons, and of conduct of those sons; likewise an account of the first murder and murderer, of the first man who had two wives, and of the second murderer. The chapter ends with statement of Adam's 3rd son, then of his 1st grandson, closing with declaration that men then began to call on the name of the Lord.

What does "knew" mean in v. 1 of this chapter? Refers to fleshly relationship of Adam and Eve as husband and wife.

What evidence in the Bible that God told Cain and Abel to bring offerings to Him? Paul says in Heb. 11: 4 that Abel made his offering by faith; and in Rom., 19:17 that same apostle declares faith comes by the word of God. This shows God must have given instructions to Abel on the subject; and, as he wasn't partial, he must have given to Cain the same instructions.

What was character of Cain's sin? It was doctrinal, for it was in regard to worship. Instead of bringing a lamb he ventured to bring something of the vegetable kingdom. Such offering is, in Lev. 2:14, called a meat offering, and in Lev. 7:12 is called a thanksgiving". But, because Cain's offering was different from what God required it was rejected; and this should warn all who read the Bible, in regard to departures from what God has commanded.

What does v. 7 teach? That God was not partial but that if Cain had done "well" he would have been accepted. Teaches also that Cain had some advantages over his brother which, in absence of evidence to the contrary, must have been based on the birthright advantage so prominent in later history of the Patriarchal age. .

Did Cain dislike his brother, and, if so, why? The record implies he even hated him. And, as no reason is given for his hatred, we are left to judge it was outgrowth of his own disobedience, and the fact that his brother was a better man than himself.

Does such disposition still show itself among mankind? It has shown itself in all ages, and is still in many persons. Evil disposed persons often hate those who are good.

Did Cain think his killing Abel was a secret? Verse 9 implies he thought it was not known to God.

Why did God decide to avenge Cain's death "seven-fold" if anyone slew him? No reason is given except on the principle mentioned in Prov. 24:17,18 and in last part of 1 John 5:16. God placed severe punishment on Cain, and while God's punishment was being inflicted he did not intend any other person should add to it. John did not say anyone should pray for a brother who had so sinned that God's judgment unto physical death was brought on him. Implication in case of Cain, and in case of the one mentioned in 1 John 5:16, is to this effect:-  
-When one was suffering God's special judgment let not anyone else add to it, nor try to take from it.

What should we say to those who ask where Cain got his wife? We should inquire where Adam's 3rd son, Seth, got his will. Gen. 5:4 tells us "daughters" as well as "sons" were born to Adam, and there was no other woman for either Cain or Seth to take for his wife except one of his sisters. Such marriage was permitted then but was condemned by the Jewish law (Deut. 27:22), and would be very wrong now.

What does v. 19 of this chapter set forth? Tells of a man named Lamech who took to himself two wives.

Was Lamech a good man? No, he committed murder.

Did he try to console himself in regard to his murder, and, if so, how? Hew did; and by referring to God's sentence in Cain's behalf he tried to think he was safe from human vengeance.

**In Genesis, chapter 5** we find the genealogy, or a statement of the generations, of mankind, from Adam to Noah.

How many generations does this chapter mention? Including Adam and Noah there were 10; between Adam and Noah were 8.

Are the ages of all the men mentioned in this chapter so given that the entire number of years mankind were on earth before the Flood can be definitely counted? Yes, and the sum of them is 1656.

What shall we then say concerning the theory that mankind and animals have existed on earth millions of years, or that there was a human race on earth before Adam? We should pronounce such theory a mere fancy.

But what should we say of bones of giant animals and men that have been discovered? We should say the Bible accounts for them in what it says of man and animals. See Gen. 6:4, Job 40:15-24; 41:1-34.

**In Genesis, chapter 6,** is account of conduct of mankind as they began to multiply, of their

wickedness, of God's purpose to overthrow them with a flood of waters, and of what he said to Noah on the subject.

Who were "the sons of God" and who were "the daughters of men" mentioned in first part of this chapter? According to history thus far given, we are confined in thought to descendants of Seth and of Cain; the former being the "sons of God" and the latter being "the daughters of men".

What is meant by v. 3 which speaks of God's Spirit not always striving with man? Means what it says.

How did God's Spirit strive with people before the Flood? Just as He has always done since then, and as he did on the day of Pentecost mentioned in Acts 2, namely, through the Word of Truth. According to 2 Peter 2:5, Noah was a preacher of righteousness and: as such, the Spirit of God did strive, through him, with wicked people to whom he preached. Besides, God's forbearance was tested by disobedience of wicked people before the Flood, and in that sense also God's Spirit did strive with them.

What is meant by the expression "for that he also is flesh"? Simply that man, being encompassed in flesh, is not of such worth or dignity that God's Spirit should constantly strive with him. Zech. 12:1 teaches man has a "spirit" formed "within him"; nevertheless as he is not all spirit, but "he also is flesh", therefore God decided not to strive with him "always". As further evidence in regard to God's method of striving see Neh. 9:30.

What is meant by "his days shall be a hundred and twenty years"? As the date when God said his Spirit should not always strive with man is not indicated, it is evident we should not think it must have been after Noah was 500 years old. On the contrary, we should consider God made that statement sometime in course Of the period mentioned in verses 1, 2 of this chapter, and, therefore, previous to completion of Noah's 500th year, This leaves us free to conclude God intended to suffer mankind to live on earth 120 years from the time he rendered his decision not to strive always with them. There is no evidence God expressly said to Noah, nor to any other earthly being, what is set forth in v. 3, nor that verses 3, 13 refer to the same date.

What about giants that were born in those days? Simply that marriage of opposites tended, according to certain laws of nature, to produce giants. The sons of God and the daughters of men were probably opposites in temperament, and, by coming together in marriage relation, they produced what are called "mighty men, men of renown." All extraordinary physical and mental vigor now bestowed by nature is produced on the same principle.

In view of what is said about giants of those days, and families of giants mentioned in Deut. 2, should we be surprised if bones of giant men be now found in the earth? No.

Then, in view of what is said in Job 40:15-24, concerning an animal called "behemoth", should we be surprised if men now find bones of giant animals in the earth? No.

Is there need to suppose a pre-historic age to account for giant men and animals? No.

How long was Noah in building the ark? No evidence on the subject.

What was size of the ark? About 450 feet long, about 75 feet wide, and about 45 feet high. Near size of a present-day trans-Atlantic liner.

Did the Lord tell Noah to take food into the ark for himself and the animals? He did.

**In Genesis, chapter 7**, we are told what God said to Noah in regard to himself, his family, and the animals which should be taken into the ark; also that Noah did what God commanded. Mention is then made of Noah's age when he entered the ark, also of the fact of the Flood, of destruction of life by the Flood, and of length of time the waters prevailed on earth.

Did the Lord tell Noah to take only two of all kinds of animals into the ark? He told him to take two of all beasts called "not clean", but those he called 'clean' he commanded to be taken by 7s, or seven of each kind.

What is meant by distinction of "clean" beasts from those "not clean"? No evidence on the subject except that, according to chap. 8:20, when Noah built his altar to worship God, after the Flood, he took "of every dean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar." This indicates "clean" animals were such as could be used for sacrifice.

How many windows and doors did God command Noah to make in the ark? Only one of each.

What shall we say of modern artists who've drawn pictures of the ark representing it as having many windows? They had no regard for Scripture on the subject when they drew such pictures. Some have supposed the window God commanded Noah to make in or near the top of the ark was a cubit in height but in length extended all around the ark, or all around the top.

What shall we think of this supposition? No testimony on the subject, and human suppositions are of no value.

What is meant by "the fountains of the great deep" being "broken up", and "the windows of heaven" being opened, as mentioned in v. 11? Those two expressions are poetic references to coming of the waters on the earth.

What shall we say to skeptics who say only part of the earth was covered with the Flood? and to those who say sufficient rain could not have fallen in 40 days and nights to cover the highest mountains? We shored refer them to the statement that "the fountains of the great deep" were "broken up", which implies God lifted restrictions he placed on the waters at the time mentioned in job 38:10, 11. Besides, we should remind them God understands his own business, and if he should, at any time, lift all his restrictions on waters of the great deep there would be a flood without rain.

How long did the waters prevail on earth? Verso 24 implies it was five months.

What is meant by the waters prevailing on the earth? It is implied by the record that they covered it entirely without decreasing.



Have there been discoveries in the earth, concerning man, or animals, or vegetation, which may not be reasonably explained by the fact that the waters of the Flood prevailed five months? No.

Does not Gen. 8:5 inform us it was not until in course of the 10th month of the Flood that tops of mountains were again seen? Yes. Then there were about 10 months that the waters prevailed before they subsided sufficiently for tops of mountains to appear.

**Genesis, chapter 8**, mentions that God remembered Noah and all else in the ark that he caused the waters to decrease until they were dried up from the earth; that Noah and all with him went forth from the ark; that Noah built an altar and offered acceptable sacrifices to the Lord that the Lord was pleased with the offerings and promised he would never again destroy the earth with a flood.

What should we answer of a certain so-called scientist should say the "wind" mentioned in v. 1 of this chapter was the first "wind" of which we have account in the Bible? We should refer that one to Gen. 3:8, where we find the Hebrew word translated 'cool' literally means "wind".

How long did the waters recede, after the wind began to blow on them, before the tops of mountains were seen? Five months.

How long after tops of mountains began to be seen, in the 10th month, did Noah wait before he sent out a raven and a dove? Forty days.

How long was Noah in the ark with his family and the animals? One year and 10 days.

What promise did God make man after the Flood? That He would no more curse the ground for his sake; and that while the earth should remain the seasons of the year should not cease as they had been made to cease for a year by the Flood.

What shall we say if confronted by the theory of a so-called scientist that before the Flood the whole earth was of tropical heat? We should state Gen. 8:22 is against, such theory for it declares God said, "While the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease." Such words imply all these had ceased or been suspended during the Flood, at least as far as man's welfare was concerned in them. Therefore such words imply cold as well as heat existed on earth before the Flood. Besides, we should remind that would be scientist that seasons of the year are determined by varied relations of the sun to the earth, and that such relations existed before the Flood as well as afterward.

**In Genesis, chapter 9**, we read of God's blessing on Noah and his sons; of his charge to them; of fear He would place on lower orders of creation; of granting them flesh to eat; of capital punishment for murder and the reason why. We read also of God's covenant with Noah in regard to not bringing another flood, and the token of that covenant. The chapter ends with account of Noah and his family, and how long he lived after the Flood.

Did God give a new law in regard to man's food after the Flood? He did. After the Flood man was permitted to eat animal flesh.

Was he permitted to eat blood? No. God said "flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat."

What does this teach in regard to blood-letting, or lancing, in order to cure or relieve diseases? It teaches that physicians were, generally, guilty of criminal blundering on that subject during the entire time they practiced it.

If physicians had read the Bible with care might they not have learned the blood is the life of the flesh, and thus that they should not, unless perhaps in rare instances, have taken any life out of the flesh in order to keep the life in? Yes: but their confidence in regard to their human learning prevented their reading the Bible on the subject of their science. As a result, even those who had access to God's Word were criminal blunderers, by reason of imitating heathen medical men in regard to this question during more than 2,000 years.

Has same been true of so-called scientists in other departments? Yes; natural scientists remained ignorant of spherical shape of the earth, and of rotary motion of the earth, during thousands of years, simply because they did not read the Bible on the subject.

What should we say of ignorance of the Bible on the part of legislators for human governments? They have blundered, on many occasions, simply because they were ignorant of God's Word, and, by reason of such ignorance, they are always liable to blunder.

Do we find capital punishment mentioned in this chapter? We do, and that it was ordained of God.

On what basis? Because man was made in God's image.

What is meaning of this? That, as man bears his Maker's image, whoever makes a deadly assault of personal vengeance on the life of a fellow mortal, so insults his Maker that he is not fit to live.

Does this prevent men from killing men in obedience to the commands of a civil government in a righteous war? No. To kill in such war is not personal vengeance. In 1 Kings 2:5 distinction is expressed between "the blood of war" and blood shed in time of peace.

What shall we say of those who teach capital punishment originated with the Jewish law and is no longer in force by Divine sanction? They are ignorant of what the Bible teaches on the subject. Capital punishment was Divinely ordained over a thousand years before the Jewish law was given.

Do chronological figures on the margin of the Bible justify such a statement? Not altogether. But those figures are wrong, in that they deny the Israelites were in Egyptian bondage more than 215 years, which is contrary to chap. 15:13 also Acts 7:6.

What sign did God give Noah that He would not again destroy the earth with a flood? The rainbow.

Was there a rainbow before the Flood? There was if the sun ever shone while rain was falling, for the rainbow is a natural result of the sun shining off drops of water in the air.

Did Noah walk before the Lord in a perfect manner after the Flood? Not altogether. He drank wine and became drunk.

What was result of his drunkenness? His son Ham saw him and in some way showed disrespect toward him. As a result the father afterward showed displeasure by cursing Ham's son, Canaan, declaring that a servant of servants he should be to his brethren.

What justice was there in cursing a son because his father had done wrong? None, unless it was to show that for a man to treat his father with disrespect, even when his father does wrong, will bring evil on that man's own children.

What lesson to be learned from the blessing Noah pronounced on his sons who treated him with respect while he was drunk? That it is commendable for children to respect their parents even when those parents do wrong.

**Genesis, chapter 10**, sets forth history concerning origin of certain nations.

What parts of the world did descendants of Noah's son, Japheth, inhabit? Those parts, it is here implied, which are called "isles of the Gentiles".

And what is recorded of descendants of Ham? Egypt was occupied by one of them', and cities of Babylon and Nineveh began to be built by others of their number.

What is said of Shem's descendants? He became father of a man named Arphaxad, and from him, seven generations later, came Abram, father of the Jewish nation through his son Isaac.

**Genesis, chapter 11**, mentions building of the tower of Babel, and the nine generations that arose between Noah and Abram.

How many languages had been given to mankind up to the time mentioned in beginning of this chapter? Only one.

What did men decide to do in a certain land called Shinar? To build a tower that would reach to heaven; to make themselves a name; and to avoid being scattered abroad on earth.

What was the result? God confused their tongues; thus they ceased building the tower, and their efforts to bind themselves together was a failure.

Is there resemblance between the motive which suggested building the tower of Babel and the motive which has, generally if not always, been connected with shaping man-made religious creeds? Yes, all such creeds are outgrowth of desire to establish a humanly arranged method of reaching Heaven; also to make a name and form a human bond of union. Same is in a measure true of certain societies that are not strictly religious.

Does not the account of the tower of Babel teach God was once author of confusion? Yes, as a special judgment, and, in that sense, he is still the author of confusion.

In v. 26 it is said "Terah lived 70 years and begat Abram, Nahor and Haran." Does this

mean Abram was eldest of Terah's sons? No. In Gen.10:21 Japheth is spoken of as "the elder" though Noah's three sons are generally spoken of as "Shem, Ham and Japheth." Then in chap. 48:20 of this book we learn Joseph's younger son was chosen to be placed before his older brother because he should be greater. These facts show the writer of this book sometimes called men by name in order of their importance, and not in order of their ages.

**Genesis chapter 12**, mentions the call of Abram, the Divine promises to him, his obedience to God's commands, his fear for himself and wife when they went into Egypt, and what the result was.

To what, or whom, does the promise to Abram--that in him should all families of earth be blessed--refer? We learn it refers to Christ, by reading Acts 3:25.

How old was Abram when he left Haran and went into Canaan? The record says he was 75 years old.

How can we harmonize the statement which implies Abram's father was but 70 years old when he begat Abram, Nahor and Haran (chap. 11:26) with the explicit declaration he was 205 years old when he died, and still Abram was only 75 years old when his father died? No need to harmonize them if we admit, as we may reasonably do, that Abram was not the eldest of Terah's sons. The first named was not always the first born. Japheth was older than Shem, yet he is last named. This we learn by reading Gen. 5:32, 6:10, 10: 21. Therefore we may, according to style of this historian, admit Abram was youngest of Terah's sons, and thus account for the 50 years which would otherwise be considered a discrepancy. Gen. 48:17-20 gives light on this subject.

What is meant by "the souls" Abram and Lot "had gotten in Haran"? Their servants, as we may judge by reading Gen. 14:14.

Where did Abram build the first altar of which account is given? At or near a place called Sichem.

Who was then in that land? The Canaanite.

Did Abram permit that fact to prevent his building an altar to the Lord? No.

Where did Abram build his next altar? At a mountain east of Bethel

What did Abram do when there was famine in Canaan? Went down into Egypt to sojourn there.

What was his conduct in Egypt? He acted the part of a timid man, and told a lie by telling only a half-truth; also instructed his wife to do the same.

What was the lie? That his wife was his sister. She was his half-sister; but he was afraid to-acknowledge her as his wife lest he should be killed for her sake.

Did God take care of Abram and his wife so that no evil came on either? He did.

How was it Abram could have his half-sister to be his wife, then tell a lie about it, without being rebuked? The law concerning marrying of relatives, and in regard to telling the truth, was not given then as it was in the Jewish law, and "Where no law is there is no transgression", and again, "for until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law" (Rom. 4:15, 5:13). Explains to us what Paul meant in Rom. 7:9. Believers in God thru the Patriarchal age had much more liberty than believers had after the Jewish law was given.

Did believers in God have more liberty during the Jewish age than we have under the Gospel age? In some respects. For instance, the Jew was not regarded as a murderer unless he had actually taken the life of a human being, but in the Gospel age "whoever hateth his brother is a murderer" (1 John 3:15). Shows mankind are responsible according to light they have. Those who lived in the First Religious Age of the world's history were not as responsible as those who lived in the Second Religious Age. Then those who lived in the Second Age were not as responsible as those of the Third or last age, commonly called the Gospel age. Therefore we cannot justly sit in judgment on Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, nor even on the Jews. We have more light than they were permitted to have, thus we are more strictly responsible than they were: See Deut. 27:22 in regard to marrying a half-sister, and Mat. 5:27,28 in regard to adultery.

**Genesis, chapter 13**, records Abram's wealth, his nephew's wealth, of strife between their herdmen, of their peaceable separation, and of God appearing to Abram and renewing His promises.

What did Abram do when he went back to Bethel where he had previously built an altar? Called on the name of the Lord.

Was his nephew Lot with him up to that time? Yes. What caused separation of Lot from Abram? Strife between their herdmen.

Did Abram propose separation and make a fair proposition to Lot in regard to it? He did, and thereby showed himself honorable in business.

Did the Lord appear to Abram after Lot separated front him? He did, and renewed His promises to him, giving further statement thereof than is previously recorded.

When Abram again moved, to Hebron, what did he do? Built an altar to the Lord.

**In Genesis, chapter 14**, is account of war in which Lot was made a captive, of Abram acting the part of a soldier, of being met and blest on his return from victory, and of his sense of honor as shown by refusing reward for what he had done in battle.

In this chapter Abram is called "the Hebrew". What is origin of that name? Supposed to have come from Eber or Heber, mentioned in Gen. 10:24, 25, which means "beyond", and that it was applied to Abram because he came into the land of Canaan from beyond the river Euphrates. But this is only supposition.

When Abram learned certain kings had made war against certain other kings, and that his brother's son Lot with his family had been carried away as captives, what did he do?

Armed his trained servants, 318 men, and went after the captors, made a night attack and drove them off, securing his nephew with his family and other, who had been taken captive with them, likewise the goods that had been taken at the same time.

Did a notable person meet him when he returned from pursuing his enemies? Yes, a being called Melchizidek met him with bread and wine, and that being is also called "the priest of the most high God." What did he do to Abram? Blest him.

And what did Abram do to him? Gave him tithes of all, which means a tenth of all, that he had with him.

Did Abram acknowledge Melchizidek's superiority in giving him tithes, and receiving a blessing from him? He did.

But was not Abram the greatest man before God on earth at that time, at least as far as the Divine record informs us? Yes.

Was not Abram a priest, and was not same true of Lot and every other man who was a true worshipper at that time? Yes.

What mere man, then, was worthy of being called "priest of the most high God"? No one.

Who then was Melchizidek? The Old Testament does not inform us definitely, but what it declares concerning him shows he was more than a man.

What shall we say of the idea that he was one of Noah's sons--the one named Shem? Simply an opinion based on supposition that Shem had come into the land of Canaan, and was king of a city called Salem, and that his name was changed to Melchizidek (which means, king of righteousness); that he was worthy of that characteristic name, and was so much greater than Abram that he was chosen of God to bless him; and that he was worthy to receive tithes of Abram and, last of all, was pre-eminent or chief among priests of the Patriarchal age, and thus worthy to be eared "priest of the most high God". Here are not fewer than 7 suppositions that are necessary to furnish basis for the opinion that the one called Melchizidek in this chapter was Shem.

Did Abram show high sense of honor in refusing reward for what he had done as a soldier? He did, and thus set good example for other commanders in armies to follow.

**Genesis, chapter 15**, informs us that the word of the Lord came to Abram assuring him of a son and of multitudes of descendants; also that the Lord required him to prepare 5 different kinds of animals after a certain manner; and, then, that God made definite revelation to him concerning his descendants.

What is meant by the statement of v. 6 that Abram believed in the Lord and it was counted to him for righteousness? Simply that Abram had no earthly basis for his confidence that he should be father of a great multitude, nevertheless he believed what God said on the subject. Such belief was pure unmingled faith, because all earthly prospects were in the opposite direction.

But when God told Abram he should inherit the land of Canaan, what did he request? He asked whereby he should know he should inherit it.

What did the Lord then require him to do? Prepare 5 different kinds of animals.

Did Abram prepare them for sacrifice, or in the manner required for making a covenant? Jer. 34:18 indicates those animals, at least 3 of them, were prepared by Abram in manner required when a covenant was to be made.

What revelation did God make to Abram about sunset of the same day that he prepared the animals of which the record informs us? That his descendants should be strangers in a land not theirs, and should be afflicted 400 years; also that God would judge the nation that would afflict them.

What is meant by "the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full"? A people called Amorites were then dwelling in Canaan. They were descendants of Noah's grandson, Canaan, as we learn in Gen. 10:15, 16. They had become wicked; but the measure of their wickedness was not filled,--which means Divine forbearance would suffer them to continue longer in their wickedness, and even to become more wicked than they were at the time God spoke to Abram concerning them. But God intended, while the Amorites were filling up the measure of their iniquity, to develop Abram's descendants into a great nation in a strange land, Egypt.

What should we say to those who contend the Israelites were up Egypt only 215 years? We should remind them God said to Abram his descendants should be afflicted in a land not theirs for 400 years; and that Stephen, in his speech recorded in Acts 7th chapter, endorsed what is here recorded in Gen. 15:13. Then we should remind them that in Exo. 12:40, 41 is stated that "the children of Israel"--not Israel and his ancestors, but "the children" of Israel--sojourned in Egypt 430 years, and that history of the children was not given 'til death of their father. This is evident by reading Gen. 47:27-31, for until his death Israel was chief.

But what should we say if confronted by Gal. 3:17, and on basis of that scripture be told the law was given 430 years after giving of the covenant, and that this does not allow 430 years for Israelites in Egypt? We should point out that, according to Gal. 8:17, the law was given 430 years after confirming of the covenant, and not after its giving. Then we should refer to Gen. 49:10 and show Jacob's words to Judah must have referred to Christ; also that those words were spoken the same day Jacob died, and thus are the same day "the sojourning" of his children, without their father, began. Finally, we should refer to Psa. 105:8-12, where confirmation of the promise concerning the land of Canaan is mentioned, and that included the promise concerning descendants, even to Christ.

**Genesis, chapter 16**, tells of Abram's wife endeavoring to assist the Lord in fulfilling His promise to Abram in regard to offspring, and of trouble which resulted.

Did the marriage law, as far as it had been given, in days of Abram, permit a man to have 2 wives at the same time? Yes.

Did Abram's wife Sarai (as then called) wish her husband to take a 2nd wife? She did.

For what purpose? That if the 2nd wife should bear children then she would "be builded

by her", as the Hebrew text expresses the thought she entertained.

To accomplish this end what did she do? Gave her servant maid into her husband's bosom.

What was result? Trouble in the family.

Is it not true that trouble always results from supposing the Lord does not understand His affairs, and that we should help Him by our devices? Certainly.

When Sarai said to Abram, "My wrong be on thee" --what disposition did she show? Common disposition of mankind, to settle blame on someone else; only she was more candid than many have since been, in that she confessed she had done wrong.

What was result of that trouble in Abram's family? His 1st wife mistreated his 2nd wife so seriously that she ran off into a wilderness, where an angel of God found her and told her to go back and submit to her mistress. Then the angel told her that her descendants should be very numerous; that she should bear a son and call his name Ishmael; also what kind of man he should be.

Is there evidence that an angel of God ever before appeared to anyone on earth? No.

What shall we say of the fact that the first appear-once of an angel of God on earth was to a run-away slave? We should consider no human being is beneath God's notice.

What did that servant maid say when she learned God had spoken to her by His angel? She said, "Thou, God seest me".

What use should we make of that saying? We should consider it every day and, if possible, every hour. That saying should be so considered as to keep us from all evil.

**Genesis, chapter 17**, informs us concerning what is commonly called "the covenant of circumcision". The word "covenant" is often used in the record of Abram. What does that word mean? An agreement.

What is difference between a covenant and a will? "Covenant" implies agreement between two or more persons to that which is proposed, while the word "will" means something decided on by one person, but not necessarily accepted by anyone else.

What is difference between a "will" and a "testament"? "Will" refers to decisions of the mind even before they are expressed, while "testament" means expression of those decisions. Thus legal documents use the expression "will and testament".

When was Abram's name changed to Abraham? When he was 99 years old, and when God had told him 4 times he should be father of a great nation. In this 4th instance he was told he should be "father of many nations".

Did Abraham become father of any other nation beside the Israelites? Yes, through descendants of his 2nd and 3rd wives he became father of several nations. This is evident



from Gen. 25.

When was Abraham's 1st wife's name changed from Sarai to Sarah? When God made the definite promise to Abraham that she should bear him a son.

Why did God give Abraham the institution called circumcision? Paul tells us in Rom. 4:11, 12.

What was meaning of circumcision to Abraham and to the Israelites afterward called Jews? It was intended to keep them personally separate from all other nations, and to keep them separate in life from sins of other nations. Thus in Deut. 10:16 Moses commanded Israel to circumcise themselves in their hearts "and be no more stiff-necked". Spiritual circumcision is also spoken of in Jer. 4:4. Then Paul refers to the same in Rom. 2:28, 29.

Are Christians spoken of in Scripture as being circumcised? Yes, in Philip. 3:3 Christians are declared to be of "the circumcision", and in Col. 2:11 obedient believers are declared to be "circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ". The Savior was cut off from this life for us, and we should, on that account, obey Him so we shall be cut off from all sin. This is meaning of circumcision made without hands.

How old was Ishmael when his father circumcised him? Thirteen years. What race descended from Ishmael? The Arabians. Do they circumcise their sons? They do, at age of 13; thus Josephus, greatest of Jewish historians, testifies.

**Genesis, chapter 18**, promises Abraham and his wife should have a son, also states concerning Sodom's wickedness.

Did Abraham ever entertain angels? Yes, 3 at one time, one of whom, in special manner, represented the Lord.

Did he give them anything to eat? Short-cake and veal; "and they did eat".

What outburst of emotion came from Sarah when she heard a son should be born to her in her old age? She laughed.

When Abraham was questioned concerning Sarah's laughing, and she overheard the question, what did she do? She denied it.

Why? She was afraid.

Was that right? No. But it was not as sinful for Sarah as it would be for those under the Gospel age to deny truth, for to her the law concerning truth and telling the truth had not been given as it is set before us. And "where no law is there is no transgression". And "sin is not imputed when there is no law" (Rom. 4:15, 5:13).

Did Sarah's denial of truth annul the truth in that case? No. And thus it has been ever since, and will be 'til time shall end. Falsehood does not annul truth in reality.

When the Lord decided to destroy certain cities, called Sodom and Gomorrah, was He disposed to destroy the righteous with the wicked? No.

Was He willing to spare the city for the sake of even 10 righteous persons? He was. What disposition did Abraham show in pleading with the Lord in regard to Sodom? The very disposition most prominent in the Jew.--endeavoring to secure the best possible terms. Abraham "jewed" the Lord from 50 to 10, in his effort to save Sodom.

What shall we say of v. 21? Did not the Lord know all about Sodom without sending anyone to see about it? Rom., 6:19 is here suggested. Paul said "I speak after the manner of men because of infirmity of your flesh". That is to say, Inspired men sometimes wrote in accommodative manner so as to make the record plain to the ordinary mind. But certain Inspired men wrote as if God does not keep His eye at all times on all events in this life. On the contrary, He is rather represented as chief commander of an army in who has aids to make inquiries, also to express and execute his orders. In Zech. 1:7-11 we learn something on this subject. What is said of angels in the book of Daniel is additional evidence. Thus it: may be God does not concern Himself to look at details of human affairs, but sends His angels to look after them when they're brought to His notice because they are very bad or very good.. At the same time all right and all wrong acts make impressions on the mind or spirit so that when the Lord investigates an individual case He beholds it exactly as it is. Of the Jews He said "the show of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare their sin as Sodom; they hide it not" (Isa. 3:9 ). To a skilled physician many conditions of the human system are evident at first sight, and to the ordinary observer outward effects of fixed diseases are apparent. Same is true in regard to an immoral life. On the same principle we may conclude, specially in light of Isa. 3:9, that every deed, thought, emotion, right or wrong, makes impression on man's spirit and perhaps, on the physical man, which will be apparent to the scrutinizing gaze of the Infinite One, and even to angels. Thus every man is before God a record of all his deeds, thoughts, emotions; also every woman, as seen of God, is a record of all her deeds, thoughts, emotions, in this view of mankind before their Maker we can accept it, as literally true, that God had sent angels to investigate Sodom's condition.

**Genesis chapter 19**, mentions that angels entered Sodom, announced its destruction, and saved Lot, Abraham's nephew, with certain members of his family. The chapter ends with account of gross misconduct by Lot's unmarried daughters.

Did Lot entertain angels that came to Sodom? Yes, he entertained 2 the last night he lived there.

Did he give them anything to eat? He prepared a feast "and they did eat".

What angels did he entertain? Two of those who stopped with Abraham and were sent to investigate Sodom's condition.

Did they find Sodom's wickedness as great as the report indicated? They did, judging from what men of Sodom, old and young, wished to do with the strangers in Lot's house.

Was Lot justified in offering his daughters to those vile men in order to protect the strangers? Certainly not, in light of the Gospel!

How many daughters had Lot? At least 4,--2 were unmarried and 2 were married to men of Sodom.

Were those men who married Lot's daughters disposed to heed his warning to get out, of that city? No; he seemed to them as one that mocked.

Did the angels hasten Lot, his wife and 2 daughters out of Sodom? They did, and told them that, in fleeing to the mountain, they should not look behind.

Was a reason given why they should not look behind? No.

Was punishment threatened for looking behind? No. Why then did God turn Lot's wife to a pillar of salt? No reason given except warning of the Savior in Luke 17:32--"Remember Lot's wife!" Severe judgments God inflicted on the disobedient in the First and Second religious ages of the world were recorded for our learning. This lesson we are taught in Rom. 15:4, and in 1 Cor. 10 we are informed certain judgments inflicted on Israelites in the wilderness happened for ensamples to us, that we should not desire evil things as those did on whom God's wrath was inflicted. In Heb. 2:2 the case of Lot's wife is embraced, for in her case the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and transgression thereof received just recompense. Thus the New Testament informs why Lot's wife was turned to a pillar of salt. To say the least, it was for our warning.

Were Lot's unmarried daughters justified in their treatment of their father and of themselves? Not from a Gospel viewpoint, nor for any other reason we can understand, except reasonable and merciful decision of our Heavenly Father mentioned in Rom. 4:15 and 5:13--"where no law is there is no transgression" and "sin is not imputed when there is no law."

From children born to Lot's 2 unmarried daughters what nations descended? Moabites and Ammonites.

Did those nations treat Israelites kindly when they were passing from Egypt to Canaan? No.

Did God remember their misconduct? He did. In Deut. 23:3-6 special directions were given concerning them, and it was distinctly stated they should never be permitted to enter the congregation of the Lord.

In view of this what shall we say of those who teach all nations about the Israelites had privilege of entering the Jewish kingdom at any time? They err, not knowing the Scriptures.

**Genesis, chapter 20**, gives account of Abraham with his wife among the Philistines, and that he deceived Abimelech, the king, by stating his wife was his sister; also of results.

How often does the record show Abraham said his wife was his sister? Twice; 1st in Gen. 12 was when he was in Egypt; 2nd was when, according to this chapter, he went to Gerar, a town in Philistia.

What reason did he give for so doing, when questioned by the king of Gerar? He said,

"Because I thot, Surely fear of God is not in this place; and they will slay me for my wife's sake."

Was he justified in telling a lie because he was afraid? Not from a Gospel viewpoint. But his conduct illustrates Rom. 7:9. Shows also the Bible is an impartial record. Not arranged on the principle of a funeral sermon,--to tell all the good and pass over all the bad. On the contrary, it tells bad as well as good, even of God's friends. But in regard to all wrongs of good men, in course of the First religious age of the world's history, we should always remember Rom. 4:15 and 5:13.

Did God take care of Sarah? Yes; though Abimelech, king of Gerar, took her, yet she was safe in his hands, as God informed him in a dream she was a man's wife. When he awoke he called Abraham and reproved him; he also reproved Sarah and restored her to her husband.

What lesson should this record of Abraham and Sarah impress on our minds? We should learn God's chosen ones are always safe. At the same time we should always consider those who are now His chosen people are without excuse if they do wrong, for the light offered to all who live under the Gospel is sufficient to keep those Who receive it from all wrong. God anciently reproved kings forsake of His people (Gen. 12:17, 20:3, Psa. 105:14).

**Genesis, chapter 21**, sets forth birth of Isaac, his mother's joy, her impatience with Ishmael at a later date, and what she said to her husband about the bondwoman and her son; also that God told Abraham to do as his wife said. Then account is given of God's care for Hagar and Ishmael, also of a covenant between Abraham and the Philistine king.

What does "Isaac" mean? Laughter.

Why was Abraham's son of promise thus named? The reason is not definitely revealed. In Gen. 17:19 God said to Abraham concerning his promised son, "thou shalt call his name Isaac". But whether this was because Abraham and his wife laughed, when definitely told they should have a son, is not revealed.

What occurred when Isaac was weaned? His father made a feast and his mother saw Ishmael, Abraham's son by the bondwoman, mocking.

What did Sarah say by reason of this? "Cast out this bondwoman and her son; for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac."

What use is made of this in the New Testament? In Gal. 4:30 this is used to show the Old Covenant from Mount Sinai was Divinely intended to give place to the Gospel or New Covenant.

Are there religions denominations that object to this? Near or about all sects object to it in some measure. Paul said, "Cast out the bondwoman and her son!" By this he meant, Let the law given on Mount Sinai in Arabia be ended. But the sects generally hold the 10 Commandments are still in force, and most of them quote David in favor of instrumental music. Thus they show they do not believe the bondwoman and her son should be cast out.

Did God tell Abraham to do as his wife commanded? He did, and to console him in his distress God said, "also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed."

Did God take care of the bondwoman and her son? He sent an angel to give directions to the mother, that her son might live. In due time she took him a wife out of Egypt and, according to Gen. 25:16, he became father of 12 princes.

**Genesis, chapter 22**, records Abraham's offering Isaac on an altar, and what God said to him in regard to having made that offering.

In what land was Isaac born? In Philistia.

Where was Abraham when God told him to offer Isaac for a burnt offering? Judging from silence of the record he was in Philistia, or what was then the land of the Philistines.

Where was the land of Moriah? In what is now called Judea.

On what mountain did the Lord direct Abraham to offer Isaac? The record does not state.

In what mountain was the temple at Jerusalem built? 2 Chron. 3:1 informs us it was built in Mount Moriah.

What shall we say of the statement that the temple was built where Isaac was offered to God? May or may not be true, and we should not try to be wise above what is written.

What about the idea that where Isaac was offered Jesus was crucified? It is in doubt, and we shouldn't try to be more definite than the Bible is.

Did not God know what was in Abraham's heart before he took hold of the knife to slay his son? He did, judging from promises He had made to Abraham thru Isaac.

Why then did He say through an angel "now I know thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thine only son from me"? In view of what the record sways, and omits to say, it is a Divinely enforced conclusion that though God knew what was in Abraham's heart, yet He did not propose to acknowledge it 'til Abraham had gone to the farthest extent in obedience that Divine mercy would permit. This shows fearing God is not determined by thought and feeling alone, but by obedience to the utmost God commands and permits.

Why is Isaac called Abraham's "only sou" in vs. 2, 12? Simply because Ishmael was not counted.

Why was he not counted? No reason definitely given, but the record informs us Ishmael was not the child of promise as Isaac was. The entire arrangement concerning Ishmael was human. Abraham's wife, Sarah, seemed to fear her husband would go to the grave childless, and she thought to secure children through her servant maid; and for that reason gave her to Abraham to be his wife. The result was, Ishmael was born, and gave trouble both before and after his birth. When God made this record in the Old Testament, also in the New, judging by Heb. 11:17, Ishmael was not counted.

What should a record of such facts teach us? We ought to learn if we become unwilling to wait for outworking of God's purposes, and arrange human devices in religion, we are liable to get into trouble and to find in the end, that results accomplished by those devices will not be counted in God's record of our lives. Certainly there was danger in such devices both in Patriarchal and Jewish ages, and Paul says in Rom. 15:4 "whatever things were written aforetime were written for our learning". Therefore all good that may be done by means of human devices in religion is liable to be omitted from God's record except, as we may, in that record, be held accountable for not doing all possible good according to Divine directions.

**Genesis, chapter 23**, records death and burial of Sarah, Abraham's first wife; also records of events in regard to Abraham's purchase of a burying lot.

Did Abraham show good business ability in refusing to bury his dead in the sepulcher of men of Canaan? He did, and the entire account of his purchase of a burying place shows he was a man of clear mind, and high sense of independence and honor among men. He not only bought a burying lot, but paid for it in "current money with the merchant", and even arranged for "trees in the field, and in the borders round about", so they were "made sure".

**Genesis, chapter 24**, gives account of selection of a wife for Isaac from among Abraham's relatives.

Did Abraham show religious devotion in desiring his son should not marry a woman of the Canaanites? He did.

What should we say of his charge to his eldest servant, not to take his son into the land of the Chaldees? It was wise, and manifested religious devotion.

What should we say of what the record states concerning his eldest servant's journey to Mesopotamia and of his success in securing a wife for Isaac? It is a beautiful and touching story, which manifests Divine providence and outworking of human nature. Very few events in life are more touching than behavior of a young woman in leaving her home, whereas he has been watched over with devotion and tenderness from the dawn of her existence, to go to another home of which she knows nothing. But millions have done so, and with fewer favorable prospects than the one who went to become wife of Abraham's son, Isaac.

**Genesis, chapter 25**, tells of life of Abraham after a wife had been found for Isaac, also of Abraham's death and burial, then of Ishmael's descendants, death and burial; latter part of the chapter informs concerning Isaac's family.

Do we find much in the Divine record concerning Abraham after Isaac's marriage is mentioned? Yes, but all very briefly stated. We are, in 10 verses, told he married a woman called Keturah, who bore him 6 sons; also that he gave those sons presents and sent them away, leaving his wealth to Isaac. Then we are informed he died at age of 175 years, and was buried by his sons, Ishmael and Isaac, in the cave he had bought of sons of Heth. Abraham's official work was ended when Isaac married, and arrangements had thereby been made for fulfillment of God's promise to make him a blessing to all nations. When that work was ended he was, perhaps, no more in God's sight than any other good man; therefore the last 35 years of his life are but briefly mentioned.

Is there anything remarkable in what the record sets forth concerning Isaac's children? They were twins, and before their birth God informed their mother the elder should serve the younger. Besides, the children were very different in appearance when born, and showed different dispositions in later years: the elder becoming a "cunning hunter", and the younger a "plain man". God chose the "plain man" to be the official character through whom He would fulfill His promises to Abraham.

Is it still true God chooses "plain" persons to accomplish His will? Seems so in light of 1 Cor. 1:27, 28, and if we may judge from the fact that brilliant persons generally go astray.

What special event in early history of Isaac's 2 sons further showed difference in their dispositions? The "cunning hunter". Esau, sold his birthright to the "plain man", Jacob.

For what sum did he sell it? For a mess of beans or peas cooked in a pot, and some bread. The mess was called "bread and pottage of lentils". Besides, he confirmed the sale with an oath. In so doing he showed he considered present pleasure rather than future good, even as worldly minded people have ever done since; but Jacob denied himself present pleasure for sake of future good, even as God's people have ever since done. By selling his birthright Esau became an illustration of those who have since lived in disobedience to God forsake of worldly pleasure, while Jacob has ever illustrated those who practiced self-denial for sake of God's blessings.

**In Genesis, chapter 26**, is account of Isaac going into the land of the Philistines, of his conduct and success there, of impression on Philistines' minds, of treatment he received at their hands, and of grief Esau inflicted on his parents by marrying 2 women of the land of Canaan.

What was the first revelation, of which the record informs us, that God made to Isaac? He told him not to go down into Egypt, but to dwell in the Philistines' land; then He made to him promises formerly made to Abraham in regard to the multitude of his descendants, the land of Canaan as their inheritance, and that he should bless all nations.

Did Isaac imitate his father in anything about his wife? He did. Because she "was fair to look upon" he said she was his sister, fearing, as Abraham had done, that if he acknowledged her as his wife the men of that place might kill him on account of her.

What shall we say of such conduct? It was less excusable from our viewpoint than was such conduct on the part of Abraham, as Abraham's wife was his half-sister, while Isaac's was not. But as law concerning truth had not then been given, as afterward revealed, both Abraham and Isaac were more excusable than anyone in Bible lands would now be if guilty of such conduct. Rom. 4:15 states "where no law is there is no transgression", and in Rom. 5:13 we read "sin is not imputed where there is no law."

Did God take care of Isaac with his wife and children? He did, and blest him abundantly.

What was result of the great blessings bestowed on Isaac in the land of Philistia. The Philistines envied and annoyed him, and, finally, the king said to him, "Go from us, for thou art mightier than we." Later he went to a place called Beersheba, and the Lord appeared to him, renewing His promises. Then he built an altar and called on the name of the Lord, and

next we learn the Philistine king desired to make a covenant with him because he had seen the Lord was with Isaac.

Did Isaac make a covenant with him? He did.

Is envy an unreasonable disposition? It is. In Prov. 27:4 we read "wrath is cruel, and anger is outrageous; but who is able to stand before envy?" By unselfish devotion to what is good and right it is possible for men and women to become highly esteemed and greatly beloved by some, but they will likely be envied and hated by others. In such instances the extent and degree of goodness manifested will determine extent and degree of envy that will be cherished.

**Genesis, chapter 27** sets before us account of Isaac blessing Jacob and Esau.

What does this chapter reveal concerning disposition of Isaac's wife--Rebekah? She was not willing to permit the Lord to manage all His affairs, but proposed to manage one of them for Him.

What was result? She planned deception of her husband, and caused her son Jacob to become a deceiver. That resulted in Esau hating Jacob and purposing to kill him. As further result Rebekah further deceived Isaac by saying she was weary of life because of the daughters of the land, and that if Jacob would take a wife of them she intimated her life would do her no good. That was probably true, but she misled Isaac in regard to her chief motive in mentioning it: to save Jacob's life.

What shall we say of such conduct on the part of Rebekah? No apology to be made for it except in light of Rom. 4:15, 5:13. Also illustrates in a measure what is recorded in Rom. 7:9, where Paul speaks of himself as a descendant of Jacob, and thus as if he lived when the Law was given. In so doing he speaks as if he had done some things before the Law was given which were not charged against him, and thus he lived, or "was alive". But when the Law was given through Moses the commandment came, thereby sin was made manifest, or "sin revived", and, as a Jew, he was condemned to die, and thereby "died". Such at least is Scriptural explanation of the statement "for I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came sin revived, and I died." This explanation of that statement is in perfect harmony with connection in which it is found, and reveals that we must not measure those who lived in the First religious age of the world's history by the light that was given in the Second age, nor by the light of the Gospel age.

**Genesis, chapter 28**, records account of Jacob's departure from home for a place called Padan-aram, where his mother's people lived, to seek a wife. Account is also given of what occurred on the way.

What effect did the fact that Jacob obeyed his father and mother, in going from home to take a wife from among his mother's people, have on Esau? Led him to think in regard to his own conduct in taking 2 wives from among the Hittites, by which he had displeased his father and mother. Also led him to decide he would take a wife from daughters of Ishmael, a fleshly relative. But there is no evidence his 3rd wife pleased his parents.

What does the record inform us concerning the first night Jacob spent after he left home?



It was the night of his extremity and of God's opportunity. He slept on the ground with stones for his pillows, but God gave him a beautiful vision of angels and a glorious revelation in connection therewith.

What did the Lord mean by saying He would not let him go until He had done all He had promised him? The Lord meant He would take care of Jacob until he had accomplished His divine purposes in and through him.

Has not God thus dealt with all others He has chosen for official positions in Church or State? He has. When God has selected a man to accomplish a particular end, religious or secular, He has never permitted that man to escape, or be overcome, until that end has been accomplished. God's care will always be over that man, and no weapon can be made that will be suffered to do him fatal injury until the Divinely appointed end has been accomplished. Then God may suffer him to be overcome. Thus it has been, thus it is, and thus it ever will be until close of time. God's fore-ordination of men and women to official work is arranged with unerring certainty of Him who is infinite in all His attributes.

What shall we say of Jacob's vow when he considered the revelation God made to him? Probably acceptable, as Jacob lived in the First religious age of the world's history.

Would such vow or promise be acceptable in the Gospel age? No; it is too much like proposing terms to the Almighty. To say to the Lord that if He will do certain things then He shall be our God and we will give Him certain things, would be nothing less than presumption if manifested under the Gospel age. We should say to God, "Not my will, but Thine, be done." We have no right to dictate, stipulate nor propose terms to God or Christ. But what the Father and Son have declared to us in their Word we should humbly accept, ever remembering the chief end of our existence is to honor and glorify God through the Lord Jesus Christ.

**Genesis, chapter 29**, records events connected with Jacob's arrival and stay at Padan-aram.

Did Jacob meet with success after God's revelation had been made concerning his future life? He did. He went to Padan-aram and served his mother's brother, Laban, 14 years for 2 wives. As a result of obtaining 2 wives a large family began to be born to him.

What is said of Jacob's love for a daughter of Laban who afterward became his wife? It was so intense that the 7 years he served for her "seemed unto him but a few days."

What shall we say of Jacob having more than one wife? The marriage law in his day was not set forth as it is in the Gospel age, and "where no law is there is no transgression" (Rom. 4:15). God showed His decision in favor of only one wife for each man by creating but one wife for Adam; and by saving 4 men, each of whom had but one wife, at time of the Flood. Nevertheless He had not then given the law which restricted man in the number of wives he might have; thus Jacob, without censure, was permitted to have more than one wife.

Is it possible for a man under the Gospel age to have more than one wife? No. In light of I Cor. 6:16 a wife for a man is determined at point of fleshly relations, and when a man enters such relations with a woman she becomes his wife, for he thereby makes himself "one body" with her. When such relation is established with one woman then that relation doesn't

exist with any other woman. Any other conclusion is not in harmony with last part of Eph. 5th. chap. On the contrary, the conclusion that a man can at any one time be "one body" with more than one wife, under the Gospel age, implies Christ can be "one body" with more than one church. But such implication is contrary to Eph. 1:22, 23; 4:4. Christ could as scripturally be head of all religions bodies in "Christendom" as a man could, at one time, be husband of 2 or more wives, in Heaven's sight, under the Gospel age. One Lord Jesus Christ and one Church; one man and one wife,--is the Divine arrangement. Christ could as lawfully become head of a 2nd church while the first Church lives, as any man can become head of a second wife while his first wife lives. If Christ would join himself to a sectarian body He would thereby sever His relation to His own and only Church, even as a man who would join himself to a 2nd woman would thereby sever his relation to his own and only wife. the only difference between binding relationship of Christ to his Church, and a man to his wife is that the Church will certainly live, but a man's wife may die. If she dies then he is free to marry another; and he is free also if she becomes unchaste.

**Genesis, chapter 30**, gives account of progress of events in Jacob's family and business relations.

What does this chapter reveal concerning disposition of Jacob's wives? They tried to excel each other in honoring their husband with children, and in so doing each of them gave her servant-maid into her husband's bosom to be his wife, by which arrangement Jacob became husband of 4 wives.

Was such disposition on the part of Jacob's first wives right? Yes, God's first command to Adam and Eve was, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish (fill) the earth, and subdue it." That command has never been recalled nor modified.

What else does this chapter reveal? Informs us Jacob served Laban 6 years for wages beside the 14 years he had served him for his 2 daughters: also that Jacob was very successful in securing wealth of his father-in-law.

**Genesis, chapter 31**, tells of Jacob's departure from his father-in-law, of the manner of his departure, and of its effect .

What did Jacob learn concerning his brothers-in-law? That they complained because he secured much of their father's wealth.

Did God reveal to him how he should proceed in order to secure it? He said he had seen in a dream how to proceed, and seemed disposed to give the Lord credit for it.

What does the record state in regard to what Jacob should do when he heard complaints of his brothers-in-law and learned the countenance of his father-in-law was not favorable toward him? The record states God directed him to return to his father and kindred, and that He would be with him.

Did Jacob make this known to his wives? He did.

What did they say about it? They spoke as women devoted to their husbands always speak.

Did Jacob permit Laban, his father-in-law, to know of his purpose to go away? He did not, and Laban did not learn of it until the day after Jacob started. Then he went after Jacob, but God revealed to him that he should not harm him.

What was the result? Laban overtook Jacob and after much earnest talk they made a covenant, and Laban returned home.

In course of Jacob's talk with Laban what charge did he make? He charged Laban with having changed his wages "10 limes", which was not denied.

What is meant by the "gods" or "images" Laban charged Jacob with having stolen? Seems as if, in Laban's home, were images, that, in some sense, were regarded as gods, and that these were stolen by one of Jacob's wives. Jacob was not aware of what his wife had done, and when charged with the theft he hastily made a dangerous speech. Hasty speeches are generally dangerous. Unmodified speeches are also dangerous in most instances.

**Genesis, chapter 32**, gives account of Jacob's return to the district of country where his father and brother lived, and of events which preceded meeting of his brother.

Was Jacob afraid of his brother Esau? He was.

How did he propose to secure his favor if he was angry at him? By a present.

With whom did he wrestle the night before he met Esau? In Hos. 12:4 we learn he wrestled with an angel.

Did Jacob ask the angel for a blessing while he had full strength? No. While he had his strength unimpaired he wrestled; but when the hollow of his thigh was out-of-joint he asked for a blessing.

Did he receive it? He did. His name was changed from Jacob, which means "supplanter", to Israel, which means "prince of God".

What should we learn from this event in Jacob's life? That the time of man's confidence in himself is the time when God does not specially help him, but that man's extremity is God's opportunity. While Jacob depended on his muscle his wrestling was a failure, but when he asked a favor of God's messenger he received it. This should teach us that all our efforts will be in vain unless the Divine blessings rest on us.

What does certain presumptuous conduct, manifest in modern times, suggest on this subject? Instead of regarding man's extremity as God's opportunity, many speak and act as if God's extremity is man's opportunity. Instead of saying "where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent", they say "where the Bible speaks we should be silent; and where the Bible is silent we may speak". Thus silence of infinite wisdom, love, mercy and goodness they regard as their opportunity to speak, and to advocate appendages to worship and work of the church. So doing they fail to observe the admonition and precaution in Prov. 30:6, and they fail to consider that adding to Divine appointments is adding to God's Word.

**Genesis, chapter 33**, sets forth meeting of Jacob and Esau.

What does it show? That Esau held no malice against Jacob; also that God's assurance of care over him continued.

Did Jacob manifest gratitude to God? Yes; when he had bought a place to pitch his tent he erected an altar for worship, and called it by a name which meant "God, the God of Israel".

What lesson should facts just stated impress on our minds? In view of what is said in the Old Testament and New concerning God's love for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, all of whom were humble and constant worshippers of Jehovah, we should never grow weary in prayer and praise, thanksgiving and adoration to God in the name of Christ; nor should we grow weary in doing good to mankind. Though we be throughout life without direct evidence of God's approval, yet we may rest assured He approves all our righteousness.

**In Genesis, chapter 34**, is record of coarse and cruel outworking of human nature on the part of a young man named Shechem, of the land of Canaan, toward the only daughter of Jacob: then an account of equally coarse and cruel vengeance on the part of certain of Jacob's sons.

Was Jacob afraid of evil results of what his sons had done? He was; he feared the report of what they had done would cause inhabitants of the land to gather against him and his family, and destroy them.

Did an expression of his fear effect his coarse and cruel sons? No.

What should this record of events teach all who read it? First, the unutterable wrong of outraging a woman's person; and, second, the terrible spirit of vengeance it is liable to stir in her relatives. It also suggests that women, specially young women, should, whenever possible, be attended by some one who can protect them.

**Genesis, chapter 35**, gives account of Jacob's return to a place called Bethel; what he said and did with reference to going there; and what he did when he arrived;--mention is then made of death of his mother's nurse, also that God appeared to him and renewed His promises. Then account is given of birth of Benjamin, and of his mother's death and burial. The chapter closes with mention of death of Isaac, at age of 180 years, and of burial by his sons, Jacob and Esau.

What does Jacob's command, that his household put away their 'strange gods', imply? That in Jacob's family were, at that time, some images called "gods", perhaps the very ones his favorite wife, Rachel, had stolen from her father, of which mention is made in chap. 31:30-32.

In obeying his command what did members of his family do? They gave him all the "strange gods" in their hand, and all their "ear rings" which were in their ears.

What does this imply? That they supposed "strange-gods" and "ear rings" belonged together.

Were they not right? I Tim. 2:9 and 1 Peter 3:3 suggest they were. When Christians go to God's house they should consider Jacob's command to his household, "Put away the strange gods among you, and be clean, and change your garments". In so doing they would better put away all ornaments.

What did Jacob do with the gods and ear rings given him? Buried them under an oak tree.

What should Christians do with all their idols of whatever kind? They should follow Jacob's example or, better still, destroy them utterly.

What did Jacob do when he reached Bethel? Built an altar to worship God.

What does the word Bethel mean? House of God. What is the house of God in the Gospel age? In 1 Tim. 3:15 we learn the church of God, consisting of obedient believers, is "the house of God".

What does the Greek word "ecclesia" translated by the word "church" in the English New Testament mean? It means "called out", thus means "separated".

**Genesis, chapter 36**, sets before us account of Esau's family and descendants, also that he left the land of Canaan, taking all he had, and went into Mount Seir for the purpose of getting away from Jacob; as their cattle were more than the land or, possibly, that part of it not already occupied by other people, could bear.

By reading this record of Esau's family what, do we learn? That he was father of the nation called Edomites, also that 8 kings reigned in Edom before there was a king over Jacob's descendants.

What else do we find in this chapter? First mention of dukes.

What is difference between a duke and a king? A duke is a temporal ruler several grades lower than a king.

**In Genesis, chapter 37**, we find recorded that Jacob dwelt in the land of Canaan, and specially loved Joseph as the child of his old age; that he showed partiality for Joseph, and the consequent hatred of his brothers toward him; also that Joseph dreamed 2 dreams which implied his brethren would, at some time, bow down to him. Then we read they envied him; and some proposed to kill him but were prevented by the counsel of one of their number. Next we learn they sold him to Ishmaelites, killed a kid and dipped his coat in the blood, after which they sent that coat to their father and said they had found it.. Jacob knew the coat and concluded Joseph had been killed by a wild beast; whereupon he was filled with grief and refused to be comforted. The chapter ends with mention of Joseph sold by the Midianites to an Egyptian officer.

Will partiality of parents toward a favorite child still cause other children to envy and, perhaps, hate the favored one? Yes. Weakness of human nature is still manifest in this direction. For this reason parents should be very careful not to favor one child above another, unless it be clearly explained that it is because of delicate health, good conduct, or some

other good reason, on the part of the favored one.

**Genesis, chapter 38**, is largely filled with accounts of irregular and unbecoming conduct. Several items are condemnable from a moral viewpoint.

What shall we say of propriety of such a record made and inserted in the Bible? Shows the part of the Bible in which such record is found was written by one who was impartial. Same may be said of several other parts.

What should we think of the story of Onan? Shows that those who enter the marriage relation are not at liberty to do as they please in regard to offspring.

If God was so displeased with Onan's misconduct as to slay him, though he, probably, had not been forewarned on that subject, how will He regard similar misconduct on part of others who have, or may have, Onan's case before them? There is unutterable danger in disregarding the warning of this case.

**Genesis, chapter 39**, gives record of Joseph in Egypt and of God's care in his behalf.

What does this record show? That Joseph feared God at all times, and desired to be correct in his life. Shows likewise he did not become discouraged when falsely accused and thrown into prison.

What should young men learn from the life of Joseph as here set forth? Importance of being always faithful to God, and true to all trust committed to them by others. Had Joseph varied from honor he'd have been ruined. One deviation from right has ruined millions of young men and women. The only safe course in life is of constant, unflinching honor. The only assurance for such a course of life is to live daily and hourly in fear of God. "Thou God seest me" is the chief safeguard.

**Genesis, chapter 40**, records God's continued care over Joseph, and of events through which his reputation became established as an interpreter of dreams, and results thereof.

What is further revealed by events here recorded? That God knows how to manage His own affairs, and that He does all things well. Also illustrates God's plan of testing faith of those He intends to exalt. This shows the sooner every human being learns to say to God, "Not my will, but Thine be done", the better it will be. From an earthly viewpoint it seemed very unfortunate for Joseph to be sold by his brethren, then falsely accused by the wife of his master, and then to be cast into prison; but it was all overruled for good. Therefore every son and daughter of mankind should learn to pray to God. "Lead me in the way Thy wisdom seeth best."

**Genesis, chapter 41**, records certain dreams the king of Egypt dreamed while Joseph was still in prison, also of Joseph being called to interpret those dreams. Next we learn when he had given the interpretation to the king's satisfaction he ventured to advise the king. As a result he was elevated to the second position in Egypt, having no one above him except the king.

What else do we learn by facts recorded in this chapter? That after Joseph had been fully

tried God elevated him suddenly, and then that in all things he behaved wisely.

How long had Joseph been on trial? Thirteen years, as we learn by comparing chap. 37:2 with v. 46 of this chapter. He was about 17 years old when he was sold, and was 30 when he appeared before Pharaoh to interpret his dreams.

What else should we learn from record of Joseph's promotion? We ought to learn value and bearing of Psa. 75:6, 7.

And what should this teach us? Folly of ambitions struggling for prominence. We should remember the whole duty of man is to fear God and keep His commands, as Eccl. 12:13 declares; and to do all things "to the glory of God", as 1 Cor. 10:31 requires. By so doing we shall, like the child Jesus, increase "in favor with God and man" (Luke 2:52). And then, if the Lord needs us to fill a position of prominence, He'll open the way for us. Therefore our daily prayer should be for Him to lead us in the way His wisdom sees best; or, as the Savior sets us the example, we should say to the Father, "Not my will, but Thine be done."

**Genesis, chapter 42**, mentions famine in the land of Canaan, and of Joseph's brethren going into Egypt for grain; also of events connected with Joseph knowing his brethren and refusing to make himself known to them.

What shall we say of Joseph's dreams which implied his brethren should bow down to him? They were fulfilled.

What does the fact of their fulfillment imply? Psa. 76:10. God overruled wrath, or hatred, of Joseph's brethren to His own praise and to Joseph's honor.

But did not Joseph's brethren, at first, propose to kill him? They did; but that degree of wrath God restrained. "The shields of the earth belong to God" (Psa. 47:9), and the wrath of mankind is under the Lord's control.

What shall we say of the manner in which Joseph treated his brethren, in binding Simeon and demanding that Benjamin should be brought down to him; before making himself known to them? He acted the part of a hypocrite, or pretender, toward them, taking advantage of their ignorance concerning him. Such conduct, even under such circumstances, was unfair, and, from a Gospel viewpoint, was censurable.

But did not his brethren deserve such treatment, in view of the manner in which they treated him? Yes: but the Gospel does not permit us to act the part of hypocrisy in order to inflict justice on others.

What apology, therefore, can we offer for Joseph's rough speaking and other pretensions before his brethren? He did not live in the Gospel age and, in light of Rom. 4:15. 5:13, he was excusable.

Do we find anything in this chapter which suggests the question of conscience? The 21st and 22nd verses inform us Joseph's brethren had consciences, also that they believed in Divine judgments on wrong doers. They could not forget the anguish Joseph showed when they sold him, and they feared God's vengeance. This informs us mankind cannot be happy

except by doing right. All wrong doing, specially all crimes against a fellow mortal, will bring misery.

**In Genesis, chapter 43**, we read a second command of Jacob that his sons go down into Egypt to buy grain; Judah's speech to his father in regard to sending Benjamin with them; Jacob's consent to send him; also the manner in which Judah and his brethren were received in Egypt.

Is there anything specially touching recorded in this chapter? The record of Jacob's effort to secure favor of the great man of Egypt, by sending him a present, not knowing the one whose favor he desired was his own beloved son, is very touching. Besides, it illustrates the doctrine that error, if believed, will have the same effect on mind and heart, as far as begetting fear or hope is concerned, as truth will have.

Does error when believed have same effect on the mind, in all respects, as does truth when believed?  
Not altogether

What is most evident difference between the two effects? Belief of truth tends to prepare the mind to investigate both truth and error; but belief of error tends to close the mental eye and ear against investigation of truth. Thus truth is like wholesome medicine to the mind, while error is like mental poison. The wholehearted believer who understands the Bible is free to investigate all phases of infidelity; but the infidel is not free to investigate the Bible. The Christian is free to investigate all humanisms in religion, but the sectarian is not free to investigate all that is Divine in religion. In many instances the sectarian will not investigate anything in religion beyond the creed he has accepted.

In view of what has just been stated it may be safely said the first effect of believing a truth and an error may be similar, but after effects are very different, and in many instances they are directly opposite. Besides, an error is often a mental stimulant, while truth serves as mental food. After-effects of all stimulants are, generally, unfavorable; while aftereffects of all wholesome foods are generally good.

**Genesis, chapter 44**, informs concerning Joseph's treatment of his brethren in commanding they should be sent away with his silver cup in Benjamin's sack, also in sending his steward after them and bringing them back. Mention is then made of their distress of mind, and report is given of Judah's speech before Joseph, which ended with his offer to remain, instead of Benjamin, a bondman to Joseph.

What should we say of Judah's speech before Joseph? In clearness, conciseness, directness, pathos, and nobility of spirit, it is, probably, the equal of anything found anywhere in the domain of literature.

Why do we not find it in books which give samples of human eloquence? Unacquaintance with the Bible is, probably, the first reason; prejudice against the Bible is, probably, another reason.

Is not prejudice against the Bible the chief reason why many people are almost entirely ignorant of its contents? Ignorance begets prejudice, and prejudice results in more ignorance.



**Genesis, chapter 45**, consists of account of Joseph making himself known to his brethren; proposing his father's entire family should be brought down into Egypt, to be cared for during the 5 remaining years of famine; sending wagons to bring the family into Egypt, and provisions for the household to eat on the way. This chapter also sets forth that when Joseph's brethren told their father he was still alive, and was governor over all Egypt, he did not believe them; but when he saw the wagons Joseph sent to take him and his family into Egypt he believed, and said he would go and see him.

What should we conclude from the record given of Joseph? Illustrates the truth that God does all things well.

But what shall we say of Jacob refusing to believe his sons when they told him the truth concerning Joseph, but afterward was led to believe by seeing wagons which were sent to take him into Egypt? Illustrates need of testimony, even strong testimony, being confirmed in order to be accepted in favor of an unlikely statement.

Did not Jacob readily believe a lie when Joseph's bloody coat was shown him? Yes; according to chap. 37:31-35 he inferred from blood on the coat that Joseph had been devoured by an evil beast, and, on that inference, mourned for his son many days, and refused to be comforted.

What does this show concerning the human mind? That what seems likely is readily believed, while that which seems unlikely is only believed on strong evidence confirmed by other strong evidence.

Do not mankind generally believe with readiness what they wish to regard as true? Yes, but there are exceptions. Sometimes that which is stated is suspected because it is regarded as too favorable, or too good, to be true. This was true with Jacob when he heard Joseph was alive and ruler over all Egypt.

**Genesis, chapter 46**, gives account of Jacob's journey into Egypt and that when, on his way, he reached a place called Beersheba, he offered sacrifices to God; also that God appeared to him in visions of the night and told him not to fear to go down into Egypt, for he should be brought out again. The chapter then informs us of the number of Jacob's family, of his actual entrance into Egypt, even to the land of Goshen; of Joseph meeting him, and of directions he gave his brethren in regard to what they should say to Pharaoh if questioned by him concerning their occupation.

What should we say of direct instructions, assurance and promises God gave to Jacob, also to others, in course of the period when He was making his revelation to mankind? Direct information must have been satisfactory when given, but the ancients did not have the Bible and thus needed special guidance.

Should we desire direct instructions from Heaven? No; and it is dangerous for us to imagine we have received them. Christians should at all times pray to be led in the way Divine wisdom sees best. They should also pray to be blest in all that is right, and made to fail in all that is wrong, so as not to be encouraged in wrong doing. While thus praying, and keeping mind and heart in submission to the Divine will, desiring to do and be whatever is in harmony with that will, there is no danger of going wrong except as may be necessary in

order to teach lessons which could not otherwise be learned. That is to say, God sometimes suffers His children to go wrong, in business, social life, and even in family affairs, in order, to impress such truth, and perhaps error, as could not be otherwise impressed. It is blessed to be unable to see into the future, and to live by faith each day, being willing to be led as God sees best.

**Genesis, chapter 47**, states that Joseph told Pharaoh his father and brethren had come into Egypt; that he presented 5 of his brethren to Pharaoh, also his father; that Joseph was told by Pharaoh that in the best of the land he should nourish his father and his family during the remaining years of famine, and the fact is stated that Joseph did so. Account is then given of the course Joseph adopted in regard to furnishing food to the Egyptians, which resulted in the king owning all the land. The chapter ends with mention of prosperity of Jacob and his family in Egypt, of the number of years he lived in Egypt, also of that which he requested Joseph to swear to him in regard to burying his body.

What should we conclude in regard to Joseph's treatment of the Egyptians when they called on him for grain? He showed business ability and disposition of his father, and which is still manifest in the Jew. Jews are farsighted in regard to temporal affairs; but in regard to faith in God they have shown weakness common among mankind.

What is the secret of this common weakness? Mat. 22:29 informs us.

**Genesis, chapter 48**, gives account of Jacob's sickness, of Joseph visiting him and taking his 2 sons, Manasseh and Ephraim; of Jacob claiming and blessing them, placing the younger above the elder by placing his right hand on the head of the younger son. The chapter ends with assurance by Jacob that God would bring his descendants out of Egypt, and the statement that he had given Joseph a portion above his brethren.

What should we conclude from the fact that Jacob crossed his hands in order to place greater blessing on the younger son? That the Lord guided him. What does this show in regard to the Lord's wisdom?

That He knows how to manage His own business.

What was meant by Jacob when he stated he had given Joseph a portion above his brethren? The Divine record limits us to the conclusion that while each of his brethren would be father of only one tribe, he should be father of 2 tribes, afterward called Ephraim and Manasseh.

Was not Jacob speaking prophetically when he said what he did to Joseph on that subject? Yes, and by limitations of history we must conclude he was speaking prophetically in what he said about that which he had taken from the Amorite. He must have meant that in so claiming and blessing the 2 sons of Joseph each of them would become head of a tribe; he would in the land of Canaan take a double possession from the Amorites, but he would do so through the tribes which should spring from Ephraim and Manasseh.

As there were 12 sons born to Jacob, and each became father of a tribe, while Joseph became father of 2 tribes, did not that make 13 tribes in Israel? Yes; but the record informs us from one of the tribes the priests were to be chosen; thus the Lord had need for the 13th

tribe.

Did the Savior choose 13 Apostles? He did. He first chose 12, and after Judas Iscariot was dead He chose Matthias by lot. (See Acts 1:26, Prov. 16:33.) After that He chose Saul of Tarsus to be an Apostle. And He knew what to do with the 13th Apostle.

**Genesis, chapter 49**, records Jacob's final sentence on each of his 12 sons.

To what did that sentence refer? Chiefly to their future history. In every instance it was brief statement of a prominent trait in character of each son, as shown in his past history, on which was based a prophecy concerning future history.

What should we say of the sentence on Reuben? It mentions what is recorded in chap.35:22 against him, and mentioned it as basis of what was said concerning his character and future history.

Do we now find men who, like Reuben, have in them excellency of dignity and power, but can never succeed in any business because they are unstable? Yes; this is often true of brilliant, dignified and powerful men. Nature gifted them highly in regard to intellect, but made them defective in regard to stability, and sometimes in regard to moral sentiments. They have vivid imaginations and disregard truth; sometimes they are strongly inclined to vulgarity and licentiousness.

What is the only remedy for such defects? Daily and wholehearted devotion to God's Word.

What about the sentence on Simeon and Levi? Jacob referred to a prominent instance in their past history as the reason for the sentence of division in Israel he pronounced on them.

Does later history of those men inform that they were scattered? It does in regard to Levi, from whose tribe priests were chosen; but not in regard to Simeon, except that as tribes Simeon and Levi were not permitted to dwell together or near each other.

Did not some Levites dwell in midst of the tribe of Simeon? Yes; we read thereof in Josh. 21:4, but that implies only about 1-12th of the tribe of Levi dwelt among the Simeonites. So we can understand how, as tribes, they were divided or separated from each other.

What may we safely conclude from the sentence Jacob pronounced on Judah? The name Judah means "praise", as we may learn in chap. 29:35; and the meaning of Judah's name was mentioned by his father as basis of his prophecy concerning him. His greatness in Israel and supremacy over his enemies: also his rulership until Christ would come, are all foretold. Judah, the son who made the manly speech before Joseph in behalf of his father and his youngest brother, recorded in chap. 44:18-34, was Divinely ordained to become father of the largest and most powerful tribe in all Israel, which was to remain the ruling tribe until a certain one, called Shiloh, should come, unto whom the people should be gathered. The word Shiloh means "rest"; and in Mat. 11:28-30 we learn why Christ should be called Shiloh in prophecy.

But what is meaning of the 11th and 12th verses? They set forth poetic references to Judah's exaltation in a land of abundance of good things.

What does the sentence pronounced on Zebulon indicate? The district of country in the land of Canaan where his tribe should dwell.

Was that district given him? According to Josh. 19: 10, 11 it became his by lot.

What shall we conclude of the sentence pronounced on Issachar? The name Issachar means "rewarded", and the sentence pronounced on him is poetic reference to his desire for rest, and enjoyment of what was pleasant, and the result.

Is that result recorded in history of the tribe of Issachar? No, except in the record in 2 Kings 17 of the tribute required of Israel, which included Issachar, in the reign of Hoshea.

What is meant by the sentence on Dan? The name Dan means "judgment", and the sentence pronounced on Dan means shrewdness, as when a reptile plans to bite a man on horseback by biting heels of his horse so as to make the man fall backward. Thus that sentence is poetic reference to shrewdness which enables one to accomplish different ends by doing something which will make those ends within easy reach.

What shall we conclude concerning sentence pronounced on Gad, Asher and Naphtali? Gad means "troop", Asher means "happiness", and Naphtali means "wrestling". Thus the sentence pronounced on Gad seems to refer to his name. Same is true of the sentence on Asher. As for the name, Naphtali, which means "wrestling", it refers to mental wrestling, as we learn by reading chap. 30:7, 8. Then, as "goodly words" are often result of mental wrestling, it seems in the sentence pronounced on Naphtali reference is to his name.

What shall we say concerning the sentence pronounced on Joseph? Explained by his history and remarks in regard to Ephraim and Manasseh, of whom we have account in the previous chapter. 1 Chron. 5: 1, 2 also records information on this subject. It is there declared the birthright of the family was given to Joseph.

What about the sentence Benjamin received.? We find nothing in his after history which seems fulfillment of this prophecy except what is in Judges 20:21, 25. Benjamites showed marvelous power as soldiers. Besides, the first king chosen to reign over Israel, and the last Apostle chosen to preach the Gospel, were from the tribe of Benjamin.

What of the expression "everlasting hills" in v. 26? In Deut. 33:15 we read of "the lasting hills", and in Hab. 3:6 we read of "the everlasting mountains" and "the perpetual hills". But all these expressions must be taken in relative or modified sense, and not in absolute or unmodified sense. Same is true of the words "life" and "death", also of other words in the Bible. Words, phrases, clauses, sentences and even paragraphs must be considered in light of connection in which they are found. For instance, in Mat. 10:39 it is recorded the Savior said, "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Here the word "life" is used in 2-fold sense. (See also Mat. 16:25.) The idea is: All who would save their earthly life by denying Christ, or refusing to confess Him, will finally lose life beyond this world; but those who would lose their earthly life by confessing Christ shall gain eternal life.

**Genesis, chapter 50**, sets forth account of what Joseph did and ordered to be done to his father's dead body. Then mentions Joseph's request of Pharaoh to let him go bury his father's body in the land of Canaan, and an account is given of the journey into Canaan, of the burial, and of the return to Egypt by Joseph, his brethren, and, all others who went with them. Next we are informed concerning an interview between Joseph and his brethren in regard to their mistreatment of him in selling him to strangers. The chapter ends with account of continuance of Joseph's life, his age at time of his death, assurance he gave his brethren in regard to leading Egypt, and the oath he required of them concerning his bones.

What does the book of Genesis in general, and specially the story of Joseph and his brethren, set forth? That God does all things well, and that His ways are not man's ways nor His thoughts man's thoughts. But as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are His ways higher than man's ways and His thoughts than man's thoughts. Thus we read in Isa. 55:8, 9, and what is therein taught is strikingly and grandly illustrated by what is recorded in the book called Genesis.

**Exodus, chapter 1**--Meaning of the word Exodus is "going out", "departure".

Why is the book thus named? Because the most prominent part is departure of the Israelites from Egypt.

What are leading facts mentioned in chapter 1? Names of Israel's sons; death of Joseph and his brethren; increase of their descendants in Egypt; arising of a new king; his evil purposes in regard to male children of Israelites; and how that evil purpose was thwarted.

What is first said of the new king over Egypt? He knew not Joseph, which means he knew not what Joseph, under God's directions, had done for Egypt, and thus was not disposed to look with favor on Joseph's relatives--the Israelites--then in Egypt.

Why did not that new king know of what God had done for Egypt through Joseph? We are not definitely informed, but may judge concerning his lack of knowledge by Isa. 1:3. In all ages it has been true of mankind that they don't know because they don't consider.

**Exodus, chapter 2**--"The house of Levi", mentioned in v. 1, refers to one of Israel's sons named Levi, and "the house of Levi" consisted of the tribe descended from the son who wore that name.

What are chief events recorded in this chapter? A Levite married a woman of his own tribe; a son was born whose appearance was good, his parents hid him because of wish to save him from the king's sentence against male children of the Israelites;; a statement of what was done with him when he could no longer be hidden by his parents; the fact that the king's daughter found him, named him Moses, and adopted him; what he did to an Egyptian when he became a man; his leaving Egypt and why; whither he went; how he was treated while a stranger; the fact that God considered condition of the Israelites and remembered His covenant with their fathers.

What does the New Testament state concerning Moses' purpose when he killed an

Egyptian? Acts 7:25 informs us he "supposed his brethren would have understood how God by his hand would deliver them." Again, he chose "rather to suffer affliction with people of God than to enjoy pleasures of sin for a season" (Heb. 11:25).

Through what channel could Moses have learned concerning his relation to the Jewish people and God's purposes in regard to them? Only through his mother and father, judging by what the record states and by its silence.

While purpose of Moses to deliver his brethren was in advance of God's purpose, what was the result? A failure.

Is not this true in all instances where human purposes are in advance of those that are Divine? Thus it has been; thus it is; and thus will be 'til end of time.

**Exodus, chapter 3**, mentions Moses as a shepherd; of God appearing to him by an angel in a burning bush; of God's purpose to deliver Israelites from bondage by Moses as leader; of disposition Moses showed in regard to the office of leader; of disposition Pharaoh would show; and of the wealth Israelites should obtain from Egyptians.

If the ground on which Moses stood near the burning bush was "holy ground" because God's angel was in the bush, how should we regard pages of the Book in which God's Spirit speaks? We should regard them as holy pages, and always read them with deepest reverence of which we are capable.

When Moses spoke to God as if he should not be the one to go to Pharaoh and become leader of the Israelites, what disposition did he show? Meekness.

What is meaning of meekness? In his case it was opposite of ambition for prominence, and was desire to remain in obscurity. Meekness is genuine modesty, result of humility.

What shall we say of God's direction to Moses, that women of the Israelites should borrow of Egyptian women? The Hebrew word translated "borrow" means "to pull out, or draw forth", hence "to demand or require, to ask", also "to seek a gift or loan, to borrow". Therefore we are not confined to the idea that Israelites "borrowed" of the Egyptians, but we are at liberty to translate the passage: "But every woman shall ask of her neighbor", etc. No unfairness in Israelites asking gifts of the Egyptians, specially as they had long served them.

**Exodus, chapter 4**, presents Moses' plea that the Israelites would not believe him; the miracles by which he should convince them: his plea that he was not eloquent: his brother Aaron promised to him for spokesman; return of Moses to Egypt; God's threat to harden Pharaoh's heart and slay his first-born; God's displeasure in regard to Moses because he neglected to circumcise his son; meeting of Moses and Aaron; calling together of elders of Israel and the effect Aaron's statement of God's purpose concerning them had on their minds.

Why did God decide to harden Pharaoh's heart? In chaps. 7:3, 10:1, we learn it was done in order to furnish opportunity for multiplying signs and wonders in Egypt.

Why does the record state the Lord met Moses at a certain place and threatened to kill him? What the record sets forth on this subject implies he had neglected to circumcise his

son.

Did Moses' wife go on with him? No; we read in chap. 18:2 he sent her back.

**Exodus, chapter 5**--The name Moses means "drawn out". He was thus named by the daughter of the king of Egypt, who found him in an ark of bull-rushes, because she had drawn him out of the water.

What is meaning of the name Aaron? "Mountaineer, or enlightener".

Is it important to know meaning of names of persons and places mentioned in the Bible? Yes, for they are generally characteristic names, thus give light in regard to character or history.

This chapter mentions the 1st interview Moses and Aaron had with Pharaoh; of response Pharaoh made; of his command to oppress more severely the Israelite; who made bricks; of evil results among the brick-makers; of their complaint against Moses and Aaron; and of the complaint of Moses to the Lord.

What did Pharaoh's 1st answer to Moses and Aaron show? That he felt as if he could defy the Hebrews' God.

Have the wicked shown that disposition at other times? Psa. 10 indicates thus it has been, thus it is, and thus it will be 'til end of time.

What does the speech Moses made to God, recorded in last part of this chapter, indicate? Human impatience in contrast with God's longsuffering and forbearance. That speech illustrates common weakness among mankind, a weakness which resulted in overthrow of hundreds of thousands in the wilderness, and which is still manifest among religious people to their ruin.

What lesson should we learn from the mistake Moses made when he showed his impatience? We should learn to cultivate patience to the utmost in all trials, and learn to wait for outworking of God's purposes in regard to both truth and error.

**Exodus, chapter 6**--How often is the statement, "the Lord spake to Moses", found in the Old Testament? About 70 times without any other word.

What does this statement imply? Direct, positive, verbal inspiration. To deny this is to impeach Moses' character by implying he was a reckless asserter of falsehood and a vile slanderer of God. For him to declare 70 times in his writings that God spoke to him, then pretend to give God's words just as he received them, would have proved him a reckless and vile character if he had not been a writer of God's verbal dictations. Then as Christ endorsed Moses without criticism, it is evident Moses' integrity and Christ's divinity are inseparably connected.

What are leading thoughts in this chapter? An interview between God and Moses in regard to the king of Egypt and the Israelites; also a record of names of 3 sons of Jacob and their sons and other descendants.

What did Moses mean by saying he was of "uncircumcised lips"? He meant to make excuse for himself.

**Exodus, chapter 7**--What did the Lord mean by saying He made Moses "a god to Pharaoh"? In chap. 4:16 we learn Moses was intended to be "instead of God" to Aaron, while Aaron should be "instead of a mouth" to him. This indicates Moses was to be "a god" to the bring of Egypt, in that he was to act instead of God in what he would say to him.

This chapter records what the Lord commanded Moses with reference to Pharaoh; what Pharaoh would not do; respective ages of Moses and Aaron at that time; what miracles Moses and Aaron should perform before Pharaoh; by whom those miracles were imitated; and how Pharaoh's heart was hardened.

By what power could the magicians of Egypt turn their rods into serpents and turn water into blood? In Psa. 62:11 we learn that "power belongeth to God", and in Rom. 13:1 we read "there is no power but God". This being true, all power originated with Him. But He has delegated or given power to angels and men, and in Eph. 2:2 the devil is called "the prince of the power of the air". Then in Job 1st and 2nd chapters we learn the devil has great power but is held under God's restrictions. In 2 Thess. 2:9 we read of him "whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power, signs and lying wonders". These Scriptures show Pharaoh's magicians were in league with the devil, and by his power imitated miracles wrought by God's power through Moses and Aaron. God suffered the devil thus to work through those magicians at that time in order to accomplish an end He had in view.

What is a miracle? A result accomplished independent of natural means. Formal use of means was sometimes used in working miracles, but miracle-working power was always that by which the miracle was wrought, and not the formal use of means.

What was the 1st plague God brought on Egyptians in order to induce them to let the Israelites go from bondage? Turning waters into blood.

**Exodus, chapter 8**, sets forth account of God's 3rd command to Moses and Aaron to demand of Pharaoh release of the Israelites; the threatening and bringing of the plague of frogs; Pharaoh's promise to let Israel go if the plague of frogs would be taken away; his request that it should be taken away "tomorrow"; his violation of his promise; the plague of lice; failure and confession of the magicians; the plague of flies; Pharaoh's 1st offer of compromise; his 2nd offer to compromise: admonition Moses gave him; and Pharaoh hardening his own heart.

What shall we say of Pharaoh's request that Moses would entreat the Lord for him "tomorrow"? Mentions origin of the doctrine of delay in calling on God. Egypt as a nation, including its king, was suffering dreadfully, but Pharaoh did not ask for immediate relief. On the contrary, he said "tomorrow". Thus it has been, is, and will be, while mankind shall live on earth. In perverseness and rebellion many decide to defer securing their best interests, religiously, 'til "tomorrow".

What confession did Pharaoh's magicians make in regard to the plague of lice they could not imitate? They said it was "the finger of God".

What did they mean? Far as the record informs us, they must have meant the plague of



lice showed God's power beyond any power they possessed.

Was such confession a mark of candor? Yes; it showed more candor than many other errorists have since been disposed to show. Many who, defeated by truth, make no confession. On the contrary, they cherish hatred for truth's advocates.

What was Pharaoh's 1st offer to compromise? He proposed the Israelites should sacrifice in the land of Egypt.

What is meant by "the abomination of the Egyptians" in v. 26? Animals Egyptians worshipped, and which the Israelites would offer in sacrifice to God.

Can we be certain of this? Yes; it is a divinely enforced conclusion by what is said in the record.

What was Pharaoh's 2nd offer to compromise? He promised to permit the Israelites to go into the wilderness to sacrifice, but wished them not to "go very far away".

Does the devil ever propose such compromises.? Yes; when he cannot persuade persons to reject religion altogether he proposes they shall be religious on his territory. When this proposal fails he requests them not to "go very far away". He specially objects to persons going as far away from him as Christ's gospel requires.

Are there many who, accept the devil's propositions of compromise? Yes; a large majority of those who become religious seem to do so with one or more liberties, or limitations, or reservations, which the Gospel does not authorize. Wholehearted devotion to God and Christ is the exception, not the rule, among religious people. Even those who profess to, be Apostolic disciples are, in many instances, self-deceived on this question. They have limited themselves in regard to what they will do and give for the Lord, and will leave the Church rather than be wholehearted.

**Exodus, chapter 9**, records Moses' address to the king of Egypt in regard to release of the Israelites; also the plague of fatal sickness among domestic animals of the Egyptians; the plague of boils on man and beast; the plague of fire and hail; and the king of Egypt humbled.

What is meant by the statement in v. 16 that God raised up Pharaoh for purpose of showing His power and that His name might be declared through all the earth? Psa. 76:10 informs us the wrath of man is made to praise God; and in Pharaoh's case the stubbornness of man praised Him. Had Pharaoh yielded readily to the Divine demand to let the Israelites go, then the glory of God in working miracles would not have been manifested to the Egyptians nor through them to other nations.

Does God now cause man's wrath to praise Him? Yes. In Psa. 22:28 we learn He is "the governor among the nations", and among the nations He still causes man's wrath to praise Him. Among religious people same is true. In I Cor. 11:19 we learn even heresies are of advantage.

When God brought plagues on the Egyptians did He, in any degree, afflict the Israelites, called Hebrews, by those plagues? No. He suffered no harm to befall His people. In them was

fulfilled what is written in Psa. 91:10.

What does the Divine record of such protection imply? That God's care was over His ancient people, and suggests Heb. 13:5 and many other assurances in the New Testament concerning God's spiritual care for Christians, or in regard to their spiritual welfare.

**Exodus, chapter 10**, gives address of Moses and Aaron to Pharaoh in which was threat of a plague of locusts; mention of what Pharaoh's servants said to him; proposition of compromise; the plague of locusts; Pharaoh's humility and stubbornness; plague of darkness; another proposal of compromise; Pharaoh's threat to kill Moses.

What was the 1st proposal of compromise mentioned in this chapter? That the men should go, but not their little ones. The king of Egypt first said for the Hebrews to take their little ones; then said "no", but that the "men" should go.

What was the next compromise offered? He said they might take their little ones but should leave their flocks and herds.

Does the devil ever make such proposals? Yes; he sometimes proposes parents may become religious but that their children should have their fun; and that parents and children may be religious but that they should not take their wealth with them. He says, If you are going to imitate Christ you must be poor--very poor. Knowing the love parents have for children, the devil knows if children remain with him and do wrong, he can, generally, get their parents to compromise; and knowing if he can persuade people to think God requires them to give up even common comforts of life, in order to be Christians, he can cause them to draw back from devotion to Christ.

What was the entire number of compromising proposals Pharaoh made to Moses and Aaron? Four. The 1st was to sacrifice to God in the land of Egypt; 2nd, to go into the wilderness but not very far away; 3rd, to go, but leave their children in Egypt; 4th, to take their children but leave their flocks and herds.

Did Moses and Aaron consider with favor any of those proposals? No. Should we consider with favor any of the devil's proposals of compromise? No; but we should surrender body soul and spirit, and all that we have, to God and Christ.

**Exodus, chapter 11**, informs that God would bring one more plague on the Egyptians, and then they'd thrust the Hebrews out from them. That plague was determined to be death of the first-born of man and beast throughout Egypt, while the Hebrews should suffer no harm.

How can we reconcile the last verse of chap. 10 with the last part of v. 8 of this chapter? By considering that before Moses left Pharaoh's presence he spoke all that is charged to him, as a direct address, between beginning of the 4th and end of v. 8 of this chapter. The 2nd and 3rd and last 2 verses of this chapter seem not in strict historic order. Same is true of chap. 12: 35, 36. But these are only discrepancies, or only seem such, because the history is but briefly given.

**Exodus, chapter 12**--What is meant by the 2nd verse? Means the new year should begin among Hebrews with the month up which they would leave Egypt. That month was called

Abib of Nisan, and corresponds to April in the Roman calendar we use.

What are outlines of this chapter? A record of ordering and eating the Passover; death of the firstborn of the Egyptians; departure of children of Israel from Egypt; mention of time they sojourned there; and certain directions concerning the Passover.

Could Israelites see any sense, or reason, in being required to sprinkle blood of the Passover lamb on door-posts and lintels of their houses? No.

Could they see any sense, or reason, in eating bitter herbs with the Passover lamb? No. Those requirements were as far above their reason and sense as baptism and the Lord's Supper are above ours. But in Heb. 11:28 Paul says they obeyed "by faith".

What of the length of time Moses declared the children of Israel sojourned in Egypt? Moses doubtless knew, and his statement should end controversy. Jacob was called Israel; and though his descendants began to be called "the children of Israel" before his death, yet they were not thus called as separate from their father 'til after his death. When he died he confirmed the promise concerning Christ as recorded in Gen. 49:10. In Gal. 3:17 Paul speaks of confirmation of that promise, then says the law given 430 years afterward could not annul that confirmation. This corresponds with statements of Moses in the chapter before us concerning sojourning of children of Israel in Egypt being "four hundred and thirty years". If we seek for uninspired testimony on this subject we may read in Josephus, book 2, chapter 9, that he says his people were in bondage 400 years; but such testimony is only incidental.

What should we say to those who tell us the Septuagint (Greek Version of the Old Testament) renders v. 40 so as to include sojourn of Jacob, Isaac and even Abraham in the land of Canaan as part of the 430 yrs. mentioned in that verse? We should inform them the Septuagint is not always reliable, and no argument call be safely based on what it declares.

But what should we say to those who refer to what is said about the family of Levi, and endeavor to show that, according to genealogy of that family, the Israelites could not have been in Egypt 430 years? We should first inform them it is not according to Scripture to count chronology by generations of the tribe of Levi. Then we should state that the numbers of the Levites require more time than the account given of the generations of Levi's descendants would permit. Next we should call attention to omission of names of 3 kings of Judah from the genealogy in Mat. 1, as illustration of omissions in chronology. Finally we should state all human calculations of chronology which contradict Gen. 15:13 and Acts 7:6 should be rejected as erroneous. Jacob had 4 wives, yet about 100 years were required for him to have a family of 70. At that rate the reader can decide length of time that would be required for the Hebrews to number 3 or 4 millions of persons so they could have over 600,000 men of war.

**Exodus, chapter 13** -- What does the statement "and the Lord spake to Moses, saying ..." mean? That the Lord gave Moses articulate, distinct, verbal directions.

What are outlines of this chapter? Record of the Lord claiming the 1st-born of man and beast of the Israelites; his command to observe the Passover, and why; his command to explain the Passover to children; further mention of God claiming the 1st-born, and why; direction of departure from Egypt, and why; care concerning Joseph's bones, and why; their

2nd journey and encampment after leaving Egypt; and how the Lord went before them.

What is meant by unleavened bread? Simply bread not made light by yeast, or souring.

Why did the Lord require his people to eat unleavened bread in the Passover feast which continued from the 14th to close of the 21st day of the 1st month of each year? No reason given in Scripture why leaven was forbidden in that feast; and it does not become us to suppose any reason. But we may safely say it was according to the Divine idea in regard to fitness of things.

What may we learn from the Divine command given the Israelite that he should teach his children meaning of the Passover? 1st, the Lord desired Israelites to remain in the land he would give them, and, in order to accomplish that desire, he commanded them to teach their children. 2nd, in order for children to grow up with understanding of the Lord's will they need to be taught that will in childhood.

What is meant by the people repeating when they would see war, and return to Egypt? Simply that the Israelites were not, when they first left Egypt, prepared, in mind and heart, to enter the land of promise and engage in warfare.

Did they afterward become prepared to fight their enemies? They did.

May we learn to fight our enemies? Yes; but we must first learn to put on the whole armor of God, for ours is strictly spiritual warfare.

**Exodus, chapter 14**, records encampment of Israelites by the Red Sea, and why; following of the Israelites by the king of Egypt and his army--result of this on minds of the Israelites; deliverance of Israelites by passing through the sea; overthrow of the king of Egypt and his army in the sea.

What does this book declare concerning God hardening the heart of the king of Egypt? It is 4 times stated God would harden his heart, 7 times stated he did harden it, and 3 times stated the king hardened his own heart.

What shall we say of those statements? All in harmony with each other, with God's character, and with human nature. The fact that God hardened Pharaoh's heart did not prevent him from hardening his own heart; and the fact that he hardened his own heart did not make it unnecessary for God to harden it in order to make his stubbornness such as to require 10 plagues to move him and his people to let Israelites out of Egypt.

Does God harden hearts now? Yes.

By what means or methods? 1st, by permitting persons to have their own way even as parents, by that method, sometimes harden hearts of their children. 2nd, God hardens hearts of some by bringing afflictions oft them, or by suffering them to be afflicted; then permitting them to be relieved. This often has hardening effect, or results in perverse people hardening themselves. Thus it was in case of Pharaoh (Ex. 8:15, 32; 9:34). Perverse persons are occasionally brought very low by sickness or other afflictions; then they sometimes make

promises in regard to doing good if they be permitted to recover. But after recovering they often become worse than before. Thus it is that afflictions sometimes result in hardening perverse characters.

Did God harden Pharaoh's heart by any other method than by permitting him to have his own way? The 4-fold statement of the Lord, "I will harden his heart", and the 7-fold statement, "I have hardened his heart", together imply the Lord really hardened his heart in direct manner.

Was God justified in so doing? Certainly. God is judge of all the earth; and when mankind do wrong he has right to bring on them judgment of blindness, or hardness, or any other kind of judgment that may suit his purpose. Pharaoh had afflicted the Israelites, and made their lives bitter with hard service and cruelty, even ordering their male children put to death at birth; and God had right to harden his heart until justice had been inflicted on him and the Divine name honored.

**Exodus, chapter 15**, consists of a song by Moses and the children of Israel; response by the sister of Moses and certain other women: mention of a journey of 3 days from the Red Sea into the wilderness; also mention of thirst; bitter water, how it was made sweet; what God said to the Israelites on the subject; and encampment at a place where were 12 wells of water and 70 palm trees.

Were the Israelites patient when they became thirsty and had nothing but bitter water to drink? No, they murmured.

When the waters were healed, what lesson did God endeavor to impress on the minds of the people? Importance of obeying Him in order that none of those diseases he brought on the Egyptians should come on them.

If Christians fully obey the Lord what will be true of them? They will be saved from spiritual ailments which afflict the disobedient.

**Exodus, chapter 16**, records account of the journey from the palm trees to the wilderness of Sinai; also of murmuring on the part of the people because they were hungry; promise of bread from heaven; meat and bread furnished; Divine regulation concerning bread sent from heaven; its name, and the command to preserve a pot of it for a memorial,

Why did Israelites murmur against Moses and Aaron when they were hungry? Because they lacked faith.

What does the word "manna" mean? It is a question. When the Israelites saw it they asked, "What is this?" The Hebrew word for "What is this" is "manna."

Does God in the Gospel age offer mankind bread from heaven? He does (John 6:32-35).

Did Israelites ever grow tired of bread God gave them? Yes (Num. 11:6, 21:5).

How do mankind generally regard bread God offers them, by his Word, in the Gospel age? They loathe it; speak of the volume which reveals that bread as a "dry book"; many hold

it in doubt, and thereby say, "What is it?" while others reject it altogether.

Was murmuring of the Hebrews against anyone beside Moses and Aaron? Yes; Moses told them their murmurings were against the Lord.

Did some people try experiments in regard to the :manna God gave them for bread? Some of them disobeyed, in leaving of the manna overnight; and some went out on the 7th day to gather it.

Was such experimenting displeasing to the Lord? It was,, and so was all other disobedience.

What is God's interpretation or estimate of all disobedience? He charges it to unbelief (Heb. 3:17-19).

What should we learn front the fact that God commanded every man to gather the same amount for each person in his family? We should learn "equality" as set forth in 1 Cor. 8th chapter.

How long did Israelites eat manna? Forty years.

**Exodus, chapter 17**, records a journey, of scarcity of water, and of murmuring on the part of the people; of water provided from a rock; of Amalekites warring against Israelites, and how they were defeated; of God's purpose concerning Amalekites.

What did Israelites resemble in their murmuring? A company of children. They soon forgot what God had previously done for them, and did not consider his assurance that he would take them into the land promised their fathers.

What should we learn by the record of their mistakes? Never to become fainthearted, nor even to falter in regard to Divine promises. If we only obey fully and faithfully what the Lord requires of us, his promises will certainly be fulfilled. They cannot fail This is evident from what is said in Luke 16:17 concerning the law given through Moses.

**Exodus, chapter 18**, mentions Jethro, father-in-law of Moses, visiting the Israelites' camp bringing with him Moses' wife and 2 sons; an interview of Moses with Jethro; advice of Jethro, and its adoption; departure of Jethro to his own land.

What shall we say of advice Jethro gave Moses in regard to judging the people? Resulted in less work for Moses, and more prompt hearing of the people's cases; but there was no man in the entire congregation as capable as Moses to instruct people concerning God's will.

What shall we say of adoption of Jethro's advice? Seems to have been adopted by Moses without, mention of the Lord's approval, and it does not seem to have answered the purpose, for in Num. 11 mention is made of Moses complaining of being burdened, also of God commanding him to gather together 70 elders of the Israelites, and promising to take of the spirit of Moses and put it on them, and they should assist in bearing the burden of the people.

Could not those 2 accounts of assistance being furnished Moses have referred to the

same occasion? No. Jethro visited Moses before the Israelites reached Mt. Sinai, while the book of Numbers begins with mention of time about a year later.

What then should be our conclusion concerning adoption of Jethro's advice. It was neither approved nor disapproved, so far as the record informs us, and was ineffective, as implied by what is said in Num. 11 on this subject of furnishing help for Moses. According to Num. 11:16, 17, when God gave directions in regard to choice of men to help Moses, he proposed to take of the spirit that was on Moses and put it on them. When this was done then Moses had help certainly acceptable in God's sight, and effective for the people.

What should we learn concerning Jethro's advice That we would better let the Lord, at all times, manage his own business (Psa. 18:30).

**Exodus, chapter 19** -- How many journeys did children of Israel make in passing from Egypt to Mt. Sinai in Arabia? Nine. First to Succoth (Exo. 12:87); 2nd to Etham (Exo. 13:20); 3rd to the Red Sea (Exo. 14:2); 4th was through the Red Sea (Exo. 14:22); 5th was to Marah (Exo. 15:23); 6th was to Elim (Exo. 15: 27); 7th was to wilderness of Sin (Exo. 16:1); 8th was to Rephidim (Exo. 17:1); 9th was to Sinai (Exo. 19:2).

What are outlines of this chapter? It mentions Israelites in wilderness of Sinai, camped before the mount; Moses going to the mount and having an interview with God; Moses informing the people what God would make them if they would obey Him; promise of the people to be obedient in all things; directions to sanctify the people and keep them from the mount; obedience to directions; manifestations of God's power on Mt. Sinai, an interview of God with Moses.

When Israelites pledged themselves to obey all God commanded, what did they make with Him? A covenant, an agreement.

When God declared that if they would obey Him and keep His covenant, He would make them a peculiar treasure unto Him, above all other people, and would even make them a kingdom of priests and a holy nation,--ought not that to have been sufficient to cause them to be always obedient? Certainly!

Should not God's promises to those who obey Him in the Gospel age be sufficient to cause them to be always obedient? Certainly!

Why then do many turn from obeying God, and others refuse to learn what He requires of them in any particular? "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God", said the Savior in Mt. 22:29.

Was ignorance of the law the reason why the Jewish people went astray? Yes, we are so informed in Isa. 5:13, also in Hos. 4:6.

Was it important for God to make great demonstration on Mt. Sinai when He gave the law? Yes; miracles were necessary in giving the law, in order to convince people who were to receive it of the fact that it certainly came from God, thus was of Divine authority. When this conviction was produced then the Divine authority for each item of the law was established in their minds.

What would have resulted if that authority had been always held in the Jewish mind? There would not have been any national rebellion against God, but the people generally would have obeyed what He required.

What would be result if mankind generally would keep in mind Christ's authority as Head of the Church, and King of kings? They would not trifle with Divine commands, but would obey Him in what the Gospel requires.

**Exodus, chapter 20**, records giving of the 10 commands, afterward written by the Lord himself on tables of stone; manifestations of power the Lord made fear of the people by reason thereof, and what Moses said to quiet their fears; also directions concerning the altar for offering sacrifices.

How many of the 10 commands given on Mt. Sinai have a Godward bearing? The first 4.

How many have a manward bearing? Six.

In what great command are the first 4 summed up by Moses in another place? "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul and with all thy might" (Deut. 6:5).

In what great command are the other commands, written on stones by the finger of God, summed up? "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Lev. 19:18).

What relation do these great commands sustain to all others given the Israelites? "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets" (Mat. 22:40).

How is this explained? The entire duty of the Jewish people during the Jewish age was set forth in the law given by Moses and the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, and all that was required of them was summed up in their duty to God and to their neighbors.

Is all this required in the Gospel age? Yes, but more is required of Christians than God required of Jews. We must love God with all our hearts, love our neighbors as ourselves, and love our enemies. This last command was added by the Savior (Mat. 5:43, 44).

What may we learn by Divine directions in this chapter in regard to building an altar of whole stones? We may learn God did not intend His altar should be in any respect polished By man.

Does the New Testament teach the Gospel may be changed, polished, or beautified, by man's device? It teaches if any man ventures to change or modify the Gospel in preaching it, he does so at his eternal peril (Gal. 1:6-9).

**Exodus, chapter 21**, gives law concerning Hebrew servants, murder, man-stealers, personal injuries; also law in regard to retaliation and compensation.

What is meant by "the seventh" year mentioned in this chapter? In chap. 23:10, 11 the Israelites, also called Hebrews, were commanded to permit their land to rest every 7th year;



and in Deut. 15:1 they were commanded to make release that year. The 12th verse of that chapter gives special directions on releasing a Hebrew servant on the 7th year.

Under what circumstances could one Hebrew own another as a servant? A thief was sometimes sold for his theft (see chap. 22:3). Besides, Hebrews sometimes became so poor they did not or could not pay their debts; and God intended His people should be personally responsible for their debts. (See Lev. 25:39-43; Mat. 18:24, 25.)

What shall we say to those who denounce such law as unrighteous? We should tell them God knew what was best for his people; also that even under the Gospel age would be more economy and less dishonesty among certain classes of people if they were made to understand they are personally responsible for their debts.

Did the law given on Mt. Sinai require capital punishment for wilful murder? Yes, and for several other offenses.

What about the law concerning man-stealers? It was severe; if the one engaged in stealing one or more of man kind was found with his theft he was ordered put to death.

What bearing should that have had on those who stole Negroes from Africa and sold them as slaves in America? It should have prevented such stealing, and should have caused civil governments in Great Britain and America to have punished such stealing with death. The New Testament as well as the Old is against man-stealing as well as against all other kinds of theft. (See 1 Tim. 1:10.)

What should we say of the law of retaliation found in this chapter? It was justice in the civil code of the Jews; but Christians should not practice it. (See Mat. 5:38-41.)

**Exodus, chapter 22**, sets forth concerning punishment of thieves, and the one who killed a thief after sunrise; restitution for damage; law concerning seduction and other evils; how to treat strangers, widows and the fatherless; law concerning usury, or interest, also in regard to pledges for what was borrowed; law against reviling and cursing; a law concerning the first-fruits, and a law against eating meat torn of beasts.

Did the Jewish law put a man in prison for theft? No. It required him to make liberal restitution.

If he were not able to make restitution, then what? He was sold for his theft, as commanded in v. 3.

What is meant by v. 3? That killing of a thief in daytime, when he could be recognized, was murder, and should be punished as such.

Why does the law require so much more of a thief in v. 1 than it does in v. 4? Anyone can see, by reading with care, that v. 1 refers to a thief who had killed or sold what he had stolen, while v. 4 refers to a thief whose theft was found in his hand alive, thus could be restored to its owner.

What are principles underlying the entire manward code of laws given the Israelites?

Justice to all, compassion for the unfortunate who do right, and personal responsibility on the part of all.

Are not these the principles of all good government? There can be no good government if these principles are ignored. Why did not such laws as God gave His ancient people make them better than they were? 1 Sam. 8:3 and Isa. 3:12, 9:16 mention the reason as consisting in corrupt leaders.

Did God legislate against witchcraft? Yes; see v. 18 of this chapter.

What does this prove in regard to witchcraft? That it had existence in fact, and that it was wrong to practice it.

Should mistakes of some people concerning witchcraft cause us to deny its existence as a fact? No.

What does this chapter reveal concerning God's care for the widow, fatherless, and poor? Reveals that He was very compassionate toward them.

Is such compassion in harmony with His severe law requiring a poor person to be sold for debt? It is. God did not propose to encourage extravagance, laziness nor dishonesty.

What is meant by reviling the gods? In light of John 10:34, 35 and Psa. 82:6 the word "gods", in v. 28 of this chapter, must find its explanation in chapters 4: 16 and 7:1, where we learn Moses was "instead of God" to Aaron, and was made "a god to Pharaoh".

**In Exodus, chapter 23**, we find laws in regard to false reports, a false witness, perverting justice, treatment of an enemy's beast, bribes, treatment of strangers, the 7th year, the name of false gods, the 3 national feasts each year blood and leaven in sacrifice, fat of sacrifices, cooking a kid, the angel the Lord would send before the Israelites, idolatry, true worship, Divine blessing, success against enemies, boundaries of the land of promise.

Why did the Lord command His people not to follow a multitude to do evil? He had made man and knew his weaknesses, thus knew his disposition to follow a crowd.

What is meant by v. 3? Just opposite of what is in v. 6; God did not intend that a poor man, charged with wrong, should be countenanced or favored because he was poor, nor that justice should be perverted against him because he was poor. God intended compassion should be extended to the poor in his misfortunes, and that justice should be inflicted on him for his misdemeanors.

What does the law here say against bribery? That a judge should "take no gift", then adds that "the gift blindeth the wise" or, as the Hebrew text says, "blindeth the seeing" or sight.

What does "sabbath" mean? Rest.

How many Sabbaths did God require His ancient people to keep? The weekly sabbath and certain feast sabbaths, then every 7th year their land should have a sabbath.

Was anything special required of Israelites in course of the 7th year while their land rested? Deut. 31:10-13 informs that in course of that year the entire nation should assemble, at the place God would choose, to hear the entire law read.

What was God's plan for keeping His people from idolatry? Not to talk about other gods nor even to name them.

Would not that have been a good plan for Christians in regard to innovations on the Gospel plan? Yes; if innovations had not been named they certainly would not have been introduced.

What is suggested by the law against offering blood of sacrifices with leavened bread? That we should not put leavened bread on the Lord's Table in connection with the fruit of the vine, which is a memorial of the blood of Christ's sacrifice.

What is meant by the command not to seethe a kid in his mother's milk? Not explained; and the only conclusion to which we can justly come is that it was contrary to the Divine idea of fitness of things, that a kid should be cooked in its mother's milk.

Should not God's promise, that He would take sickness from His people, that there should be nothing unfruitful among them, also that He would put the fear of them on their enemies, and send hornets before them to drive out their enemies,--should not those promises have been sufficient to have kept Israelites from disobedience to God? Certainly.

Why then did not those promises prove sufficient to keep them from disobedience? Psa. 106 informs that they forgot God's works.

But why did they forget? To forget is weakness common to mankind.

But did not God make provision against such weakness? Yes; but the leaders failed to do their duty in conforming to the provision made.

Is not the same true under the Gospel age? It certainly is, and that, too, regardless of forewarnings in the Old Testament.

**Exodus, chapter 24**, mentions certain God-given directions to Moses in regard to himself, Aaron, 2 sons of Aaron and 70 others; also in regard to the people generally; that the people twice renewed their covenant with God: that an altar was built and sacrifices offered, and what Moses did with blood of the offerings; that he and 73 others saw God; that Moses was called up on the mount to God for purpose of receiving the law, and that he took Joshua with him as his minister; that Aaron and Hur remained with the congregation while Moses, Joshua and 72 others were up in the mount; that there was a cloud on Mt. Sinai, and that Moses went up into the midst of the cloud.

What is meant by the statement that Moses and those with him "saw God" in the mount? In Deut. 4:12, 15 the Lord stated to the Israelites that they "saw no similitude", which means they saw no likeness nor appearance of any person, nor of any other being. This informs that Moses and his company only saw manifestations that were about God when He came down on Mt. Sinai.

What is meant by "he laid not his hand", in v. 11? Not revealed; and human opinions are of no worth in this investigation.

What impression on the Israelites should have been made by the fact that God descended to earth in order to deliver His law to them? Profoundest reverence for that law should ever have filled them.

What impression should the fact that God's Son came to this world and lived, suffered and died, in order to reveal the Gospel to us, make on our minds? We should be filled with deepest humility and highest reverence of which we are capable.

Did Joshua go up into the presence of God with Moses? We are not definitely informed how far he went but, as it is not stated he stopped anywhere, we are left to conclude he was with him, or near him, during his entire stay in the mount; for he was with him when he came down. See chap. 32:17.

**Exodus, chapter 25**— What does the statement, "and the Lord spake to Moses, saying", indicate.? Direct and articulate manner in which the Lord made revelations to Moses. Shows it was by verbal utterances He made His will known to Moses, and by verbal inspiration Moses wrote that will.

What are outlines of this chapter? A command that Israelites should bring free-will offering of gold, silver, brass, blue, purple, scarlet, fine linen, goats' hair, rams' skins dyed red, badgers' skins, shittim wood, oil, spices, sweet incense, and certain kinds of stones; that of these a sanctuary should be made according to a certain pattern; then description is given of internal furnishings of the sanctuary.

Of what were those furnishings to consist? First, of a box or chest called an "ark", made of certain kind of wood, and overlaid inside and out with pure gold; 45 inches long, 27 inches wide, and 27 inches high (if we accept 18 inches as a cubit). It was to be finished with a crown of gold round about on top, and 4 rings in the 4 upper corners to receive 2 staves of wood and covered with gold, by which the ark could be carried.

What was the ark for? The place to keep the law of the Lord, called "the testimony". In Deut. 31:24-26 we learn more on this subject.

What else was Moses ordered to make? A mercy seat of pure gold, and a cherub (likeness of an angel) on each end, and faces of the cherubim were to be turned toward each other.

Are full dimensions of the mercy-seat and cherubim in the Divine record? No. Length and breadth of the mercy-seat are given, but not the height, depth, or thickness; neither are dimensions of the cherubim given. But the mercy-seat seems to have been intended a lid for the ark.

What else was Moses ordered to make? A table of certain dimensions on which what was called "show-bread" should be placed always.

How much bread and how often renewed? In Lev. 24th chap. we learn 12 cakes in 2

rows, with pure frankincense on each row, should be placed there every sabbath; which means the bread should be renewed every sabbath.

What else was Moses commanded to make? A gold candlestick of beaten work with 3 branches on each side of the shaft.

Are dimensions of the candlestick in the record? No. We are told it was to be of a talent of pure gold; but height of the shaft and length of the branches are not given.

Is anything in this chapter about the altar of incense? No.

Is it mentioned elsewhere? In chap. 37:25-28 record is given.

**Exodus, chap. 26**--What does the word "tabernacle" mean? A slightly built habitation, a tent; thus a temporary dwelling place.

What is said about the tabernacle God commanded Moses to make? He commanded him to make a tent of 10 curtains of fine-twined linen, each 42 feet in length and 6 feet in width, and all were to be coupled, together so as to make one tent or tabernacle, He was also required to make 11 curtains of goats' hair, each to be 3 feet longer than the curtains of fine-twined linen, but of same width. All goats' hair curtains were to be coupled together and used as covering for the tent of fine-twined linen. Next Moses was required to make a covering of rams' skins dyed red, then a covering of badgers' skins to be spread over the tent, or tabernacle. Thus the curtains of fine-twined linen made the top part of the tent, or tabernacle, and over that were 3 coverings: one of goats' hair, one of rams' skins and one of badgers' skins.

What of the sides of the tabernacle? They were to be of boards 15 feet long and 27 inches wide, set upright and held together and made firm by bars.

What then were dimensions of the tabernacle as indicated by the boards on the sides and on the west end? It was 45 feet long, 18 feet wide and 15 feet high. When the curtain of fine-twined linen was placed over the top of this board enclosure the tabernacle, or tent, was formed; then over the tabernacle thus formed 3 coverings were placed.

What else is in this chapter pertaining to the tabernacle? A vail of blue, purple and scarlet, and fine-twined linen, Was to be hung on hooks on 4 pillars set in 4 sockets of silver.

Where were the pillars to be set? Under the taches, or center couplings, of the top part of the tent. What is properly called the tent, or tabernacle, consisted of 10 curtains which were first coupled into 2 curtains, then these 2 were to be coupled by fastenings called "taches" which, when the curtain was spread, came in, or near the middle of the tent.

What was the vail for? To divide the tent into 2 apartments eared "the holy place and the most holy".

What apartment was "the most holy"? The west end of the tent.

What, was behind the vail in the most holy place? The ark of the testimony and the

mercy-seat placed on the ark. Then in Heb. 9:3, 4 we learn "the golden censer was there.

Where was the table of showbread placed? On north side of the tent "without the veil", or on north side and toward front of the tent.

Where was the golden candlestick placed? Opposite, the table of showbread and on south side of the tent "without the veil".

What about the door of the tent? A hanging like curtains of which the tabernacle consisted was ordered hung on 5 pillars of wood overlaid with gold and having sockets of brass. This was to be "the door of the tent".

Where was the golden altar, called 'altar of incense', placed in the tabernacle? Exact position may not seem altogether clear from writings of Moses. But Paul declares "the golden censer" was "after the second veil", thus in "the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all" (Heb. 9:3, 4). He also declares "the golden censer" was with "the ark of the covenant" Moses declared was in "the most holy" place.

What should we say if it be supposed "the golden altar" was in one place while "the golden censer" was in another? Our answer should be that the most holy place in the tabernacle represented Heaven. (See Heb. 9:7-9, 23, 24) Then in Rey. 8:1-5 we learn John saw the "golden altar" and "golden censer" together in Heaven. Such testimony should be sufficient, at least, to prevent preachers and others from confidently declaring the golden altar was in that apartment of the tabernacle in which the golden candlestick and table of showbread were placed.

**Exodus, chap. 27**-- What do, we find in this chapter? First we have the command to make 'the brazen altar', of wood and overlaid with brass.

What were its dimensions? It was to be 5 cubits square (7 ½ feet on each side) and 4 ½ feet high.

Where was this altar to be placed? Before the door of the tent, as we learn in chap. 40:6.

What was this altar for? In chap. 38:1 it is called "the altar of burnt offerings".

Is anything said in this chapter about the laver? No, but we read of it in chap. 30:18-21, and learn it was to be placed between the tent and the brazen altar.

What is in this chapter about "the court of the tabernacle"? It was to be 150 feet long, 75 feet wide, and consist of hangings-of fine-twined linen hung on pillars based on sockets of brass. The east side of the tabernacle court was to consist, of 2 hangings of 22 ½ feet each, hung on 6 pillars (3 pillars for each hanging). Then the gate of the court was ordered to consist of a hanging 30 feet in length hung on 4 pillars. Length of the court, was 150 feet, the width 75 feet, and the curtain which enclosed it was to be 7 ½ feet wide. The hanging of 30 feet was in the middle, and one of the others was hung on one side and the other on the other side of the east end. Everything was properly arranged so the tabernacle when set up would be a building of symmetry and beauty, foreshadowing spiritual harmony and excellence of the Church of Christ when in obedience to her only Head. The chapter closes with directions

concerning olive oil for the lamps.

**Exodus, chap. 28**--What do we find in this chapter? That God commanded Moses to make priestly garments for Aaron and his 4 sons; that the garments for Aaron, should be "for glory and beauty", consisting of a breastplate, and ephod (or sort of vest), a robe, a brodered coat, a mitre and a girdle; also that Moses should take 2 "onyx stones", on each of which the names of 6 tribes should be inscribed, and that they should be fastened on the shoulders of the ephod, or vest, worn by Aaron before the Lord when he would go into the tabernacle. Then we learn the breastplate was to be about 9 inches square, with 12 stones, set in 4 rows, fastened to it; that in each of those stones should be the name of a tribe of Israel, and that Aaron should bear them on his heart when he would minister in the priest's office.

What next do we learn? That the breastplate Aaron was to wear was called "the breastplate of judgment" and that in addition to the 12 stones there should be placed in that breastplate what was called "the Urim and Thummim", which words mean "light and perfection" through which the Lord was to be consulted; but what the "Urim and Thummim" consisted of is not recorded in the Bible. Finally we learn a plate of pure gold was to be made, and the words "Holiness to the Lord" were to be engraved on it; and that the plate should be fastened on the front of the mitre, or head dress, of the high priest, which he should wear while ministering before the Lord.

What is meant by the statement in v. 38 that "Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things"? We may learn by referring to Num. 17, 18 chaps., specially Num. 18:1. The Hebrew word in this connection, translated "iniquity", means "perverseness, crime, crime of the judges, "also punishment or infliction". As this word means "crime of the judges" it embraces the idea of official responsibility. The record given of priests resisting King Uzziah, in 2 Chron. 26:16-20, gives light on this subject. Priests were responsible for sanctity and order of all that pertained to tabernacle worship.

Was anything foreshadowed, or typified, by glory, and beauty of priestly garments we have been considering? According to Heb. 9th chap. the Jewish high, priest foreshadowed Christ; and, according to 1 Peter 2:5, 9, Jewish priests, not including the high priest, typified Christians, This being true we may conclude, in light of Rev. 19:8, that the garments of beauty and glory of the high priest referred to beauty and glory of the character of Christ; while garments of the common priests referred to character of Christians. Then by the light of Heb. 9:24 we may learn "the most holy-place" of the tabernacle typified Heaven; and this leaves us to conclude "the holy place" represented, or foreshadowed the Church.

**Exodus, chap. 29**---The subject of this chapter is the consecration of Aaron, brother of Moses, and 4 of his sons, to the priesthood for public worship of Israelites as a nation.

Of what officials did the priesthood consist? High priests and priests.

What difference between high priest and one simply a priest? Garments of the high priest were ordered to be different from those of ordinary priests. Besides, his official work was somewhat different. The high priest was required to burn incense on the golden altar each morning, and to make atonement on horns of that altar once a year with blood. See chap. 30:1-10 and Lev. 16:18.

How long were consecrating ceremonies? Seven days. How many kinds of offerings made in consecrating Aaron and his sons? This chapter informs that "a sin offering" was to be made and "a burnt offering", also "a wave offering" and "a heave offering".

What difference between wave offering and heave offering? Former was waved, or moved sidewise, before the Lord; but the latter was heaved, or moved up ward, before the Lord.

What is meant by the command to put blood on tip of the right ear, on thumb of the right hand, and on great toe of the right foot of those who should be priests? The reason is not explained, and we can see nothing in it except test of faith.

Suppose Moses presumed to put blood on both ears of those who should be priests? The Lord would have censured him for disobedience.

Suppose he pleaded the Lord did not forbid putting blood on both ears? The Lord would have needed to raise up another man to lead the Israelites.

**Exodus, chap. 30--** We find command to make shin, cense altar, how to make it, when to use it, and the purpose; regulations concerning numbering men of Israel from 20 years old and above; a command to make a laver of brass, put it in a certain place and use wit for a certain purpose. Also directions concerning anointing oil and tabernacle perfume.

Where was the incense altar to be placed? Before the vail by the ark, and before the ark, and before the mercy seat. So we learn by v. 6, also by chap. 40:5. In Heb. 9:3, 4 we learn "the golden censer", which be, longed to the incense altar (2 Chron. 26:16-19), was il the most holy place where the ark was.

How often was sweet incense to be burned on the golden altar? Once in the morning when the high priest dressed lamps of the golden candlestick in the holy place; and once in the evening when he ligated the lamps.

What shall we say of the idea that lamps in the tabernacle were divinely intended to burn constantly day and night? An error, as one may learn by reading chap. 27:20, 21; 30:7, 8; and Lev. 24:2, 3.

What shall we say of testimony of 1 Sam. 3:3 and 2 Chron. 13:11 on this subject? Such testimony implied that, in course of time, those lamps were only used for light for awhile in the evening.

Was this according to law? No, the law required they should be used to give light "from evening unto morning", which means the entire night, But it is mistake to suppose they were used for light during the day.

What is teaching of this chapter in regard to taking the number of the Israelites? When it would be done there should be a certain sum of money, 25 or 30 cents given for each one. That was called "a ransom", and implied that, if the mentioned sum was not given, there would be a plague among the people.



Was every individual required to give that much money? No, only those 20 years old and above.

Women as well as men? Only men were meant, judging by Num. 1:2; 26:2; 2 Sam. 24:9.

What does this chapter teach in regard to anointing oil? It was ordered made according to certain directions, and used only in a regard to religion. Priests and all furniture of the tabernacle were anointed with it, but it was not used for a common purpose.

What does anointing oil, as required by the law to be made and used, represent or foreshadow in the Gospel age? The Holy Spirit, as bestowed on Christ and all Christians. The Savior was anointed by the Spirit (Acts 10:38), all Inspired ones were anointed by the Spirit which taught what they needed to know (1 John 2:20, 27), and all who obeyed the Gospel received of the Spirit (Gal. 4:6). Besides, we have, in the Inspired words of the New Testament, result of the anointing which Apostles and certain Inspired evangelists received.

Does precaution against using anointing oil for common purposes mean anything special to us? Should forewarn mankind against stirring religious excitement by appeals to human emotions, then charging such excitement to the Holy Spirit.

Was perfume used in the tabernacle service intended to represent anything in the Gospel age? Yes, in Philip. 4:18 certain good deeds are mentioned as "an odor of sweet smell sacrifice:, acceptable, well-pleasing to God", and in Rev. 8:4 we find 'smoke of the incense' in connection "with prayers of the saints".

Should those in the Gospel age learn anything from precaution given Moses against using holy perfume for common purpose? Yes, we should thereby learn we should study the Bible with care in order to learn what we should pray for; thus avoid offering to God unscriptural prayers. We should also learn to avoid using prayer, praise and thanksgiving to God as arguments with men, for in so doing we would certainly make common and unscriptural use of those requirements.

**Exodus, chap. 31**--We learn the Lord told Moses He had called and gifted certain men, whom He named, for work of preparing all parts of the tabernacle and its furniture, with the priestly garments, anointing oil and holy perfume. We find also God told Moses he should command people of Israel to keep His sabbaths, and tell them reason for so doing. The chapter ends with statement that God gave Moses 2 tables of stone called "tables of testimony", "written with the finger of God".

Did God give any other people besides Israelites command to keep His sabbaths? No. The Lord said in the last part of this chapter the sabbath, or 7th day as a day of rest, was a "sign" between Him and the Israelites; but He has never told us it was a sign between Him and any other people.

Did God ever give special reason for commanding Israelites to keep the Sabbath? He did, as we learn by reading Deut. 5:15. It is therein recorded that He commanded them to keep the Sabbath because they were servants in the land of Egypt, and that God brot them out through a mighty hand and stretched-out arm.

Did sabbaths God commanded Israelites to keep foreshadow anything that pertains to the Gospel? In Col. 2:16, 17 we learn the sabbaths, or "sabbath days", 'are a shadow of things to come'.

What shall we say of those who contend Christians should observe a shadow? They "err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God", even as materialistic Sadducees erred (Mat. 22:29).

What should we say in answer to those who refer to Mat. 24:20, 21 as evidence that Christians should keep the Jewish Sabbath? We should refer them to Acts 1: 12 where "a sabbath day's journey" is mentioned, and show that while Jewish people were in control who ever would violate the Jewish idea of a "sabbath day's journey" would be liable to severe treatment. Then we should again quote Mat. 22:29.

But what should we say to those who refer to the fact that Paul frequently went into the synagogue of the Jews "on the sabbath day", as recorded in Acts 13: 14; 14:1, and other places? We should inform them that Jews who did not believe in Christ were accustomed to meet on the 7th day of the week in their synagogues, or places of worship, and Paul went there to preach Christ to them; even as a preacher of the Gospel would go to a Seventh Day Advent house on the 7th day of the week to find people of that faith gathered together, and make the truth known to them. Having given this answer we should again quote Mat. 22:29.

But what should we say if told the pope, or Roman Catholics, made the change from the 7th to the 1st day of the week? We should remind them of danger of stating what is not true; then inform them that the change was not made by Roman Catholics, nor by the pope, but was declared by Constantine, emperor of Rome, in A.D. 321, and only after Christians had made the change quite general by worshipping on the 1st day of the week. Again we should quote Mat. 22:25.

**Exodus, chap. 32** shows impatience on the part of the congregation because of the long time Moses remained in the mount; the demand the people made that Aaron should make them gods; making of the golden calf and worshipping it; Moses commanded by the Lord to go down from the mount; God's threat to destroy the people generally and make of Moses a great nation; Moses' prayer in their behalf; the prayer heard what Moses did when he arrived at the camp; what he said to Aaron, and the plea Aaron made for himself; death of 3,000 men; command of Moses that the people should consecrate themselves, his prayer to God in their behalf, and the Lord's answer.

What disposition did Moses show in his prayer for Israelites when God threatened to destroy them and make of him a great nation? Meekness; he showed he was not ambitious for greatness.

What is meant by the statement that "the Lord repented of the evil he thought to do to the people"? Changed His sentence. This idea of God's repenting is further set forth in Jer. 18:1-10.

But what disposition did Moses show when he came near the camp and saw the calf and the dancing? Showed his human nature by permitting his anger to control him so that he cast the tables of stone out of his hands and broke them. Thus before he knew personally of

iniquity of the people he pleaded for them; but when he had seen it he became angry and broke the tables of stone. This illustrates disposition of many Christians. They will plead for wrong doers while they have not seen wrongs done by them; but when they become personally acquainted with those wrongs they lose self-control.

Was Joshua with Moses during his stay in the mount? In chap. 24:13 we are informed they were together when Moses rose to go up into the mount, and in v. 17 we learn he was with Moses when he was coming down from the mount.

What reason did Aaron give for making the calf of gold? Said the people were "set on mischief".

Was that a sufficient reason? No, but it is the kind of reason timeserving leaders generally give for doing wrong.

Why were the Israelites set on mischief? They lacked faith, and as a result the record implies they, concluded Moses would never come down from the mount. Paul charged them with unbelief (Heb. 3:17-19).

**Exodus chap. 33** informs the Lord commanded Moses to go with the people to the land of promise; that He would send His angel with them but would not go up in midst of them lest He consume them in the way; also that the people mourned when they heard this, and no man put on his ornaments; Moses pitched the tabernacle without the camp, to which everyone resorted who sought the Lord; Moses went into the tabernacle and there the Lord spoke to him as a man speaks to his friend; likewise Moses requested the Lord to show him His glory, and was told no one could see God's face and live.

What tabernacle is referred to? The record doesn't inform us. The tabernacle God commanded Moses to make, setting up of which is mentioned in chap. 40, was not commenced 'til after Moses came down from the mount 2nd time. Therefore we are safe in concluding what is here called "the tabernacle" and "the tabernacle of the congregation" must have been a tent pitched by Moses between his 1st and 2nd ascent into the mount. Chap. 17:15 mentions an "altar" Moses built, and here chap. 33 mentions a "tabernacle" he pitched. As no explanation is given in the record Deut. 29:29 is suggested.

**Exodus chap. 34** sets forth that Moses was commanded to hew 2 tables of stone like those he had broken, and again ascend the mount; his obedience to the command, and what the Lord said to him in the mount about goodness, mercy, miracles and Divine jealousy; forewarning against idolatry, command to keep the Passover, to observe God's claim of the first-born, to observe the law concerning the Sabbath and the 3 feasts, and assurance that no one should desire the Israelites' land when they would go to the place of worship. To this is added a command not to offer blood of sacrifices with leaven, and to bring first fruits of the land to the Lord's name, and a command not to cook flesh of a kid in the milk of that kid's mother. The chapter ends with statement concerning appearance of Moses when he came down from the mount, and that he put a veil over his face when he spoke to the people but took it off when he spoke to the Lord.

Did Joshua go up into the mount with Moses where he went the 2nd time? No, he was commanded to ascend alone.

What special name does this chapter inform us God gave Himself? He said His name is "Jealous".

Did God require all first-born of mankind and beast-kind? He did not; He required only the first-born males. See chap. 13:12; 22:29; Deut. 15. 19.

What is in the New Testament about Moses putting a veil on his face? Paul mentions it in 2 Cor. 3:3-15 and speaks of it after a manner which indicates Israelites' blindness was determined at the time Moses came down from the mount the 2nd time. This implies making of the calf at Mt. Sinai was their fatal mistake as a nation, for by so doing they made it necessary for Moses to go up to God a 2nd time, and when he came down their eyes could not bear shining of his countenance. Then the veil Moses put over his face, according to Paul, meant a veil over their minds and hearts,--which means a beclouded condition of their thoughts and affections when reading the Old Testament.

What is the bearing of all this on us? It was written for our learning, and should serve as forewarning against all sin.

Have professed followers of Christ done anything which has had effect of veiling their minds and hearts? Yes, man-made religious creeds have generally had that effect on those who adopted them, and specially the doctrine that internal emotions or feelings of the fleshly heart produced by religious excitement and misapplication of Scripture are unerring evidences of pardon of sins and acceptance with God. This one doctrine has done more damage to the Protestant world than all others combined in preventing professed Christians and many others from reading the Bible and understanding it when read or heard. It is a foundation error.

**Exodus chap. 35** records what Moses said to the congregation when he came down from the mount the 2nd time, in regard to the Sabbath; and making free-will offerings for the tent, the tent covering, priestly garments, and all else pertaining to the tabernacle. Mention also of actual giving of materials required, and that certain wise-hearted women did their part of the work, likewise that certain men were failed with wisdom for their work.

Did the Lord bestow special wisdom for the work? In chap. 31:6 we learn the Lord put wisdom in all that were wise-hearted. This implies He selected those who had, by nature, and perhaps by experience, some ability for the work, and then, by special bestowments, He added to that ability. Materials for the tabernacle and its furniture, together with priestly garments, were furnished by the "willing hearted", and made into proper form by the "wise hearted".

By what other name was the tabernacle called? In Judges 18:31 and 20:26 it is called "the house of God".

Is the Church of God in the New Testament called "house of God"? In 1 Tim. 3:15 Paul writes of "the church" as "the house of God".

This being true, is there any resemblance in regard to furnishing and shaping of material for "the house of God" in the Jewish age and "the house of God" in the Gospel age? Yes. "The house of God" as established in the wilderness consisted of materials furnished by the

"willing hearted" and worked into proper form by the "wise hearted". Same is true of "the house of God" in the Gospel age. Those who become Christians surrender themselves to Christ, thus become "willing hearted", and are molded into proper form by teachings of apostles and evangelists, who were made "wise hearted" by the Holy Spirit that was bestowed on them.

**Exodus chap. 36** shows work of shaping material according to Divine directions, for the tabernacle, also that people were so "willing hearted" in giving that they brought more than was necessary, and needed to be, restrained from giving.

As all this was written for our learning (Rom. 15: 4), what should we learn from such? The lesson is that as Christians are "the house of God" in the Gospel age, they should all be liberal hearted in regard to everything pertaining to their spiritual welfare. Time and attention, energy and money, should be freely and abundantly expended to build ourselves up in the Truth and enlarge borders of "the house of God" which exists in the Gospel age. This "house" is not limited in regard to dimensions except as the world of mankind is limited. Therefore we cannot give more than is necessary to build "the house of God" in the Gospel age. Besides, as Christians we should be ashamed to permit such specimens of humanity as the Israelites in the wilderness were to excel us in liberality toward the house of God.

What is mentioned concerning sides of the tabernacle which is not elsewhere recorded? V. 33 states the middle bar was made to "shoot through the boards from one end to the other". There were 5 bars for the north side, 5 for the south side, and 5 for the west side, to hold the boards, of which the sides consisted, in position. Four of those bars on each side were to be placed in rings, but the middle bar for each side was made "to shoot through the boards from one end to the other". In order to permit this there must have been a mortise made through the middle of each board. What shall we say of artists who have drawn pictures of the tabernacle in form of an ordinary tent when stretched, having a ridge pole, stakes and cords? They have erred, "not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God" (Mat. 22:29). In chap. 35:18 and 88:20 we read of "cords" and "pins", but not of a ridge pole.

**Exodus chap. 37** gives account of making of the ark, and what pertained to it; also of the mercy seat and what pertained to it; likewise of the table for the bread, and what pertained to it; then an account of making of the candlestick, and all pertaining thereto; the incense altar; and the anointing oil.

What was the ark intended for? To contain the Divine testimony. According to chap. 25:16; 40:20 and Deut. 31:24-26, the ark was intended to be God's bookcase.

What was the mercy seat for? In chap. 25:22 we learn God promised to commune with His people from above the mercy-seat, from between the cherubim on the mercy seat. Thus we learn the Divine testimony was in the ark, the mercy seat was above the testimony, and from between the cherubim above the mercy seat God would speak to His people through the high priest

What is suggested by the fact that the mercy seat on the ark was above the Divine testimony in the ark? That mercy existed between God and strictness of His law, mentioned in Hos. 6:6; Mat. 9:13 and other scriptures, including Jas. 2:13.

What was the table of show bread for? The place for 12 cakes, prepared as directed in Lev. 24:5-7, which should be renewed once a week, or every Sabbath. When the old cakes were taken off the table then fresh ones were put on. The old cakes were eaten by the priests in the holy place of the tabernacle (Lev. 24:8,9)

What were candlesticks for? To give light in the tabernacle during the night, or "from evening to morning", as we learn in chap. 25:31-37; 30:7, 8.

What was the incense altar for? To burn incense on every morning and evening, and to put the blood of atonement on the horns of it once a year, as we learn in chap. 30:1-10.

And what was anointing oil for? To anoint the tabernacle and its furniture, likewise to anoint priests in consecrating them.

**Exodus chap. 38** tells of making what is called "the brazen altar" with all pertaining to it; the laver of brass and all pertaining to it; the outer court and all pertaining to it. Then states the amount of gold, silver and brass used in making the tabernacle and all that pertained to it.

What was the brazen altar intended for? Purpose indicated by its name and what pertained to it--recorded in first part of this chapter.

What is meant by "the looking glasses" in v. 8? Implied that certain women had brazen "looking glasses" or "mirrors", as the American Revised Version reads, and that of those "looking glasses" or "mirrors" were made the foot or base of the brazen laver.

**Exodus chap 39** mentions concerning making priestly garments and, when they were finished, then the tabernacle, its furniture, coverings and all else pertaining thereto were brought to Moses; also that he found everything according to directions he had given.

Were the Israelites in the wilderness favorably situated for doing fine work in gold, silver, brass, wood and cloth? No, everything was unfavorable.

What lesson should we learn from the fact that free work was done in the wilderness? When God desires special work accomplished he prepares men to do it.

What was the outward beauty of the tabernacle, with all pertaining to it, intended to foreshadow? Spiritual beauty of the Church, its services, and results. According to Heb. 9:23, 24, that which was behind the veil in the tabernacle, and services there attended to, referred to Heaven and to what Christ has there done and still does in our behalf.

**Exodus chap. 40** informs that the Lord commanded Moses to set up the tabernacle on the 1st day of the 1st month of the year, and that Moses did as he was commanded; likewise that when everything was done according to Divine directions the Divine approval was manifested by a cloud that covered the tent of the congregation, and that the Lord's glory filled the tabernacle so Moses was unable to enter. Then we are informed the cloud remaining on the tabernacle was sign for Israelites to remain where they were; but rising of the cloud was a sign for them to move onward. Finally we are informed the cloud was on the tabernacle in day time, and fire was on it by night, in presence of the congregation during

remainder of their time in the wilderness.

What did this mean to them? Constancy of God's care for them.

What teaching in the Gospel age was foreshadowed by God's care for Israelites? That which is stated in 1 Cor. 10:13, and the promise in Heb. 13:5, together with all other promises to Christians.

In what year after departure of Israelites from Egypt was the tabernacle set up? V. 17 informs it was set up in the 2nd year,—1st day of the 1st month of the 2nd year.

Of what period in history of the Israelites does the book of Exodus set forth information? Of the period between death of Joseph and time the tabernacle was set up. About 400 years.

**Leviticus chap. 1** directs regarding several kinds of burnt offerings.

Were these commanded? No, they were voluntary. Why were commands given concerning them? They were like vows (Num. 30),--not Divinely commanded, but Divinely regulated. It was no sin for an Israelite not to vow; but when a vow was made, and not annulled by one who had authority to annul it, then it was binding (Deut. 23,21, 22). Thus with the burnt offerings. If an Israelite decided in his mind, or purposed in his heart, to bring an offering that was to be burnt with fire, the Lord directed regarding what kind and quality it should be, and how offered.

What is meant by "flay" in v. 6? To skin, to take hide off.

Who was to put his hand on the head of the animal that was to be killed for a burnt offering? The man who brought the animal. He was to put one hand on its head, and with the other he was to kill it; that is, if the offering was of the herd or flock. But if the offering was a dove or young pigeon the priest should kill it.

How did the Lord regard such offering? He called it "a sweet savor unto the Lord".

Was it in any sense a sin offering? Not for any particular sin, but it was atonement in general for the one who offered it. Same was true of the daily, weekly, monthly, and other burnt offerings specially commanded (Exo. 29:42; Num. 28:3, 6, 10, 15, 24, 31). It was atonement for sin in general; not for particular sin.

What part of the New Testament does "sweet savor unto the Lord" suggest? Eph. 5:2.

**Leviticus chap. 2** directs concerning "meat offerings".

Did "meat" in such connection mean "flesh"? No, it meant food without flesh.

Was it voluntary or required? It was a free-will offering.

Was it to be burnt? The priest was to burn part of it, called a "memorial of it", and the

other part belonged to the priests.

Was it offered raw or cooked? In either condition it could be offered.

What is said about "leaven" and "honey" with meat offerings? There should be no leaven nor honey used in them, for neither leaven nor honey should be in any offering made by fire to the Lord.

Why not? See Deut. 29:29.

What is said about salt in connection with meat offerings? All such offerings should be seasoned with salt.

What in the New Testament does this suggest? Mark 9:49, 50; Col. 4:6.

What does this mean? Salt preserves by purifying, and is therefore mentioned by the Holy Spirit to illustrate Christians, in order to make acceptable offerings to God, must keep unspotted from the world, thus purged from corrupt speech and conduct. They should not tell lies, peddle slanders, repeat profane nor vulgar speech, nor be guilty of anything else corrupting or unbecoming.

**Leviticus chap. 3** sets forth law concerning "peace offerings".

What is meaning of "peace offering"? Chap. 7 shows it was an offering of thanksgiving, also for other purposes. Presenting peace offerings implied those presenting them were at peace with God.

What in the New Testament do such offerings suggest? Heb. 13:15, 16.  
What is said in this chapter about blood and fat? The Israelite was not permitted to eat either.

Were peace offerings required to be without blemish? Yes, like burnt offerings, they were to be unblemished.

What difference between a burnt offering and a peace offering? The former was required to be a male, but the latter might be male or female; the former was for atonement while the latter was not, but was for other purposes.

**Leviticus chap. 4** gives Divine regulations concerning sins of ignorance among Israelites.

How many regulations are given? Four:--what should be done when a priest sinned, and when the whole congregation sinned, and when a ruler sinned, and when one of the common people sinned.

Was the offering in each instance the same? No. For a priest and the entire congregation the offering was the same, but the requirement was different for a ruler, and further different for one of the common people who sinned.

What does the promise "and it shall be forgiven", in vs. 20, 26, 31, 35 mean? Just what it says.



Were sins really forgiven while the Jewish law was in force? Yes: the most evident meaning of the promise just referred to is that sins mentioned in this chapter were really forgiven when proper offerings were made in Divinely appointed manner.

Is there other evidence on the subject? Yes, in Deut. 21:8, 9 we find directions by which guilt of innocent blood was to be "forgiven". Then in Num. 14:19,20 God declared He pardoned" Israelites according to Moses' word.

But did not God declare those men He pardoned should not see the land of promise? Yes, but He overthrew them because of other sins they afterward committed.

Is there other testimony in this direction? In Psa. 103:3 David spoke of God forgiving iniquities; then up Mat 9:2 also Luke, 7:47 we learn of actual forgiveness of sins while the Jewish law was still in force.

What then is meant by Heb. 10:1-3? Paul meant just what he said. To forgive does not include purging the conscience, nor making perfect, nor even forgetting. There was no spiritual value in blood of animals when not connected with Christ. But those animals offered to God, according to His own Divine appointment, in the 1st and 2nd religious ages, were of great religious value by reason of their relation to Christ. During those ages the life of the appointed sacrifices was accepted instead of the life of the sinner, and was accepted in view of Christ-wife was Divinely ordained to come, in fulness of time, and die in behalf of sins of the world.

What should we say of those who deny sins were pardoned before Christ died on the Cross, or before the Holy Spirit descended on the day of Pentecost mentioned in Acts 2? We should refer them to Mat. 22:29. Some speak of sins "rolled forward" during Patriarchal and Jewish ages, but without Divine authority they speak thus.

**Leviticus chapter 5** gives law concerning hearing swearing and not reporting it; touching that which defiled an Israelite; actual swearing; and trespassing in regard to holy things.

Was the same offering required of all persons guilty of any offenses just mentioned? No. In regard to most of them the offering required was varied according to poverty of the transgressor.

Did the Lord hold an Israelite responsible for sins committed in ignorance or committed unintentionally? He did, and required an offering for such sins when the erring Israelite became aware of what he had done that the law condemned.

What in the New Testament harmonizes with such responsibility? Luke 12:48 states the servant who did not know his master's will, but committed things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. Thus neither the Jewish law nor the Gospel of Christ encourages ignorance. Some degree of punishment is divinely ordained against those who sin through ignorance.

**Leviticus chap. 6** sets forth laws concerning willful trespassing; burnt offerings, and why they were called by that name; the meat offering of the people; meat offering of Aaron and his sons in the day of his anointing; place of killing burnt and sin offerings; also concerning

the vessel in which a sin offering was cooked; and the exception in regard to the sin offering of which blood is taken into the holy place.

What was required of an Israelite who trespassed in regard to something committed to him, or something he had found? He was required to restore the thing itself, and add a 5th part to it in settling with the one to whom it pertained; and he was then to bring to the priest the trespass offering the Lord required, in order that it might be offered in his behalf.

What is said about the "burnt offering"? That offering is so called "because of the burning on the altar", which should be so constant that the fire should "never go out".

What difference between the meat offering presented to the Lord by one of the common people and that offered by Aaron and his sons in the day when Aaron was anointed, or when one of his sons was anointed to succeed him in his office? In the former instance part of the offering was ordered to be burnt, while the remainder was to be eaten by Aaron and his sons; but in the latter case the offering was to be entirely burnt.

What difference between sin offerings generally and the sin offering of which blood was brought into the holy (most holy) place to make reconciliation? In the former instance priests should eat the sin offering in the holy place; but in the latter the offering should be wholly burnt. This last statement is made evident by what is recorded in chap. 4.

What should we learn from the many and specific requirements of the Jewish law? That God intended to teach strict obedience by means of them.

**Leviticus chap. 7** sets forth command to kill the trespass offering in the same place where the sin offering was killed, to burn certain parts, and for Aaron and his sons to eat other parts; also that the priests should have all meat offerings and peace offerings except parts chaps. 2, 3 required offered to the Lord. Then special directions are recorded in regard to time of eating flesh of the peace offering, also mention of sanctity of such flesh. Next we find command not to eat the fat of ox, sheep or goat, and directions in regard to the fat of what died of itself, and the fat of an offering. Eating blood was again forbidden, then directions that whoever would make a peace offering should bring it with his own hands, and concerning what the priest should do in making that offering.

**Leviticus chap. 8** records that Moses was commanded to take Aaron and his sons and consecrate them to the priesthood; how he was to consecrate them; and that he obeyed the commands.

What was the procedure? Aaron and his sons were brought to the door of the tabernacle, washed with water and clothed in priestly garments provided by Divine directions. Then the anointing oil was used on the tabernacle and its furniture, also on Aaron. Next a bullock was offered after prescribed manner, then a ram was offered, then a wave offering was wholly burnt. The anointing oil and certain blood were next sprinkled on Aaron and his sons, and provision made for them to eat; and the command for them to remain in the tabernacle 7 days, the period of consecration.

**Leviticus chap. 9** says Aaron and his sons, after they had been consecrated, were required to offer sin and burnt offerings for themselves, also that the people should make such

offerings, likewise peace and meat offerings. Then Aaron lifted his hand and blest the people, and came down from making these offerings; also he and Moses went into the tabernacle, came out and blest the people; then fire came out from before the Lord and consumed the burnt offering. Finally we learn when the people saw the fire they shouted and fell on their faces.

**Leviticus chap. 10** records sin of Nadab and Abihu, and their death; the command to their brothers not to mourn for them, but that the congregation should bewail the burning the Lord kindled; the command forbidding Aaron and his sons to drink wine or strong drink when they would go into the tabernacle, but that they should put difference between holy and unholy, between unclean and clean. Then directions Moses gave to Eleazar and Ithamar, sons of Aaron, are next recorded, and record of a misunderstanding between Moses and Aaron, is also found.

What is meant by bearing "the iniquity of the congregation", in this connection? The words, "to make atonement for them before the Lord", implies that because priests made offerings for the people, thus stood between the people and the Lord, they were spoken of as bearing "the iniquity of the congregation".

What was the kind of sin Nadab and Abihu committed? Strictly doctrinal.

What should this teach us? That doctrinal sins are as dangerous as any other kind.

Where should Nadab and Abihu have secured the fire for burning incense? According to chap. 16:12, also Num. 16:46, they should have taken fire from off the altar of the Lord. But, instead, they took fire from another place,--for they were charged with offering "strange fire before the Lord, which He commanded them not".

What characters, living under the Gospel age, were foreshadowed by Nadab and Abihu when they acted the part of disobedient priests? Those professed Christians who try religious experiments, and so-called expedients, who are presumptuous, and try to substitute their own devices for Divine appointments.

What lesson should we learn from the case of Nadab and Abihu? Not to trifle with God's requirements.

Was it wrong for Nadab and Abihu to offer incense, or was the offering of incense to be always made by the high priest? 1 Chron. 23:13 implies Aaron and his sons were "to burn incense before the Lord"; thus the sin of Nadab and Abihu consisted, as the text declares, in offering "strange fire before the Lord". Luke 1:9 implies it was the duty of any officiating priest to offer incense.

What was typified by offering of incense in the most holy place of the tabernacle, and of the temple? Rev. 8:3, 4 informs that offering incense under the law typified prayers of the saints, and their acceptance in Heaven.

**Leviticus chap. 11** records legal distinction between clean and unclean animals; legal defilement of everything on which certain creeping things fell, when dead; also what should be done in case of such legal defilement.

Was distinction between clean and unclean animals set forth before the law was given to the Israelites? Yes, according to Gen. 7:2, 3; 8:20, that distinction was understood by Noah.

Was it based on habits of animals? No; the hare is a cleanly animal, but was pronounced unclean because he has a paw instead of a cloven hoof.

What was taught by the law of meats? Obedience by faith, not by reason.

What other end was intended to be accomplished by that law? Separation of Israelites from all other people in eating.

Was that important? Yes; when people eat together they are liable to be partakers of each other's manners and customs.

Did the Lord give special reason for his law? Yes, in vs. 44, 45 He said, "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy".

**Leviticus chap. 12** sets forth law given through Moses in regard to legal purification of women after childbirth, also law concerning circumcision of the man child.

Was variation to be made in regard to the offering required of a poor woman? There was.

What shall we say about time a woman was regarded as legally unclean after childbirth? It manifests Divine wisdom and mercy toward mothers, thus toward all their other children that should be born.

**Leviticus chap. 13** shows laws concerning leprosy in persons, in houses, and in garments; how to discern leprosy; what should be done with the leper, what he should do while afflicted with leprosy; also what should be done to a leprous garment.

Is there Scripture for the idea that leprosy is a type of sin? No. There are resemblances or similarities between leprosy and sin, but no evidence of type and anti-type.

What was appearance of leprosy in mankind? It was a white, reddish rising on the skin, and deeper than the skin.

What was its appearance in a garment? Sometimes greenish, and sometimes reddish, and was a growth that would spread. A garment thus polluted was ordered burned.

**Leviticus chap. 14** gives law concerning legal cleansing of a leprous person; also law in regard to detecting leprosy in a house, and what should be done with a house pronounced leprous; likewise law in regard to legal cleansing of a house healed of leprosy.

What should Israelites have learned by ceremonies required in legal cleansings and purifications? God's reason for the law He gave in regard to clean and unclean meats: "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy" (chap. 11:44, 45).

Was favor shown a poor man who came to be legally cleansed from leprosy? If he could

not "get so much" as was required, he could bring certain other offerings.

What should we say to those who endeavor to show by what is said about dipping a live bird, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop, in blood of a dead bird, in v. 6, that "dip" does not necessarily mean to put under, or cover over,--as all those things could not be put under blood of one bird? We should show it is said in v. 51 the dipping was to be done "in the blood of the slain bird, and in the running water". This shows the slain bird was killed over running water, and the dipping was done in the water as well as in blood of the slain bird.

What else may we learn by considering this subject? That it is unfair and dangerous to take a single passage of Scripture on any subject and base a conclusion thereon without considering all else the Bible says on that subject.

But who are they that know all that is in the Bible on any subject? Only those who have studied the whole Bible until they are acquainted with all its outlines; then have studied subjects in light of all those outlines.

**Leviticus chapter 15** sets forth laws to be observed by Israelites in regard to ceremonial cleansings from a running sore, or any other kind of an issue; the law in regard to washing, or bathing, their flesh, to be cleansed from other uncleanness.

What was the Divine reason for such formal cleansings? No reason given in the Old Testament except that God intended Israelites to be unto Him "a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation" (Exo. 19:6), also the reason mentioned in chap. 11:44, 45 of this book. But in the New Testament Christians are called "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people" (1 Pet. 2:9). From this we learn Israel according to the flesh was a type of Israel according to the Spirit, otherwise called Christians. Thus we learn personal cleanliness required by the Jewish law foreshadowed spiritual cleanliness required by the Gospel.

**Leviticus chap. 16** gives directions to the high priest in regard to going into the holiest place of the tabernacle, also in regard to yearly atonement for himself, for all priests, for all the people, for the tabernacle, the altar, and for the holy sanctuary.

What was meaning of such atonement? Verse 16 states the atonement should be "for the holy place because of uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of transgressions in all their sins"; also that the high priest should make atonement "for the tabernacle of the congregation" that remained "among them in midst of their uncleanness". This implies that even the tabernacle was, in some sense, contaminated with uncleanness of the congregation. Nor is this unreasonable in view of the fact that from 3 to 4 millions of people were encamped about the tabernacle, in some instances, for months in succession. Besides, there was probably, at all times, some secret violation of parts of the Divine law; and for those guilty thereof general atonement was made. It was somewhat on this principle Job made offerings for his children. (See Job 1:5.) But in Heb. 10:1-3 we learn the yearly atonement, made under the law, was in order to make "remembrance" "of sins every year"; signifying it was "not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins"; also by the high priest going alone "once every year" within the vail of the tabernacle with "blood which he offered for himself and for errors of the people", the Holy Spirit signified "the way into the holiest of all (heaven--Heb. 9:24) was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle

was yet standing" (Heb. 9:7, 8).

What should the high priest have learned by the command to put on linen breeches and other garments the Lord required when he officiated before Him? He should have learned everything pertaining to religion was sacred.

As that was true in the religion of types and shadows, how should we regard the religion of substance --the gospel of Christ? We should be filled with highest reverence and deepest humility when we talk of the Gospel or, in any respect, consider any and every part thereof.

What did the scapegoat mean to Israelites? Verse 10 informs he was intended for "an atonement".

And was the goat that was killed intended for the same? It was, judging by vs. 15, 16. Thus one goat was slain to "make atonement for the holy place because of uncleanness of children of Israel, and because of transgressions in all their sins"; and the other goat was left alive to "bear on him all their iniquities to a land not inhabited", as we learn in vs. 21, 22.

Did those goats foreshadow anything that belongs to the Gospel age? Yes, they foreshadowed forgiving and forgetting mentioned in Heb. 8:12, accomplished by Christ's death for our offenses and His resurrection for our justification (Rom. 4:25).

**Leviticus chap. 17** records forewarnings against killing animals intended for sacrifice anywhere than at the door of the tabernacle, in order to avoid customs of the heathen; also forewarnings against eating blood emphasized and explained.

What is meant in v. 7 by what is stated about offering "sacrifices to devils"? Explained in Deut. 32:17 also in 1 Cor. 10:20. Those scriptures teach the devil is behind and in all idolatry; thus when mankind have so far turned from God that they worship idols, they worship devils.

Is idolatry possible except what is outward and formal? Yes, in Ezek. 14 we learn certain men "set up idols in their heart".

Can mankind do that now? All are guilty of so doing who permit anything to come between themselves and that which God and Christ require, whether a man-made religious creed, confession of faith, book of humanly arranged religious covenants, human society, musical instruments, or anything persons set up in their hearts that will keep them from obeying the Gospel, or from endeavoring to maintain unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

What is meant by the law forbidding the Israelite to kill an offering except at door of the tabernacle? Verses 3, 4 imply if an Israelite killed any kind of animal lawful for sacrifice at any other place, and didn't bring it to the door of the tabernacle to make offering to the Lord, he should be guilty as though he had shed blood unlawfully. But that law seemed only to have applied while Israelites were encamped as a congregation; for in Deut. 12 we learn after they would enter their own land they might kill animals and eat flesh in all their gates. That is to say, they should, after entering their land, bring all religious offerings to the place God would choose; but for their own eating they might kill and eat in all their gates. Specially mentioned in Deut. 12:10-15.

What would have been result among physicians if they had read the Bible concerning blood of the flesh? They would not have been murderers of their patients by undue use of the lancet during 2,000 years or more. Not knowing the blood is the life of the flesh, they practiced blood-letting; thus took the life out of the body in order to keep life in the body!?

What is their theory now? Keep the blood in the body and endeavor to purify it. This is in harmony with the Bible, and shows whenever that which is called "science" is right it is according to God's written word.

**Leviticus chap. 18** records statutes against unlawful marriages, also against sodomy and buggery. For meaning of these words see unabridged dictionary. What is here said about doings of the Egyptians and Canaanites? Israelites should not practice them.

Did any of these laws prevent a man from marrying his sister, and even his half-sister? Yes.

How would this have affected Abraham, whose first wife, we learn in Gen. 20:12, was his half-sister? It would have condemned him. But this law was not then given and, in view of Rom. 4:15 and 5:13, Abraham was not condemned. This case also shows meaning of Rom. 7:9.

Is anything in this chapter against cousins marrying? No.

Does the New Testament set forth teaching on this subject? No.

Then is it wrong for cousins to marry? No, it is not religiously wrong except where civil law is against it.

Why is civil law against it in several States? Because the State is interested in health of its citizens, and many demonstrations show that for cousins to marry is dangerous to off-spring, specially if cousins who marry be of similar temperaments.

Is it not dangerous to off-spring for those of similar temperaments to marry, even if they be not of same family relationship? Yes. Many instances show such parents often produce off-spring below themselves in physical and mental vigor. On the other hand, parents of opposite temperaments often produce children above themselves in physical and mental vigor. This subject should be studied by all who intend to marry and rear children.

**Leviticus chap. 19** commands to be holy because God is holy; to honor parents, and turn from idols; concerning peace offerings, reaping and gleaning; stealing, swearing, and defrauding (forbidden). Special statement against mistreating the deaf and blind against respecting the poor and honoring the mighty in administering justice. Special legislation likewise against tale bearing, hating a brother, suffering sin to rest on a neighbor without telling him of it; against bearing grudge against an Israelite, and in favor of loving the neighbor; also a statute against mingling cattle of different kinds, sowing mingled seeds, and wearing a garment made of mingled material; likewise law against mistreatment of a bondmaid, law concerning fruit of young orchards, repetition of the law against eating blood, a law concerning hair and beard, also against making marks on the flesh. Finally we find law

against prostitution of a Hebrew daughter; law concerning the Sabbath briefly repeated; law against witchcraft and spiritualism; law concerning treatment of aged people, also, treatment of strangers; and law against all unjust measures, weights and balances.

What should we learn from the law against cursing the deaf and putting a stumbling block before the blind? Christians should not plot and plan in secret against any one, specially their own brethren, for evil; also they should be careful to learn the truth so they may direct aright those spiritually blind because they do not know the truth.

What effect would v. 15 have on judges and juries of civil courts if they would observe it at all times? It would cause them to disregard the plea of poverty, also influence of money, in such courts.

What reason did God give Israelites for being kind to strangers? The fact that they were strangers in Egypt.

What reason did He give for the command to be just in all matter of business, and why they should obey all His commands? He said, "I am the Lord your God who brought you out of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes and judgments, to do them. I am the Lord".

What should we learn from such reasons? That we should obey all the Savior's commands that are given us, just as He has given them; and because He died, was buried, arose and ascended to Heaven, in our behalf. Sufficient reason for all obedience Christ has required.

**Leviticus chapter 20** legislates concerning capital punishment for offering a child to a heathen god called Molech, and punishment pronounced against Israelites who would not inform on a man who gave a child to Molech; capital punishment for being what is now called a Spiritualist, or going after Spiritualism; for cursing father or mother, for adultery and other offenses; excommunication and other punishments for other offenses. Also command for Israelites to be holy because God is holy, and because he separated them from all others, that they should be his people.

What is meant by "spue you not out" in v. 22? Explained by chap. 18:25-28.

Is such doctrine taught in the New Testament? The Savior threatened to "spue" Laodicea church out of his mouth for sin of lukewarmness, as we learn in Re?. 3:14-19.

What should we learn from such teaching? That God was displeased with every kind of iniquity in his ancient people, and that he will reject Christians for sin of lukewarmness.

What effect should this teaching have on Christians? Should cause them to struggle every day to be wholehearted in devotion to God and Christ.

In vs. 20,21 we find the Divine judgment, "they shall die childless", pronounced against certain wrongdoers. Would that be regarded as a Divine judgment or Divine blessing in this generation? Judging from results, many would regard it as a Divine blessing.



Has the command given to the first husband and wife to "be fruitful and multiply" been recalled or modified? No; except in cases of physical incapability God intends that command to be obeyed in the marriage relation. It is as binding as the command to subdue the earth, and to have dominion over lower orders of creation.

What causes so much tampering with nature's laws in the marriage relation, specially in higher circles of society? Pride, or a wish, on the part of wives, to move around in society.

Who was the first proud being in the universe. 1 Tim. 3:6 implies it was the Devil.

What does this imply concerning those who suffer themselves to be actuated by "pride"? They are in danger of suffering condemnation pronounced on the Devil.

**Leviticus chap. 21** teaches dignity and sanctity of the priestly character, specially the character of the high priest.

What is meant by defiling one's self for the dead? Showing such signs of mourning as were customary at that time.

Were common priests permitted to show signs of mourning for death of mother, father and other near kin? Yes, but they should not profane themselves by making baldness on their head, nor shaving off the corner of their beard, nor making cuttings in their flesh.

What is said about the high priest, in regard to mourning for the dead, or going in to a dead body? He should not, even for his dead father or mother.

What of physical outlines of those chosen for the priesthood? They should be complete in person, and nothing should be superfluous, nor deformed.

What does such teaching foreshadow in regard to Christians who constitute a spiritual priesthood? We should be complete in spiritual character; but should have nothing superfluous, no be spiritually deformed.

How may we develop such character? By taking all instruction given us in the Bible, then making all use of it that the Lord intends. By so doing we shall develop characters acceptable before God.

What should we say of human religious creeds, societies and musical instruments in connection with religious worship? They are superfluous things, and need of them is never felt by those who make Divinely intended use of all that is in the Bible. It would not be more irreverent to imagine need for another organ in the human body, or another element in nature, than to imagine need of something more in religion than the Gospel requires.

**Leviticus chap. 22** regulates eating of holy things by priests and their families; what a man should do who was not of the priesthood but ate of holy things unknowingly; that all burnt offerings and peace offerings made to accomplish a vow should be perfect, or without blemish; but that as "a free-will offering" a blemished animal might be offered,--though not for a vow, nor a burnt offering. To kill a cow and her calf the same day was forbidden, and regulations concerning "a sacrifice of thanksgiving" were given.

What was Divine purpose in giving so many and such minute details in his law? God said of himself: "I will be hallowed among the children of Israel; I am the Lord who hallow you, that brought you out of the land of Egypt to be your God: I am the Lord". For these reasons He gave the kind and number of laws we find recorded in Moses' writings, and we can understand they tested faith.

What can we see in the fact that God told Israelites they might offer a defective or blemished animal for a "free-will offering"? A mercy toward us, for all our offerings, even offerings we make of ourselves, are free-will offerings, and they are all defective or blemished or imperfect. "Free-will offerings" made by Jews more nearly foreshadowed our offerings than any others made by them. Those offerings that referred specially to Christ's offering of himself "without spot to God" (Heb. 9:14) were by necessity required to be unblemished. But our offerings are all blemished.

**Leviticus chap. 23** sets forth Divine commands regarding the weekly sabbath, 3 yearly feasts, and several sabbaths in connection with those feasts.

What time in the year was the first feast ordered to be kept? The first was the feast of unleavened Bread, introduced by eating the Passover in the night of the 14th day of the 1st month, and continued over the 21st day of the same month. The 15th, day of that month one sabbath was kept, and another was kept on the 21st day.

What was time of the 2nd feast? Began 50 days after 2nd day of the 1st feast, and was called Pentecost because that word means 50. The same feast was otherwise called "feast of weeks". The 1st day of that feast there was to be "a holy convocation" eared a "sabbath".

What time in the year was the 3rd feast? It was ordered to begin on 1st day of the 7th month and continue over 22nd day of the same month. Was introduced by blowing of trumpets and a "holy convocation" called a "sabbath"; then the 10th day of the same month was "a day of atonement" called a "sabbath"; next, on 15th day of the same month, began "the feast of tabernacles" with a "holy convocation" ordered to continue 7 days; then on the 8th day of that feast was another holy convocation commanded.

With what month of the Roman calendar that we use did the Jewish year begin? With April; thus the Passover was eaten in evening of April 14; and the Feast of Weeks, or Pentecost, was on June, 6; and the Feast of Tabernacles began on 15th day of the 7th month of the Jewish calendar, which means October in ours. That feast was preceded by 14 days of offering sacrifices to which no name is definitely given in the law. It was a period of worship introduced by blowing of trumpets. On the 7th day of that period "a holy convocation" was to be held, and on the 10th day was to be another "holy convocation", likewise on the 15th day of the same month. (See Num. 29.)

**Leviticus chap. 24** gives directions concerning olive oil and the lamps to burn in the tabernacle from evening 'til morning; instructions then concerning 12 cakes of bread placed in 2 rows on the table of show-bread in the tabernacle, and renewed every sabbath; mention then of striving of a man of Israel with son of an Egyptian, in course of which the son of the Egyptian cursed and blasphemed; and for his offense was stoned to death. Statement then of Divine law concerning blasphemy, murder, killing another man's beast, causing blemish on a neighbor, and that the law should be the: same for a stranger and for one of the Israelites,

in regard to trespasses and injuries.

**Leviticus chap. 25** records concerning the sabbath for the land, and the year of jubilee for the Jewish nation.

How often should the land rest? Every 7th year.

How often was the year of jubilee ordained to be? Every 50 years.

By what other name is the 7th year called? The year of "release" and "the Lord's release". (See Deut. 15:1 and 31:10.)

Why so called? Because it was the year when every creditor among Israelites was required to 'release' what his neighbor, an Israelite, owed him.

What was: the law concerning the year of jubilee? It was that land outside of walled cities could not be sold forever; but only 'til the year of jubilee.

What about walled cities? In them permanent transfer could be made after a full year had been given for redeeming real estate: which had been sold. But there was exception to this law in favor of a Levite. He might redeem, at any time, a possession he had sold in a walled city; and if he did not redeem it before the year of jubilee, it should then be returned to him.

Did the year of jubilee affect case of a Hebrew servant? Yes; it released hire.

What effect did the year of jubilee have on real estate outside walled cities? Prevented land monopolies.

Could land sold by one Israelite to another outside walled cities be redeemed at any time? It could by paying back the price required by the law.

Did the Divine law regulate price of such land? It did, in that it required deduction in the selling price named by the one who bought it, corresponding to time he held it. For instance if he bought land for \$1,000 ten years before, the year of jubilee the price of the land to the purchaser was \$100 a year, Then if one came to redeem it, 1, 2 or 3 years later, the price should be reduced 1, 2 or 3 hundred dollars, according to number of years the purchaser had held it.

What shall we say of such law? Fair to all, and merciful to the poor.

Would such law be wholesome in any country and age? Yes, it would do more to prevent monopolies than any law man has framed. Besides, if parents be unfortunate and lose their real estate, such law would give it to their children in the year of jubilee, thus give them chance to hold it.

**Leviticus chap. 26** commands against idolatrous images; command to keep sabbaths and reverence the sanctuary; promise to give regularity of rain, abundant crops, and safety from enemies,--on condition of obedience to Divine laws. Then, promise of Divine presence among Israelites if their obedience would be constant; also threat of terror, of consumption

and burning ague, and ruin by their enemies, if they'd turn from Divine statutes. God even threatened he'd punish them 7-fold for their sins, so that they'd eat flesh of their children; and that He'd scatter them among the heathen so as to let the land rest. The last of this chapter promises mercy.

What's meant by the threat to make the heaven of Israelites as iron and their earth as brass? That God wouldn't hear their prayers; and the earth wouldn't open to receive them, but that they should live, and suffer Divine vengeance. Deut. 28:23 gives same idea somewhat varied, and 1 Sam. 28:6 gives instance in which that idea was fulfilled, specially if the entire chapter be considered.

What is meant by v. 26 of this chapter? That breadstuffs would be so scarce one oven would be sufficient to bake all bread that 10 women would have flour or meal to bake.

But what did the Lord say he'd do for his people, even when scattered among the heathen, if they'd repent? Promised to remember his covenant with their fathers. Leviticus chap. 27 regulates concerning vows.

What's meant by "singular vow"? Connection implies it was, first, a personal vow, or a vow of one's person at an estimated price; and, next, a vow could be made concerning a beast, clean or unclean; also in regard to a house, or a field.

What was meaning of such vow? Meant that the, person or thing vowed should "be for the Lord" and "most holy unto the Lord".

Could that which was vowed to the Lord be redeemed? If the vowed or sanctified object was a person, a monied valuation was placed on that person, which implies possibility of redemption. But if the object vowed was a clean beast there could be no redemption. See also v. 29. If, however, the vowed object was an unclean beast, a house or a field, it could be redeemed by adding a 5th part to the priest's valuation of it when it was vowed.

Were vows commanded? No, they were voluntary; but when made they were Divinely required to be kept. Deut. 23:21, 22 informs it wasn't sinful to forbear making a vow, but when a vow was made it couldn't be recalled. Eccl. 5:4, 5 teaches the, same.

Could an Israelite vow firstlings of beasts? No, nor 1st-born males. The Lord claimed all of them. In Ex. 13:12 that claim was first recorded, and in v. 26 of this chapter it is mentioned. But the word "devoted" had stronger meaning than "vowed". (See vs. 28:29.)

**Numbers chapter 1**-- The record in this book of 2-fold numbering of men able to serve as soldiers in the army of Israelites, entitles it to its name.

When was Moses commanded to make the 1st numbering? Chap. 7 informs it was on the 1st day of the 2nd month of the 2nd year after Israelites left Egypt.

What is meant by "polls" in the last of v. 2? Means heads, or chief men. Evident by v. 4: "And with you shall be a man of every tribe; every one head of the house of his fathers".

One man was named head of each tribe.

Which tribe was greatest in number? Judah. Which was next? Dan.

Which was smallest? Manasseh.

What was number of the entire army? 603,550. What does that number of soldiers imply concerning number of the entire congregation of Israel? That they were over 3 millions--perhaps 4 millions.

Was the tribe of Levi then numbered? No. God separated that tribe from the others, to serve him in the priesthood, and its men were exempt from war.

Has that exemption affected modern customs? Preachers of all religious bodies are exempt from drafts to serve in wars in many, if not all lands where the Bible is generally acknowledged as God's written revelation to man.

**Numbers chap. 2** sets forth God's arrangement of 3 tribes on each of the 4 sides of the tabernacle.

Were those tribes to encamp near the tabernacle? No.

Who were to encamp near the tabernacle and round about it? In latter part of the previous chapter we learn the Levites were required to be nearest the tabernacle.

What does such arrangement indicate? Is in harmony with all else beheld by mankind in the universe, namely, God's desire for order.

Was God ever author of confusion? He was at the tower of Babel, mentioned in Gen. 11, and he has been on other occasions when justice required him to send judgment of confusion on his enemies. But he is not author of confusion in his church (1 Cor. 14:33).

**Numbers chap. 3** informs of God's directions concerning Levites, and the charge to be given them in regard to the tabernacle; also that males of that tribe should be numbered, from a month old and upward, and that the Lord would claim them as his own instead of 1st-born males of all other tribes. Sons of Levi are also mentioned, and number of males from a month old and: upward in age. Then it is stated the Lord would require cattle of Levites instead of 1st-born males of cattle among the 12 tribes.

Were male Levites from a month old and upward equal in number to 1st'born males of the other tribes? No. There were lacking on the part of Levites 273.

What was done in behalf of those Israelites not redeemed by Levites? They were redeemed by money--about \$3 for each.

Why did the Lord claim 1st-born males of both man and beast? In Exo. 13, specially vs. 2, 12, we find the fact stated, then following v. 12 we find the reason.

**Numbers chap. 4** gives God's directions concerning distribution of work and its

responsibility among Levites.

Between what ages were they to be chosen to minister before the Lord and attend to other service concerning the tabernacle? From 30 to 50 years of age.

What do directions here indicate? That God desired everything connected with the tabernacle attended to decently and in order.

Is that His arrangement in regard to the Church in the Gospel age? It is. Elders, otherwise called over seers or bishops, have their work, and Deacons have theirs, indicated, though not entirely separated from work of Elders, nor is that of Elders entirely separated from that of Deacons.

**Numbers chap. 5** cites command to cleanse the camp of lepers and others legally unclean because God dwelt in the camp; the law concerning trespass; and the law concerning jealousy on the part of a man toward his wife.

What were Divine directions concerning cleansing of the camp intended to teach Israelites? God's holiness, and that his people should be holy, set forth in Lev. 19:2 and 20:7 and 21:8.

What should it teach us? Should at least impress on our minds what is in 1 Cor. 3:16, 17 in regard to the Church being God's dwelling place by his Spirit, and importance of keeping the Church pure.

Is the doctrine of personal holiness taught in the New Testament? In Heb. 12:14 we read, "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord". Again, in 1 Peter 1:16 the Lord says, "Be ye holy; for I am holy".

What should we conclude in regard to law respecting trespass? Should have taught Israelites all trespassing was costly for them and beneficial to the one against whom the trespass was committed.

Is not all wrongdoing costly business? Prov. 13:15 sets forth truth of universal application on the subject.

And what shall we conclude concerning Divine law to Israelites in regard to jealousy on the part of a man? It was just toward the guilty and merciful toward the innocent.

Is not this true of all laws God has given for guidance of mankind? Could not be otherwise. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" This question of Abraham in Gen. 18:25 implies what is always true concerning the Creator, Preserver and Benefactor of mankind. "As for God, his way is perfect; the word of the Lord is tried; he is a buckler to all those that trust him" (Psa. 18:30).

**Numbers chap. 6** sets forth Divine law to Israelites concerning vow of a Nazarite, how to keep it, what to do in case of defiling a vow by accident, and what to do when the period of the vow ended.

What is meant by the, vow of a Nazarite? Meaning of "Nazarite" is indicated by "separate", twice used in v. 2. Whoever vowed the vow of a Nazarite thereby vowed, or resolved, to separate himself from his family, or from his daily business, in order to be more holy to the Lord than he could be in midst of ordinary affairs of life. Somewhat indicated by Acts 21:23-27.

What is meant by the head of a man's consecration being defiled by a man dying suddenly by him? According to v. 5 a man who made the resolution, or vow, of a Nazarite was thereby specially consecrated, and the Lord gave special directions concerning his head. Thus when he became defiled by the dead body of a mare "the head of his consecration" was Divinely declared "defiled". Judges 13:5 gives further information on a Nazarite.

What do we find in end of this chapter? A beautiful formula, or form of gracious words, the high priest should use in blessing Israelites.

What should that formula teach us? That Israelites, though ignorant, weak and often perverse, yet were near and dear to the Lord, even as ignorant and perverse children are near and dear to their parents. Deut. 5:29 and 32:29 express Divine longings for Israelites, which further show the Lord's interest in their behalf.

**Numbers chap. 7** shows offerings each of the 12 tribes made as gifts to the Lord for the tabernacle.

What was done with those gifts? By Divine command they were received and bestowed for service of the tabernacle.

What may we learn from the fact that costly articles were in the hands of Israelites in the wilderness? That God's decision (Exo. 3:21) that his people should not go away from Egypt "empty" was fulfilled. We are also authorized to conclude the Israelites in Egypt, living in a district by themselves, were not without flocks and herds, oxen, wagons and millstones, and whatever was necessary to till the soil in their district and provide their own food. Exo. 10:24-26 informs they had flocks and herds which they were to take with them when they left Egypt. The Lord knew what he would need in the wilderness for building and service of the tabernacle, and, being the Architect of the universe, he made provision for his needs.

What should we learn from rich and liberal offerings each of the 12 tribes made for God's house, the tabernacle of the congregation? We should learn to offer liberally, and of the best we have, to the Church, which is now God's dwelling place by his Spirit, as Eph. 2:21, 22 declares.

**Numbers chap. 8** gives directions concerning lamps in the holy place of the tabernacle, and in regard to offering Levites to the Lord instead of 1st-born males of all Israel.

What is meant by "over against the candlestick" in vs. 2, 3? In Exo. 25:37 we find "over against it", and marginal reading informs the Hebrew is "over against the face of it", which means the lamps were intended to give light over against what was the face of the candlestick, or opposite its broad side.

What is said about offering Levites? They were to be cleansed after prescribed manner,

and brought before the tabernacle, and the whole congregation was to gather together. Members of the 12 tribes were to put their hands on Levites, then the Levites were to put their hands on certain animals that were to be slain: one for a sin offering, the other for a burnt offering.

What did the Lord propose to do with the Levites Use them about the tabernacle. From what age were they to begin to serve, and at what age should they cease? From 25 years old to 50 was the period of service.

In view of this, what shall we say of chap. 4:3, where the period of service was prescribed as from 30 years to 50? Connection in which that period is mentioned shows limitation there recorded referred to sons of Kohath, who were taken "from among" other "sons of Levi" to be used about "the most holy things". Thus while those who officiated at the altar and handled "the most holy things" were to be 30 years old before they began, nevertheless those who served in regard to other things of the tabernacle could begin at age of 25.

Was this always observed among Levites? No. In 1 Chron. 23:24, 27 we learn that by the last words of David they were ordered numbered for that service from 20 years old and upward.

**Numbers chap. 9** records command to keep the Passover in the 1st month of the 2nd year after departure from Egypt: a record of certain men who were not legally clean, and instructions concerning when they should keep the Passover; the law for both Israelite and the stranger given; an account of the cloud on the tabernacle, and how it appeared by night; also what was meant to Israelites by the cloud abiding on the tabernacle, and what was meant by the cloud rising from it.

What was the Passover intended to commemorate? Just what the word "passover" indicates, namely, a passing over. In Exo. 12:11-13 we find it explained.

Have Christians a passover? In 1 Cor. 5:7 Christ is called "our passover".

Have we an ordinance to help us keep Him in memory? 1 Cor. 11:23-26 explains.

What punishment was threatened against an Israelite who refused to keep the Passover when not providentially hindered? He should be "cut off from among his people".

Is anything threatened against a Christian who neglects to attend to the passover feast called the Lord's Supper? See James 4:17. Every Christian who neglects to attend the Lord's Supper, when not providentially hindered, is guilty of sin of omission.

What would result if all disciples of Christ would consider this fact? They would fear to treat the regular Lord's day meeting of the Church with indifference.

What should faithful disciples do toward indifferent brethren? Never cease striving to impress them with danger of indifference in regard to religious duties.

**Numbers chap. 10** sets before us a command to make 2 trumpets of silver, and directions



in regard to using them; mention of time when the cloud was first lifted from the tabernacle; mention of the order in which tribes followed the tabernacle when carried forward, mention of the father-in-law of Moses, of what Moses said to him, and of his answer. Chapter closes with a form of speech Moses used when the ark was carried, and a form he used when the ark rested.

What should we say to those who pretend to think silver trumpets mentioned in this chapter were musical instruments? 1 Cor. 14:38 would be appropriate answer. Those trumpets served such purposes, in some respects, as bells on meeting houses now serve; but not such purpose as instruments of music are now used to serve.

**Numbers chap. 11** mentions complaining on the part of Israelites, and of fire from the Lord which burned among them, which was quenched through prayer of Moses. Next we find record of complaint against bread God gave, and complaint of Moses that he was not able to bear all the people, also that the Lord proposed to relieve him by appointing 70 others, and putting on them some of the spirit that was on Moses. Record next given of the Lord's promise to give Israelites meat for a month, and of the manner in which that end was accomplished.

What may we justly say of this chapter? Gives record of several saddening events, also of God's kindness to Moses when he complained of being burdened.

Does God desire anyone of his people shall be overworked? V. 2 of the 127th Psalm does not so indicate.

Should we conclude from the 1st part of this chapter that Israelites were really hungry, or that they murmured over imaginary needs? Deut. 8:1-5 indicates the Lord really permitted them to become hungry, and to suffer in other respects, in order to chasten and test them.

And how does the Lord treat his people in the Gospel age? Heb. 12 informs us.

But were not Israelites specially inclined to murmur when required to endure hardships? They were; but the disposition to murmur was only an outworking of human nature, such as is now manifest in professed Christians who lack unwavering faith.

**Numbers chap. 12** shows Aaron and his sister Miriam spoke against Moses in regard to his marriage relation; that God was displeased with them; that he spoke to them; and that when he left them Miriam was leprous. We then learn Moses prayed for her to be healed at once; but the Lord directed she should remain out of the camp 7 days.

What is meant by the statement in v. 3? Meekness is opposite of ambition; and Moses had shown his meekness by his desire not to be leader of the Israelites, as expressed in Exo. 3.

Is meekness on the part of a man of prominence assurance in this age against censure, even when he does right? No. The more a man now does that is right, specially if he is praised for doing right, the more he is liable to be censured by envious persons (Prov. 27:4).

**Numbers chap. 13** recounts sending out 12 spies to search the land of Canaan; of their return

and report.

How long were those spies absent searching the land of Canaan? 40 days.

What impression was made on their minds by what they saw? That the land was good and the fruits good; but most of the spies thought the people who dwelt there were too great for Israelites to overcome, some of them were giants.

Why did they think thus? Lack of faith.

Why do some Christians now think sects around them are too great to be overcome? Weakness of faith.

**Numbers chap. 14** records weeping of the congregation by reason of the evil report by 10 of the spies; of effect on Moses and Aaron; effort of Caleb and Joshua to encourage the people and its results; God's proposal to destroy the entire people and make of Moses a greater nation; Moses' response; God's assurance he had pardoned them, but as they had tempted him 10 times they should not see the land he promised to their fathers. Then we read God's command that the congregation turn back into the wilderness by way of the Red Sea, for he intended to lead the people about in the wilderness until all should perish who had murmured against him, from 20 years old and upward; and that their little ones should enter the land of promise. Next we read when Moses told the people what the Lord's decision was, they confessed they had sinned, and proposed to go up against their enemies; and though warned by Moses not to go, yet they presumed to go, and were defeated.

What shall we say of disposition on the part of Israelites to go back to Egypt? It was natural when they thought of food they ate there, and thus of their earthward gratifications. Same disposition is often shown by church members in the Gospel age. After becoming lukewarm and, perhaps, coldhearted, in their religious life, they think of former enjoyments as worldlings, and often go back to them.

What became of the 10 spies who discouraged the people by their evil report? V. 37 informs they died by the plague before the Lord; and this should serve as warning to those who have so little faith that they discourage others by such conduct as indicates Christians can do little or nothing to overcome their enemies.

Why did Israelites in the wilderness possess but little faith? In Isa. 1:3 we have explanation. They did not "consider" what God had done for them in Egypt and at the Red Sea, to say nothing of other miracles in their behalf. V. 22 mentions the Lord's complaint against them on this subject.

Why is it mankind generally, including professed Christians, have but little faith? They don't know be" cause they don't consider.

What should we say to those who try to explain, weakness and perverseness of fleshly Israel, and of professed spiritual Israel, by supposing existence of natural depravity? We should remind them Adam and Eve were not depraved when they came from God's hand, nevertheless, according to the record, they sinned the first opportunity they had; and no one since then has done worse.

**Numbers chapter 15** sets before us laws concerning voluntary burnt offerings, and in regard to sacrifices in performing vows, with accompanying meat and drink offerings; also that what was required of Israelites by such laws was required of strangers among them who might desire to make offering to the Lord. Next we find directions in regard to offering to the Lord of the first of the bread of the land to which they were going. Then what should be done if the congregation sinned through ignorance, also what was required when an individual sinned by reason of ignorance, also that the law for Israelites and strangers among them was the same concerning sins of ignorance. Law in regard to presumptuous sins is next set forth; then the case of a man violating the Sabbath; finally directions are given concerning certain use of blue ribbands.

Were meat and drink offerings required to vary in amount according as a lamb, a ram or a bullock was offered for burnt offering? They were required to vary, as we learn by reading first part of this chapter.

What is meant by meat offering in such connection? As it was made of flour and oil it must have meant a food offering. Lev. 2 informs it was ordered to be of flour and oil with frankincense on it, when offered alone as a meat offering. But in the chapter before us the meat offering was of the kind to be made in connection with a burnt offering, and frankincense is not mentioned.

**Numbers chap. 16** gives history of rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram; an account of its evil results, of murmuring of the congregation over those results, of God's displeasure and threat, and of "the plague" and how it was stayed or checked.

What disposition caused that rebellion? Irreverence for Divinely ordained official character of Moses and Aaron, also conceit concerning importance of those not chosen of God for official position.

How did rebellious ones express that disposition? They said to Moses and Aaron, "Ye take too much on you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one".

Is there disposition among religionists, in modern times, like that manifested by Korah, Dathan and Abiram? Same disposition is shown by infidel religionists who disparage Inspiration of those who wrote and endorsed the Bible, and who also pretend to think all men are Inspired. It is also true of those who act as if they don't need assurance of pardon set forth in Rom. 6:17, 18, because they pretend to have evidence of pardon in their own hearts independent of the Gospel. All such indicate, they don't need unerring Scripture to guide them, as they have in their own hearts what they profess to regard as an unerring guide. Nor is this all. But those preachers who presume to think the Savior's last commission is addressed to them are guilty of similar presumption, in one respect, to that of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus, specially what is in 2 Tim. 2:2 and 4:1, 2, set forth the commission under which Gospel preachers are required to work. When Christ commanded men to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature he enabled them to speak all languages and assured them of other miraculous power to confirm their preaching.

What use did the Lord direct the priest Eleazar to make of censers of princes who were burned to death because of connection with rebellion of Korah and his company? The Lord

directed they should be made into broad plates to cover the altar, and to serve as forewarning against all who were not of the priestly tribes meddling with the priest's official work.

Was destruction of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, with their company, together with 250 princes, sufficient to warn the people against evil? It, was not. They at once began to murmur against Moses and Aaron: "Ye have killed people of the Lord".

Is anything now said by religious people like such murmuring? Yes. There are those who will not obey the Gospel in its fulness; then complain against those who do preach it in its fulness, saying to them, "You send people of the Lord to Hell by your preaching, for, you condemn everybody but yourselves".

Was the Lord displeased with murmurings of Israelites against Moses and Aaron? He was, as we learn from his speech about consuming them in a moment, and by the fact that he sent among them a plague which soon destroyed 14,700 of them.

**Numbers chap. 17** teaches God gave Israelites a test by which they might know he had chosen Aaron from among them, and that the test should be used for testimony against them to cause their murmurings against Moses and Aaron to cease.

Was the test God gave effective in producing conviction in Israelites that they had sinned? It was.

What impression should record of such a test, as well as the story of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, have made on all Jews while the Jewish law was in force? Should have so impressed people generally as to keep them from meddling with priestly affairs.

But was it sufficient to accomplish that end in the case of every Jew? Not in the case of a certain king of Judah named Uzziah, of whose misconduct we read in 2 Chron. 26:16-21.

Can any doctrine against evil, however clear, warn persons if they be not acquainted with it? No. But it should be the chief business of all classes of mankind to know what God says for their guidance.

**Numbers chap. 18** shows responsibility of all pertaining to the tabernacle and priesthood was Divinely intended to be on Aaron and his sons; that their brethren of the tribe of Levi should help them in things pertaining to the priesthood, but that Aaron and his sons were the only ones that should make offerings before the Lord; that first fruits of the land and firstlings of all animals the Lord had required should belong to Aaron and his sons; also, that Levites should have no inheritance like other tribes, but that other tribes should give to the Levites. Chapter ends with directions to Levites in regard to offering to the Lord a tithe, of the tithes, or a 10th of the tenths, which they received of the other Israelites, and that, when they would do so all would be well with them.

What is meant by "iniquity of the sanctuary" and "iniquity of the priesthood", in v. 17 The word translated "iniquity" means "perverseness, crime, punishment, and infliction of punishment". Therefore in this connection it must refer to the fact that the Lord intended to make priests responsible for sanctity of all that pertained to the tabernacle.

Was Aaron to eat of holy things "in the most holy place", as v. 10 sets forth? The American Revised Version reads, "As the most holy things shalt thou eat thereof". But this is not altogether clear. "In the manner of the most holy things" or "according to the most holy things" are translations authorized by the Hebrew text. The idea is that Aaron should eat thereof according to law in regard to eating most holy things.

Why did the Lord claim male firstlings? Exo. 13 informs.

What is meant by v. 27? Meaning implied by the connection is that when Levites would tithe the tithes they had received, or make a heave offering of a 10th of the tithing, given them by the other tribes, that then such offering would be received by the Lord as if they were tillers of the soil and offered to him a 10th of their increase.

What is meant by a "heave offering"? All that was presented as a heave offering was required to be heaved or lifted up before the Lord, even as the wave offering was to be waved before him (Exo. 29:27, 28).

To whom should heave offerings of priests be given? Last part of v. 28 informs they should be given to Aaron, who, was not only priest but high priest. Thus people generally should give to the priests, and they should give a 10th to the high priest. Deut. 14:22-29 should be considered in this connection.

**Numbers chapter 19** gives special doctrine concerning the red heifer, burning of her to ashes, and use made of the ashes.

What is meant by "unclean until the even", in vs. 7, 8? Simply that ones mentioned in those verses were to be legally unclean, or regarded unclean according to the law, until evening of the day to which the evening belonged. The law given the Israelites taught that persons under various circumstances were unclean legally, or ceremonially, who were not unclean either morally or physically. In other words, the Jewish law set forth certain teaching or doctrine in regard to uncleanness which had foundation only in decision of the Lawgiver, and not in moral or physical conditions, far as we can judge.

Is same true in the Gospel age? It is. Water baptism and the Lord's Supper are legal requirements to be observed by faith, and not because of physical or moral advantages except in their test of faith.

If all persons who live in the Gospel age would consider with care all that is in the Jewish law, what would result? Psa. 119:7 indicates result, at least in honest ones. Multitudes who now say they "can't see what harm" or "what good" certain things will do, could learn by studying the Jewish law, that they should do what the Lord requires regardless of whether they can see or understand advantage of doing, or disadvantage of not doing, the Divine will.

What should we learn by the last verse? That the Israelite needed to be always on guard to avoid legal defilement, and, according to Rom. 15:4, the teaching is that we should be always careful to avoid defilement of every kind.

**Numbers chap. 20** records account of Israelites entering wilderness of Zin; death of Miriam, sister of Moses and Aaron; complaining of people against Moses and Aaron: sin of Moses

and Aaron in failing to sanctify the Lord before the congregation; request made of the king of Edom, and his response; death of Aaron on Mt. Hor and placing of Eleazar, his son, in the office of high priest.

What was sin of Moses and Aaron at the rock? They did not "sanctify" the Lord "in the eyes of the children of Israel".

What does "sanctify" mean in such connection? To regard as separate, or reverence.

How then did Moses and Aaron fail to sanctify the Lord at the rock? Did not give Him credit for bringing water out of the rock, but took credit to themselves. In Psa. 106:32, 33 we learn Moses spake "unadvisedly with his lips", His unadvised speech consisted of saying, "Must we fetch you water out of this rock?"

What did God say of Moses and Aaron on account of that speech? He said they "believed" Him not; also, in v. 24, that they "rebelled" against Him. Unbelief and rebellion were thus charged against Moses and Aaron on account of that one mistake.

Did they say they did not believe God, or that they intended to rebel against him? The record does not inform that they did, but God's interpretation of their speech was that they were guilty of unbelief and rebellion.

Therefore, the most serious question is, What does God think of our words and actions? We cannot understand how Moses and Aaron were guilty of either unbelief or rebellion, but God so regarded their words.

What should sin of Moses and Aaron warn mankind against during the Gospel age? Should serve as forewarning against doing God's will in a man's name, or through human devices. To say, Must we arrange a Creed, build a College, organize a Society, to advance the Lord's cause? or adopt an Organ in the worship? is on the same order with the sin of Moses and Aaron. It is not charged they erred in smiting the rock; but if they erred in so doing then their misconduct and unadvised speech together make them typical of those who now say by their conduct they must arrange Creeds, establish Colleges and organize Societies, to assist the Lord do his work. All who have done such things have magnified themselves rather than the Lord. All efforts on the part of mankind to do the Lord's will in their own way, or in their own name, may be scripturally regarded as unbelief and rebellion.

**Numbers chap. 21** tells of beginning of wars with those heathen whose lands Israelites afterward possessed. Then account is given of complainings of the people; also of fiery serpents that were sent among them, and of results. Next we learn of Israelites making several successive journeys 'til they came to the land of the Amorites, of their war with Amorites and victory over them. Then account of war with Og, king of Bashan, and destruction of him and his people.

What may we learn from the record of the serpent of brass? That the people sinned through unbelief, and when they repented the Lord proposed to save them by faith and obedience.

What obedience was required? To look on the serpent of brass.

Could they see any use in looking on that brazen serpent? No, and therefore they were required to exercise faith.

Is that fact referred to in the New Testament? In John 3:14. Then in v. 15 we find application for our benefit. No one can see how Christ's death on the cross could open up a way for our salvation. Same is true in regard to baptism and the Lord's Supper. But all are Divine requirements; and though we cannot see any more use in them than certain Israelites could see in looking on a piece of brass, yet if by faith we obey the Divine requirements we shall be saved from our sins, even as those Israelites were cured of wounds made by the fiery serpents, when they believed God and obeyed him.

**Numbers chap. 22** sets forth that the king of the Moabites expressed, to elders of the Midianites, his fears of the Israelites; and that he sent messengers to a man named Balaam to persuade him to come and curse Israel. We next learn those messengers went to Balaam with rewards in their hand, also that he requested them to lodge with him that night while he consulted the Lord on the subject. Then we learn the Lord told him not to go with the messengers; so he sent them back. But, Balak, king of Moab, sent other messengers to Balaam more honorable than those he first sent, and through, them made promises of great things if he would only curse Israel. Again Balaam consulted the Lord on the subject, and that time the Lord suffered him to go. The record then informs us concerning Balaam's journey, and of the fact that Balak, king of Moab went to meet him, and an account is given of the first interview he had with him on the subject of cursing Israel

Why was it the Lord told Balaam to go with the 2nd company of messengers Balak sent, if they would call to him, but was angry with him because he went? The answer is given only indirectly. The Lord had told Balaam not to go with the 1st messengers, and that should have been sufficient. But because he "loved wages of unrighteousness" (2 Pet. 2:15), and therefore desired to go, the Lord suffered him to go, even as He gave Israel a king in days of the prophet Samuel (1 Sam. 8, also Hos. 13:11). A father sometimes says to a perverse son who wishes to do something that is not right, "Well, go on then!" At the same time that father is justly angry if his son does that something, but decides to turn it to good account. Thus the Lord treated Balaam. The fatal mistake Balaam made was in straining the answer the Lord first gave him. Here is forewarning against straining Scripture in the Gospel age, and against approaching the Lord for change of decision from what He has declared.

**Numbers chap. 23** sets before us account of 3 different positions Balak and Balaam united in taking in order to curse Israel; also that in each position 7 altars were built and a bullock and ram offered on each. The chapter gives also record of 2 blessings God used Balaam to pronounce on Israel.

What may we learn in this record of Balak and Balaam? First. God's care for his people, then his opposition to enemies of his people is clearly set forth. Next, persistence of God's enemies in trying to curse Israel is suggested.

What should we conclude in regard to Balaam? He was a bad man; but God used him to bless Israel even an he used the ass Balaam rode to rebuke her master. In I Kings 13:11-22 we have record of a bad man God used to state truth, even as he used Balaam.

Numbers chap. 24 records 3rd blessing the Lord used Balaam to pronounce, also of what

Balak said and did when Balaam blest Israel 3 times, then a statement of another prophecy he expressed concerning Israel, of a prophecy in regard to Eden, Amalek and the Kenites.

Did Balak become discouraged when he heard each of the 3 efforts he made to curse Israel was turned to a blessing? He did and told Balaam to flee to his own place

Did Balak acknowledge the Lord was author of the blessings Balaam pronounced? He did.

And what did Balaam say? Referred to what he had said to Balak's messengers, namely, that if Balak would give him his house full of silver and gold he could not on that account go beyond God's word to do either good or bad, and added, "But what the Lord saith, that will I speak".

In view of Balak's discouragement when he made 3 failures against Israel, and his confession that God had kept Balaam from promotion, also in view of what Balaam said to Balak about speaking the word of God, what comparison is there between those men and many of Israel's enemies in modern times? Balak and Balaam were sensible and honorable compared with certain enemies of the Church of Christ. A dozen failures in their efforts to damage churches of Christ seem not sufficient to discourage them, and they seem to glory in saying and doing all they can against those churches, regardless of what God's word declares.

**Numbers chap. 25** tells that while Israelites were in a place called Shittim they began to mix with Moabites and Midianites, even bowing to their gods; so the Lord's anger was against them, slaying 24,000 of them by a plague. 'We read also of Phinehas, son of the high priest, zealous for the Lord, killing an Israelite with Midianitish woman he brought into camp. The chapter ends with the Lord's command that Moses vex Midianites because they vexed Israelites with their wiles.

Was it dangerous for a heathen nation to beguile God's ancient people? This record informs it was dangerous, even ruinous, to both heathen who did so and those of God's people who suffered themselves to be beguiled.

How is it in regard to Christians? Ruinous for all who allow themselves led astray, and ruinous for those who try to mislead them. Mat. 25:31-46 informs that Christ regards both good and evil done to his disciples as done to him. 1 Cor. 8:12 teaches the same in regard to doing evil to Christians.

What should such teaching impress on the minds of all mankind? That they endanger themselves, spiritually, when they say or do anything against the Lord's church, or against one of His humble disciples.

**Numbers chap. 26** sets before us the 2nd numbering of men of the 12 tribes from 20 years old and upward, also numbering of males of the tribe of Levi from a month old and upward.

Was there difference in numbers in either list? Yes, there was decrease of 1,820 in number of the men of war among the 12 tribes, and increase of 727 Levites over the 1st numbering.



How many men in the 2nd numbering were in the 1st? Only 2: Caleb, son of Jephunneh, and Joshua, son of Nun. Even Aaron was not in the 2nd numbering.

Did other Levites besides Aaron die in the wilderness? Yes, many of them. Korah, mentioned in chap. 16, was a Levite. The earth swallowed him and all that pertained to him.

What should we say to those who use v. 59 in trying to prove the Israelites were not in Egypt more than 215 years? So far as the Divine record informs, no Inspired man ever calculated the period of a generation by the tribe of Levi. Then, the number of Levites both in the 1st and 2nd numberings forbids regarding v. 59 as a standard of measuring. Finally, Matthew's genealogy of Christ shows Ahaziah, Joash and Amaziah, kings of Judah, are not mentioned. Such facts should convince all that the Israelites were in Egypt as Gen. 15:13 foretold and as Exo. 12:40, 41 declares.

**Numbers chap. 27** brings the case of daughters of a man named Zelophehad, and the Lord's decision concerning them; the Lord's command to Moses to go up into the mount Abarim and die because of his rebellion at Meribah; the speech Moses made to the Lord in regard to appointing someone to lead the people after his death: what the Lord said in response, and what was done by Moses in obedience to Divine commands.

What may we learn from the Lord's decision concerning daughters of Zelophehad? That the Lord is considerate as well as just in dealing with his people.

What may we learn from the Lord's decision concerning Moses? That the Lord is just as well as considerate. Then His justness and considerateness are manifested in his decision that Moses should lay his hand on Joshua and put of his honor on him.

**Numbers chap. 28** gives Divine instructions concerning daily, weekly and monthly sacrifices; also instructions in regard to offerings made in 2 yearly feasts the Israelites were required to keep.

What was the daily burnt offering? Two lambs without spot, one in the morning and one in the evening, with prescribed meat (meal) offering, and a drink offering that was prescribed.

What was the weekly offering? Two spotless lambs of the 1st year with prescribed meat (meal) and drink offering, besides daily offerings previously mentioned.

What do we find recorded in regard to monthly offerings? At beginning of each month 2 young bullocks, a ram, 7 lambs of the 1st year, and a kid of the goats were to be offered.

And what is recorded concerning the yearly offering? On the 14th day of the 1st month the Passover lamb was to be killed and eaten. Then the next day 2 young bullocks, a ram and 7 lambs were to be offered with prescribed meat (meal) offerings, also a goat for a sin offering. Then other yearly offerings should be when Israelites would come together in beginning of harvest., which were to consist of 2 young bullocks, a ram and 7 lambs of the 1st year with prescribed meat (meal) offerings and a kid of the goats.

Could Israelites see any use in so many and such different offerings? No. From

viewpoint of sense, and of reason, all those offerings were unmeaning. Therefore those who attended to them according to Divine directions did so by faith. Rom. 15:4 informs that whatever things were written aforetime were written for our learning; and it becomes us by reading what was written aforetime to learn obedience by faith.

**Numbers chap. 29** is a record of the last feast the Israelites were required to hold each year, and the holy convocations or sabbaths or rest days they were to observe in course of that feast: also record is given of the several offerings made each day.

What was that feast called? Lev. 23:24-44 informs that the first day of that period of feasts, beginning with the 7th month, there was commanded to be "a memorial of blowing of trumpets"; then on the 10th day of that month should be "a day of atonement"; on, 15th day of that month should be "the feast of tabernacles" held "seven days unto the Lord". The last of Lev. 23 informs it was called the feast of tabernacles in memory of Israelites dwelling in booths, made of branches of trees and brush, when they were brought out of Egypt. Then in the chapter before us we find the 1st, 10th and 15th days of the 7th month mentioned in regard to the holy convocation, or coming together, also the offerings made on each occasion.

What does this chapter and the one preceding set before us in regard to number of regular offerings required of Israelites each year? 1, There were daily burnt offerings, consisting of a lamb without spot every morning, and one every evening with prescribed meat (meal) offering, and drink offering accompanying offering of each lamb. 2, In addition to daily burnt offerings 2 lambs without spot were offered every sabbath with prescribed meat (meal), offering and drink offering accompanying offering of each lamb. 3, In beginning each month 2 young bullocks, a ram, and 7 lambs with prescribed meat and drink offerings were required; also a kid of the goats was offered as part of the monthly offering. 4, On the 14th day of the first month the Passover was killed and eaten--a lamb for each family was the original arrangement except in cases of small families (Exo. 12:1-4). 5, The 15th day of the 1st month 2 young bullocks, a ram and 7 lambs were offered with accompanying meat and drink offerings. Also a goat was offered for a sin offering. The same offerings were required for 7 days. When time would come for 1st fruits of the land to be offered, the Lord required that Israelites should offer to him 2 bullocks, a ram, 7 lambs, as burnt offerings, with accompanying meat (meal) offerings and drink offerings; also a kid of the goats for a sin offering. Thus we are informed in the previous chapter, and the chapter now before us reforms concerning offerings required in course of the feast required in the 7th month which ended with what was called "the feast of the tabernacles".

Were other offerings required besides those mentioned and the chapters just considered? Yes, offerings we have just considered were prescribed and required offerings for stated times; but in addition were special sin offerings. Lev. 4 directs concerning special offerings, and in addition were offerings mentioned in v. 40 of this chapter we now consider. Thus were offerings for each day without exception; then additional offerings for each sabbath; also monthly offerings; finally prescribed offerings for each feast, and, in some instances, for each day of a feast. But those just mentioned were what may be called regular and stated offerings. All other offerings were when occasion required. But even in regard to such offerings the Lord gave special directions. In making any and all those offerings unadulterated faith was required. No Israelite could understand why a sacrifice required of him should be made, except that God required it.

**Numbers chap. 30** shows law to Israelites concerning vows unto the Lord and concerning oaths.

What was the form of a vow? An illustration in Gen. 28:20-22 and in Judges 11:30, 31.

Were those vows binding and required to be fulfilled? Not always. A father could annul the vow of his unmarried daughter in his home in her youth, if he heard it and decided to annul it, and would do so by speaking against it. But if he heard it and held his peace, then it was binding and required to be fulfilled. A man could also annul the vow of his wife if he heard it and spoke against it. But if he heard it and held his peace on the subject from day to day, then the vow was binding.

What was result if a man annulled the vow of his wife after allowing it to be binding? Iniquity of not fulfilling such a vow would fall on the husband.

How should Christians regard vows and oaths? Mat. 5:33-37 and Jas. 5:12 clearly instruct in regard to swearing by an oath to God. On the question of vowing Paul set example (Acts 18:18), but according to Jas. 4:15 we would better say concerning our good purposes, "If the Lord will, we shall live and do this or that".

**Numbers chap. 31** records of the Divine command to avenge the Israelites of the Midianites, also of obedience to that command. Mention then of spoil taken and its division, of the fact that every man of the army that went against the Midianites returned, and that officers of that army on that account presented an offering to the Lord through Moses and Eleazar.

What number of men went against the Midianites? 12,000—a thousand of each tribe.

What is meant by v. 16 about counsel of Balaam which resulted in a plague in the congregation? In Rev. 2:14 we learn Balaam taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before Israel; and Moses here informs that women were the ones who, by Balaam's counsel, caused children of Israel to sin. Then in chap. 25:17, 18 we learn Midianites vexed and beguiled Israelites. Thus we learn when Balaam was not permitted to curse Israel he gave Balak counsel which, when adopted, resulted in beguiling Israelites through women who, later, were married women. What that counsel was the Sacred Text does not explicitly inform, though implies it was counsel in which women were actors; and the case of an Israelite bringing a Midianitish woman into the camp of Israel indicates it was fleshly as well as religious beguiling. Those further interested in that matter will do well to examine book 4 and chap. 6 of Antiquities of the Jews by Flavius Josephus. He presumed to state explicitly the counsel of Balaam; and what he states is in harmony with what the Sacred Text records.

**Numbers chap. 32** shows arrangements whereby the tribes of Reuben and Gad and half the tribe, of Manasseh were given inheritance on the wilderness side of the river Jordan, eastward.

Was Moses pleased with proposal of Reubenites and Gadites when they asked for inheritance on east side of Jordan? He was not but delivered a reproaching and warning speech.

How did their explanation impress his mind? Favorably. He thought well of their

explanation, but was not entirely satisfied it was sincere, as we may judge by what is stated in v. 23 about their sin finding them out.

Is it true now that sins people commit will find them out? Yes, sooner or later, and generally sooner than calculated, every sin will come to light.

**Numbers chap. 33** briefly mentions all encampments of Israelites from the time they left Egypt til they reached the Jordan.

How many encampments were there? 42 after they left Rameses in Egypt.

What important, truths or principles does history of Israelites in the wilderness reveal? Obedience by faith, and disobedience through unbelief.

Was unbelief of Israelites chiefly manifest when they journeyed, or while they encamped? In their encampments. While undergoing exertion of journeying they did better than when lying in camp.

Is this true of all armies? In a great measure. Man was intended for activity, and camp life oppresses him.

Is not the same true of the Church? Certainly. A church not actively engaged in doing good will go to ruin. Same: is true of church members generally.

What should we conclude from v. 52? That the Lord intended his people to keep clear of every vestige of heathenism, and destroy everything leading in that direction. Therefore He commanded them to drive out the heathen, destroy their pictures, molten images, and pluck down their high places.

But what did the Lord say would result if Israelites would not drive out the heathen? Those that remained of them shall be as pricks in their eyes and thorns in their sides, for they should be vexation to them. Finally the Lord said to the Israelites that he would, on account of certain disobedience, do to them as he thought 10 do to the heathen.

What should we learn from such teaching? That God did not intend his ancient people should compromise with evil.

And what does He intend in regard to Christians? He intends they shall keep unspotted from the world (Jas. 1:2.7).

**Numbers chap. 34** sets before us Statement of the land which should be inheritance of the 12 tribes that were to receive landed estates.

What do vs. 14, 15 set before us? That 2 ½ tribes had already received inheritance, on wilderness side of the Jordan, eastward.

Of what tribes were Caleb and Joshua? V. 19 informs that Caleb was of the tribe of Judah, and in chap. 13:8 we learn Joshua, otherwise called Oshea, was of the tribe of Ephraim.

What is specially recorded of these men? They were the only ones in 2nd numbering of men of war of the Israelites who were in the 1st numbering.

**Numbers chap. 35** records instructions concerning cities and suburbs given to the Levites among the twelve tribes who should receive landed estates, also instructions concerning cities of refuge and their purpose.

How many cities did the Lord intend to be given the Levites? 48 and their suburbs extending in every direction from the city 1,000 cubits, which amounted to about 500 yards.

And what about cities of refuge and their purpose? Six were to be, appointed, 3 on each side Jordan; and God's purpose in appointing them was that a man who killed another without malice or killed him unawares, might flee to one of them and thereby save his life under certain prescribed conditions.

Did God intend any compromise should be made or satisfaction received in regard to penalty to be inflicted on the wilful murderer? No.

Did God permit his people to put a man to death on testimony of only one witness? No. V. 30 teaches 2 or more witnesses were necessary.

What was the Divine decision concerning shedding of human blood? He said it defiled the land, and the land could not be cleansed of such defilement except by the blood of him who had shed it wilfully.

Did this law originate with the Jewish law and pass away when Christ, fulfilled that law? No. Gen. 9:5, 6 shows it was Divinely ordained soon after the Flood, and there is no evidence it was ever intended to be abolished. On the contrary, reason for that law exists now as certainly as when first mentioned: "He that sheds man's blood by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God created he him".

**Numbers chap. 36** teaches regulation in regard to Israelites marrying in their own tribes, in order that their inheritances should not pass from one tribe to another.

What was occasion of that regulation being given? A man named Zelophehad, of the tribe of Manasseh, died in the wilderness leaving 5 daughters but no son. Those daughters, recorded in chap. 27, requested inheritance intended for the father should be given to them; and the Lord directed it be done according to their request. But certain men of the same tribe foresaw if they should be married to men of another tribe there would be transfer of their estate to another tribe. When they mentioned this to Moses he gave directions providing against such transfer by ordering that tribes should marry among themselves, and not pass from tribe to tribe.

Whom did daughters of Zelophehad marry? Their father's brother's sons, their cousins.

Was it lawful for cousins to marry cousins? Yes, and among the Jews no evil seemed to have resulted. Jacob married 2 of his cousins, and Abraham did worse by marrying his half-sister.

Why, then, is so much said in opposition to cousins uniting with each other in marriage? Observation and experience among Gentiles prove it is dangerous to offspring. Therefore on statute books of certain States is a law against those related to each other as cousins uniting with each other in marriage. Cousins should regard each other very much as brothers and sisters generally feel toward each other, and thus consider themselves too closely related to marry.

**Deuteronomy chapter 1--** What is meaning of the word Deuteronomy? Second law, or repetition of law. Why is the book called by a name of that meaning? Because of its contents. Much of the law given the Israelites is reported in what this book declares; also many historic facts, in connection with which the law was first given, are repeated.

At what time did Moses speak to Israelites what is in this book? Verse 5 implies he spoke near end of the 40th year after Israelites left Egypt.

What is meant by v. 5? That Moses was in the land of Moabites when he began to declare what is here recorded; then we are informed the Lord directed him to repeat to the people much that occurred from the time they were in Mount Horeb and onward.

Obeying such directions, what events did Moses mention in this chapter? That the Lord directed Israelites while at Horeb to go into land of the Amorites; that he had told the Lord he needed help in dealing with strifes among the people; that help was given him in men appointed to be judges in regard to ordinary matters. Then mention is made that after they had gone through the wilderness 11-days journey they came to Kadesh-barnea. Then mention of sending 12 spies, one from each tribe, and of results, of which account is in Num. 13, 14.

Why was it, Israelites, when they first came out of Egypt, were afraid of their enemies? Verse 32 informs it was by reason of lack of faith.

But why did they afterward have courage to go against their enemies in battle, even when Moses told them not to go, as the Lord would not be with them? Verse 43 informs it was because of their presumption or unreasonable confidence. They were afraid to go against their enemies, though assured by Moses all would be well because the Lord would fight for them. But after they learned they had sinned against God, by expressing their fears, then they became bold enuf to go against their enemies without the Lord, and contrary to Moses' protest.

Is there anything in conduct of certain professed Christians which shows disposition just mentioned? Yes. Many who are afraid to do what the Lord commands are bold in doing what he does not command and, in some instances, bold in doing what he forbids. Many are afraid to obey the Lord by being buried in baptism, but are bold in advocating sprinkling for baptism, and the mourner's bench as means of conversion. Others are afraid to do their whole duty in reproving and rebuking, but, will be bold in advocating humanisms they know are not authorized by the Savior and will be offensive to many of their brethren. Then others are afraid to affirm the "everlasting punishment" of "everlasting fire" threatened against the wicked (Mat. 25:41, 46), but are bold to advocate eternal salvation of all mankind, or that all who die in sin will have opportunity to obey the Gospel after this life is over,--though God's

Word does not set forth such an idea directly or indirectly. Also many fear to unite with an unpopular people, though they be strictly of the New Testament order; but will be bold to go with churches unmentioned in the New Testament. Finally, many fear sectarian denominations because they are great and strong, but try to overthrow the church of Christ, against which even the gates of the unseen world shall not prevail.

What became of those ancient Israelites who were afraid to do what God required but were bold to do what he had not required? They died in the wilderness, thus never reached the land of promise. Here is warning for all the fearful and presumptuous of the Gospel age! "For whatever things were written aforetime were written for our learning" (Rom. 15:4). Again: "These things happened to them for ensamples and are written for our admonition" (1 Cor. 10:11). Israelites afraid to do what God commanded were not fit to enter the land of promise, therefore were led around in the wilderness 'til all died, or had been overthrown by Divine judgments. On the same principle, those who, in the Gospel age, fear to do what the Lord requires, are unfit to enter the Heavenly Rest. Therefore they are permitted to wander and flounder 'til they have opportunity to reveal their presumption as well as their fear.

**Deuteronomy chap. 2** gives brief mention of the Israelites during 38 years of wanderings. Also mentions that God instructed them not to meddle with Edomites, people descended from Esau, nor with Moabites nor Ammonites, who descended from Lot (Gen. 19:3638). God had given those nations their possession, and he did not intend Jacob's descendants, Israelites, should disturb them.

What is meaning of v. 7? Explanation of God's dealing with Israelites during the 40 years he kept them in the wilderness.

And what of v. 25? Illustrates what is true in regard to Apostolic disciples when they do right: all enemies fear and dread them.

What should we say of v. 30? Jehovah had right to treat his enemies thus. God created man and told him what was right. When he went wrong God had right to take his life in any manner he deemed best.

What should we say to infidels who charge God with cruelty in view of v. 31 about destroying women and children? We should first ask if it be cruelty to kilt innocent cattle, sheep, lambs and domestic fowls, to say nothing of wild animals, which are without sin and do no one any harm? Then we should inquire how it can be right for us to take the life of innocent, dumb brutes, though we have not given them life, yet be wrong for God, author of all life, to take the life of innocent human beings? Again, we should inquire whether it would not have been better if all those had died in infancy or childhood who have lived to become corrupt in life? In other words, would it not have been better for every drunkard, specially all who've filled a drunkard's grave, to have died in infancy or early childhood? To answer this question right is to confess it was best for God to take the life of children of heathen Heshbonites and Bashanites than to suffer them to grow up and be trained in abominable immoralities of their heathen parents. Nor is this all. We should remind the infidel that a surgeon is justified in cutting off a finger, hand, arm, foot or leg, and even in cutting on several members, when incurably diseased, in order to save the body from such disease. On the same principle we should state God is justified in cutting off a whole nation that is incurably diseased with sin in order to save others from becoming contaminated with them.

**Deuteronomy chap. 3** sets forth short account of overcoming of the king of Bashan and his people; also that land of Bashanites and Heshbonites had been given to the tribes of Israel called Reuben and Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh. Mention also that men of war of tribes just named were required to go over Jordan with the other part of the army 'til heathen nations there had been overcome. Joshua's position as their leader and God's care for them are next mentioned. Then Moses declared he had besought the Lord to permit him to go over into the land of promise, but the Lord would not hearken to him.

Why did not the Lord permit Moses to enter the land of Canaan? Num. 20:12, 24 informs us.

What should we learn from God's decision against Moses and Aaron? That God was no respecter of persons in ancient Israel when wrong was committed, for the greatest as well as the least suffered severe and just judgment.

How is it in the Gospel age? Acts 10:34, 35 informs us. Rom. 2:6-11 teaches the same doctrine.

**Deuteronomy chap. 4** records that Israelites were commanded not to add to the words the Lord spoke thru Moses, nor to take from them; then their attention was called to the fact that those who went after a heathen god called Baal-peor had been destroyed, while those who had not gone after that god were still alive. Next mention is made: of great advantage Israelites had because God's law had been given them. Then they were told to remember they saw no likeness of anyone when God spoke to them and gave "his covenant", "the ten commandments", in Mount Sinai. That God was angry with Moses, on account of the people, is next mentioned; also prophecy that they should utterly perish if they would corrupt themselves by making an image to worship, but that the Lord would hearken to them when they would repent. Moses then called the Israelites to consider there was no other nation to which the Lord had been so gracious as to them, and therefore they should obey him always so their days should be prolonged. Near close of the chapter mention is made of cities which, on east side the Jordan, were appointed for safety of the man-slayer who had not been guilty of wilful murder. Then a few statements which pertain to giving of God's words to Israelites, and the land already overcome and given to certain tribes.

Why were Israelites commanded not to add to God's word nor take from it? Psa. 12:6, Prov. 30:6 and Rev. 22:18, 19 give information.

Why was the Lord careful not to permit people of Israel to see likeness of any person in the mount? Vs. 16-18 inform it was to prevent their corrupting themselves by making an image to worship. God desired they should believe in and obey him by faith without having seen an object or being, of any kind, to think about or consider as an object of worship.

What should we say of those who teach the 10 commands written on tables of stone are not divinely called God's "covenant" with Israelites? We should refer them to v. 13, also to chap. 9:9, 11.

**Deuteronomy chap. 5** records account of giving the 10 commands on Mount Sinai in wilderness of Arabia; mention of how the people felt and what they said when they had heard God's voice, also his expression of desire in their behalf. Chapter ends with instruction



Moses was required to give the people that they might prolong their days in the land whither they were going.

What should Bible readers learn by v. 15? That Israelites had reason for keeping the 7th day which Gentile Christians could not have. That verse shows God required Israelites to keep the sabbath because they were servants in the land of Egypt, and that he had brought them out "through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm". Such facts are no part of the history of any people except Israelites. Therefore no other people are required to keep the sabbath for this reason.

But should Gentile Christians keep the 7th day of the week, as a sabbath, for any other reason than the one the Jews had for keeping it? No, they have no more right to the Jewish sabbath than they have to Jewish circumcision. The sabbath was part of the law engraven in stones, which, according to 2 Cor. 3, was "done away" and "abolished", and it was part of the "old" covenant which was not "faultless", and which was supplanted by the "new covenant", as mentioned in Heb. 8:7-13.

What of the statement "he added no more", in v. 22? Regard it as warning to Israelites to respect Divine silence, thus not go beyond what Jehovah said to them.

Is there anything in the New Testament on this? V. 9 of the apostle John's 2nd letter bears in this direction. God's silence is silence of Infinite wisdom, love, mercy, goodness and power. Any method of interpreting God's word which disregards the Divine silence, but adds to the word given by Divine authority, is presumption, heresy, rebellion. Specially true in worship and work of the church; for instructions have been given with reference thereto which are Divinely declared sufficient to perfect the man of God, and which embrace all things that pertain to life and godliness (2 Tim. 3:16, 17; 2 Pet. 1:3).

What should we learn from desire expressed in v. 29? Should be impressed that God was greatly and tenderly interested in welfare of his people.

Why, then, did He not more fully constrain them to be good? Next chapter informs of the only principle or plan on which Jehovah was justified in constraining his people to goodness.

**Deuteronomy chap. 6** mentions Divine commands given Israel and exhortation to obey them, with instructions concerning best method of keeping them in mind, and in regard to danger of forgetting them. Further instructions concerning the law and importance of obeying it, and what they should say to their children when inquired of in regard to Divine testimonies, statutes and judgments.

What should we learn by the declaration in v. 4? That is the foundation of all God has said to mankind. The fundamental proposition on which all else is based and by reason of which everything else God has said to mankind must be, accepted. God has spoken to man. In former religious ages He spoke through Moses and others. In the Gospel age He speaks through Christ by the Spirit, through his chosen ones. There is one, only, true and living God, and Jesus Christ is the Son of God. The 2 fundamental propositions of the Bible.

What should we learn by v. 5? Comparing it with Mat. 22:36, 37 we learn it is declared by the Savior to set forth the 1st and great command of the law. Thus we learn by vs. 4, 5 that

the chief statement or proposition of the Old Testament is, "The Lord our God is one Lord", and that the chief command is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul and might". What is true of the Old Testament is true of the New. The entire New Testament in its Godward bearing is summed up in the declarations that there is one, only, true and living God; that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; and that we should love God and Christ with the whole heart.

And what may we learn from the Lord's instructions in this chapter about teaching children? Would have saved Israelites from ruin as a nation if they had been faithfully observed.

Would such plan succeed under the Gospel age? Yes; it is the best ever proposed to mankind for religious education of their children. Just in proportion as that plan has been observed by parents they have done their duty and their children have benefitted; and just in proportion as it has been neglected by parents they have failed in their duty, and children have been deprived of the highest and best education possible for them to receive.

**Deuteronomy chap. 7** consists of God's instructions to Israelites concerning thorough and uncompromising destructions he intended they should inflict on heathen of the land of Canaan. God instructed Israelites to destroy them utterly, make no covenant with them nor show them mercy. He did not however intend they should drive all out at once, but only as they were able to take possession of the land.

Why did God command no mercy should be shown heathen in the land of Canaan? Their iniquity was full and they did not deserve mercy (Gen. 15:12-16). They had committed such abominations that the land was spoken of as spewing them out (Lev. 18:26-28).

Did God promise Israelites good health if they'd obey him? V. 15 states he would take from them all sickness.

And how would He treat their enemies? Said he'd put diseases on them; also that his people should not fear their enemies, but should remember what the Lord did for them in Egypt and in the wilderness.

Should Christians fear their enemies? Not if they be faithful in Bible study, prayer, thanksgiving and right living toward their fellowmen. But, if they be half-hearted and indifferent in devotion to God and Christ they have reason to fear their enemies. Disciples of Christ unacquainted with the Bible can't stand before their enemies; but those who know the Bible ran always confute and confound their enemies.

**Deuteronomy chap. 8** sets forth Divine instruction to keep the Divine commands; of God's purpose in placing his people on trial, and benefits to be gained by so doing; also disadvantage of disobedience.

Did not God know what was in hearts of his people before they had shown it by disobedience? Yes; but it was contrary to His purpose to overthrow them for disobedience before they had shown it. Besides, the Lord intended to make a record for warning of all in after ages. Of this we are informed in 1 Cor. 10:1-11.

What special lesson did Jehovah teach Israelites by trials through which he required them to pass? "That man do th not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord".

Is this an important lesson for Christians? It is. It was repeated by the Savior in Mat. 4:4, and has never been recalled nor modified. By reason of Christians never learning this lesson, or forgetting after having learned it, multitudes become backsliders, even as ancient Israelites did.

Did God give his ancient people power to get wealth? V. 18 informs that he did, and v. 17 was warning not to claim that power as their own.

What impression should the Divine record on this subject make on Christians, specially on those who make success in gathering wealth? According to Rom. 15:4 and 1 Cor. 10:1-11, it should impress all who profess to be Christians that they should give God the glory of all they gain honorably in this world. Besides, as God gives them all power that they have to gather wealth, they should always remember I Tim. 6:17-19, also 1 Cor. 4:7.

What difference between Christians giving to unscriptural enterprises money the Lord has bestowed on them power to gain, and withholding from the Lord's cause money they ought to give to assist His cause? Difference consists in that which exists between sins of transgression (2 John 9) and omission (Jas. 4:17).

What difference in degrees of punishment inflicted on the 2 classes of sinners just mentioned if they died in their sins? The Divine record reveals no difference. What is the safe plan by which to avoid dying in sin? Avoid living in sin (Gal. 6:7). It is just as easy to become such a character as to be finally rejected by withholding from the Lord's cause what should be given to that cause, as by giving of the Lord's money to a cause the Lord never approved.

**Deuteronomy chap. 9** consists of solemn charges, warnings and references of former history.

How often did the Lord warn Israelites not to think, after the nations of Canaan would be destroyed, that it was on account of their righteousness the Lord destroyed those nations? Three times, as mentioned in vs. 4, 5, 6.

But what was cause of God overthrowing those nations? "Wickedness" of those nations is mentioned as reason for their overthrow.

What did Moses state concerning past history of Israelites? Referred to their misconduct in the wilderness and at Mount Sinai, also to what God threatened against him, and what he did for them by pleading in their behalf.

Should not such reference to history have been sufficient forewarning for them? Yes; but in chap. 32:15 we find prophecy concerning what they would do.

Why did they soon become perverse and rebellious? Because they did not obey what was commanded them in chap. 6 in regard to teaching their children.

How is it now among Christians? Just as it was with ancient Israel. In desire to "get on in the world" professed Christians often "get down in the world". Then the world gets up in them. As result they remain unacquainted with the Bible, and their children remain uninstructed in regard to religious duties unless one or more friends become spiritual guides and supply what is lacking on the part of indifferent parents.

**Deuteronomy chap. 10** states concerning the 2nd tables of stone whereon God wrote 10 commands; a statement concerning several journeys in the wilderness; death of Aaron, separation of the tribe of Levi from the other tribes; then a statement of what God required of Israelites for their good, and how they should regard Jehovah who had done great things for them.

What does v. 16 set before us in regard to circumcision? The spiritual end God had in view when he gave the covenant of circumcision. Shows that when Jehovah commanded circumcision (Gen. 17:9-14) he had in view spiritual separation of his people from all others. In Jer. 4:4 further statement is found on the subject; then Rom. 2:28, 29 clearly sets forth spiritual meaning of circumcision to the Israelite afterward called a Jew.

has circumcision any meaning to Christians? Philip. 3:3 and Col. 2:11 show Christians are "circumcised" and called "the circumcision" just in proportion as they are, by obedience to the Gospel, separated from the world. This is circumcision in spiritual sense, and typified by fleshly circumcision.

**Deuteronomy chap. 11** gives a charge Moses gave Israelites, to love God and keep his commands, enforced by reference to what the Lord did for them in Egypt and in the wilderness, also what he did against Egyptians in Egypt and against disobedient Israelites in afflictions and their final overthrow as a nation.

How is it in the Gospel age? Same as among the Israelites. Professed Christians generally neglect to study the Scriptures. As a result they don't understand them. As further result they fail to teach their children and thus, except in rare instances, children grow up, uninformed in the Bible and become easy victims for infidels and other errorists. Deuteronomy chap. 12 records God's command that Israelites should destroy places where heathen worshipped, by overthrowing their altars, breaking pillars, burning their groves, hewing down graven images of heathen gods, and destroying names of those gods. Then we read God's directions concerning where he would choose for his people as a place of worship, and what they should take to that place; also that they should not forsake the Levite. Special directions against Israelites inquiring how heathen served their gods, and against adopting heathen customs in serving the Lord; but that they should serve the Lord according to his commands without addition or subtraction.

What instruction concerning eating flesh? Israelites were permitted to kill and eat flesh in all their gates, which means at their homes, only they should be careful not to eat the blood which is life of the flesh. Likewise they should be careful to take the 10th of the increase, also male firstlings of their flocks and herds, where the Lord would appoint, and there eat them and rejoice before the Lord. Thus while they might kill and eat flesh at their homes, still they were required at appointed times to take certain offerings to the Divinely appointed place in order to eat and rejoice acceptably.

What should we learn by the Divine command forbidding the Israelite to inquire concerning manner in which heathen nations served their gods? That Christians should not inquire concerning manner in which denominations support their preachers or conduct meetings. But our business is to serve the Lord according to his directions without addition, subtraction or modification.

**Deuteronomy chap. 13** gives instructions against following a prophet or dreamer of dreams who'd give a sign or wonder which would come to pass, if that one should advise departure from God's word. We find also that in such instance the Lord would put his people to test in order that they might show whether they loved him wholeheartedly. Divine sentence against, the false prophet and dreamer, also against anyone who would secretly entice an Israelite to serve heathen gods, is also mentioned. Directions even given to inquire about a report concerning Israelites going after other gods, and what should be done if the report was found true.

What should we learn from instructions in regard to a false prophet or dreamer? That God intended his ancient people should have more confidence in his written law than in anyone that would advise departure from it, even if the one giving such advice should foretell a sign or wonder which would really come to pass.

What impression should this make on those in the Gospel age? Ought to impress our minds to the effect that we should have more confidence in God's written word than in any and all who differ from that Word. If a man arose who would raise the dead, in one or more instances, we should not follow him if he advised departure from what is recorded in the gospel of God's grace set forth in the New Testament. But we should regard such a man as sent by the Lord to test our faith. 1 Cor. 11:19 should be considered in this connection.

**Deuteronomy chap. 14** gives command forbidding Israelites to cut their flesh or otherwise disfigure themselves for the dead; also that they should remember they were a holy and peculiar people unto the Lord. Then we read directions the Lord gave them, as his peculiar people, in regard to kinds of meats they should eat, also that they should eat nothing that had died of itself, though they might give it to strangers among them, or sell it to an alien. Chapter ends with directions concerning tithes.

What should we say to those who criticize the Lord because of what is recorded in v. 21? We should explain some people of certain nations, even now, eat flesh of animals that die of themselves, and thus it was among certain ancients. Besides, flesh of an animal that dies of itself, with blood in the veins, clearly shows it was not killed, at least in the ordinary way. Therefore no deception was practiced on those to whom Israelites gave or sold flesh of an animal that died of itself. Nor is this all. A man might say to his children, You must not eat onions; though you may raise them and give or sell them to others; yet you mustn't eat them. Certainly such command would be reasonable. A man might also say to his wife, You must not eat limburger cheese; though you may make it and give or sell to others; yet you must not eat it. This would also be reasonable; so it was reasonable for the Lord to forbid his ancient people to eat flesh of ant-mats which died of themselves but, at the same time, told them they might give or sell such flesh to others.

What does this chapter reveal in regard to tithing, or tenting, of the increase among Israelites? V. 28 reveals that every 3 years, or "the 3rd year" (chap. 26: 12), they should bring

tithes and lay them up in their gates for the Levites, also for the stranger, the fatherless and widows among them.

What shall we say of the doctrine that the Jew gave a tenth of all his increase to the Lord, therefore Christians should give at least a 10th of all their increase to the Lord? No such doctrine in the Bible. Simply an erroneous inference concerning Jew and Christian. Every "3rd year" was the year of tithing for Levites and others. Besides, this same chapter informs that Israelites should make their yearly tithes and take them, or their worth in money, and go where God would appoint and eat of them, and rejoice before the Lord.

What should we say to those who quote in favor of drunkenness what is said in v. 26 concerning wine and strong drink? We should inform them of what God said in Isa. 5:11, 12 and 28:1 and Hab. 2:15, 16. Then, we should turn to Prov. 23:29-35. So doing we shall be able to show God gave no sanction to drunkenness among his ancient people, though he gave them privilege of drinking wine and other strong drink on occasion of their feasts. Then we should show that, according to 1 Thess. 5:22, Christians are required to "abstain from all appearance of evil", thus should keep clear of strong drink except when, according to 1 Tim. 5:23, it is used as medicine.

**Deuteronomy, chap. 15** records that at end of every 7 years every Israelite should make release of all an Israelite owed him, and not exact it again; though of a foreigner he might exact what was due him. Then Divine assurance of blessing was expressed; and warning not to refuse to lend to a poor brother because the year of release was near, but they should open wide their hands to the poor. Next is account of treatment the Lord required Hebrews, or Israelites, to extend to their brethren who, on account of poverty, would be sold to them; also how they should treat them if they desired to remain servants. Chapter ends with instructions in regard to eating male firstlings of their flocks and herds.

Why was it the poor should always be among Israelites? Prov. 13:23 informs us. On account of lack of judgment, or managing ability poor people are still numerous.

Should they be censured for their defects, and should we congratulate ourselves over our abilities? 1 Cor. 4: 7 informs how we should consider ourselves and others in this respect.

What reason did God give Israelites for requiring them to be very considerate toward bondmen and bondwomen of their brethren? V. 15 informs it was because they were bondmen in Egypt, and that God redeemed them.

What should Christians learn from such teaching? To be Very considerate toward sinners, because we were once sinners but Christ redeemed us.

**Deuteronomy chap. 16** gives directions concerning the 3 yearly feasts the Lord required his people to observe; also of strictness with which justice should be dealt out to all classes. Chapter ends with commands forbidding planting a tree near an altar of the Lord, and setting up an image of any kind.

What was meaning of the feasts the Lord required Israelites to keep each year? The 1st, called Passover, was commemorative of the last night that nation spent in Egypt. Intended to keep that occasion in the memory of Israelites in all generations. The 2nd, called Feast of

Weeks, was to be held in beginning of harvest and, as v. 10 of this chapter implies, was intended as occasion of thanksgiving for present blessings. Then the 3rd feast, called Feast of Tabernacles, was intended to keep in the memory of the nation the fact that God caused those who passed through the wilderness to dwell in booths, or tabernacles, temporary dwelling places, when he brought them out of Egypt, as we learn in Lev. 23:33-43.

If Jews should become Christians would it be right for them to keep those feasts? Yes, even as Christians in America may keep the Fourth of July, Veterans Day, and other national holidays. This explains Acts 18:21 and 20:16. A national feast, or holiday, observed in a moral and dignified manner, does not interfere with the Gospel unless it is permitted to interfere with Lord's day worship.

**Deuteronomy, chap. 17** sets forth command forbidding offering a blemished animal unto the Lord; then instructions concerning punishment of anyone who'd do wickedly among Israelites; next we find directions in regard to deciding the most difficult matters. Chapter closes with instructions concerning a king when Israelites would decide to set one over them.

What do vs. 2, 3 set forth? Meaning of "transgressing" is clearly set forth.

What may we learn by vs. 12, 13? What the Old Testament means by "presumptuously", and thus what David meant by "presumptuous sins" in Psa. 19:13.

What is recorded concerning a king over Israelites? God foresaw they would, at some date, desire a king over them, so as to be like nations about them, and he gave directions in regard to choosing him and concerning his conduct after being chosen.

How many of Israel's kings followed those directions in every respect? Records of the kings imply not one followed them fully, but that many violated near or about all of them.

What would have resulted if every one of Israel's kings had made a copy of God's law to Israelites and read therein all the days of his life? Many would probably have been like David. He made mistakes but kept himself so much under influence of Divine law he was always open to conviction and, when convinced of wrong, promptly repented.

What may we learn from his ease? We ought to learn if we read God's word as we should we shall not be stubborn in error. Though overtaken in fault and do wrong, yet we shall always be open to conviction, and ready to repent when convinced.

What is chief or fundamental failure of mankind in Bible lands? Failure to read in God's book, chapter after chapter, from beginning to end, day by day. This failure results in ignorance which makes it possible for all other religious errors to prevail. In Mat. 22:29 the Savior expressed the secret of religious errorism. Mankind are always liable to be overtaken in faults and adopt errors; but constant, careful study of the Bible enables them to discover their faults and makes them willing to correct them.

**Deuteronomy, chap. 18** outlines what the Lord said about Levites; warnings against abominations of the heathen; prophecy concerning Christ, the Divine sentence against a false prophet, and test of a false prophet.

What should we learn from vs. 9-14? To keep clear of would-be fortune tellers and shun modern spiritualism with everything else of that kind. Such things were abomination to God in the Jewish age and certainly must be in the Gospel age. Paul in Gal. 5:20 wrote concerning "witchcraft" as among "work of the flesh", and in Acts 19:19 we learn those converted to Christ at Ephesus who 'used curious arts brought their books together and burned them'. Such shows the New Testament as well as Old is against "spiritualism", so-called, both ancient and modern.

What may we learn here concerning the true and false prophet? By reading Acts 3:22-24 we learn Christ was the true prophet to whom Moses referred. Then by John 12:49, 50 it becomes evident Christ received from his Father the words he spoke, even as Moses foretold. Also that, according to prophecy given through Moses, it is exceedingly dangerous for one to speak a word in God's name which is not Divinely commanded.

How should this affect those who "in the name of Christ" sprinkle water on infants or on adults? It should horrify them!

Did the Lord intend all prophets should be obeyed if they foretold something and it came to pass? No. Though the fact of a prophecy being fulfilled proved the one who uttered it was Divinely inspired, yet, according to chap. 13:1-3, the Lord sometimes inspired bad men in order to test his people.

What prophets did God intend his ancient people to obey? Such as told the truth and called on people to do what the Lord set forth in his law.

In what teachers should we have confidence? In those who tell the truth and then urge us to obey what is certainly set forth in the Gospel; and then urge us to be satisfied with diligent doing what the Lord requires. But those who do not cling to the truth in their preaching and teaching, or who, after having told the truth urge us to forsake it in some measure or degree,--all such preachers or teachers should be denounced!

**Deuteronomy 19** – Sets forth instructions in regard to 3 Cities of Refuge and purpose for which they were intended; also that if borders of Israelites should be enlarged, as the Lord purposed if they obeyed him, then they should add 8 more cities. Law in regard to wilful murder is then set forth, also law in regard to 2 or more witnesses; then law in regard to false witnesses.

What was the law against false witnesses? Same punishment should be inflicted on them which their testimony, if accepted, would have inflicted on the one against whom it was given.

Would that be good law now? Certainly. God knew what was in mankind and what kind of law was best for them. Psa. 18:30 should never be forgotten.

**Deuteronomy chap. 20** states Israelites should not be afraid of their enemies; what the priest should say when they would be required to confront their enemies in battle; what the officers should say to soldiers so certain classes should not go into the battle. Next is mention of offer of peace they should make to their enemies and how they should treat their enemies when they found it necessary to besiege a city. Chapter ends with instructions concerning kind of



trees Israelites might use and those they might not use in making bulwarks when besieging a city.

Were Israelites to offer peace to people in any city of the land of Canaan? Vs. 16-18 inform us no mercy was to be shown. Chap. 7:1-5 teaches the same.

To which of their enemies were they to offer peace? By reading vs. 5-7 we learn directions in former part of this chapter on offering peace were intended to regulate Israelites after they would settle in their own land; but that those who then occupied that land should be utterly destroyed.

**Deuteronomy chap. 21** gives instructions in regard to procedure to be adopted when one would be found killed and no one able to tell the murderer; method to be adopted when an Israelite wished to make a wife, of a captive; method to be observed in case a man would have 2 wives, one loved and the other hated, if the 1st-born of his sons were of the hated wife; method to be observed in case of a rebellious son; finally instructions in regard to the body of a man justly put to death by hanging on a tree.

What ought we learn from 1st part of this chapter? Sacredness of human life and sanctity of innocent blood. When the murderer could not be found God appointed a substitute, and when it had been killed according to instructions and other appointments attended to, as the Lord directed, then was promise of forgiveness.

What effect would such teaching have on mankind if they'd only read and consider it aright? Would impress their minds with sacredness of human life and guilt of innocent blood, so cases of murder would decrease in number. As a result God would not be offended nor the earth polluted as it is, and as further result the cry for vengeance against those who shed innocent blood, and from the earth on which innocent blood was shed (Gen. 4: 10, 11), would not constantly go up to heaven.

What should we learn from this chapter in regard to an Israelite taking a wife from among captive women? Specially from v. 13 that God regarded parental relation even among those heathen. We should learn also that those infidels who draw evil inferences from Num. 31:13-18 "err, not knowing the Scriptures" (Mat. 22:29). In this chapter is record of God's special and tender regard for heathen women captives among Israelites.

**Deuteronomy chap. 22** instructs Israelites on how to serve a brother Jew in case of finding a stray animal that belonged to him; also how to treat a brother's ox or ass found fallen by the wayside. Then instructions against men and women wearing each other's clothing; against taking a bird and contents of her nest; against building a house and not putting a railing around the roof; against mixing seeds; against making a team of an ox and an ass; against wearing a garment of mixed material. Then we find instructions intended to maintain spotless virginity among unmarried young women, and spotless chastity among both men and women.

What shall we say of punishment to be inflicted of unchaste men and women among Israelites? Very severe, but God knew severe punishment was necessary in order to guard against crime of unchasteness in men and women.

Would it be well for civil law to incorporate such punishment now? Certainly. God knew

what was best to prevent immorality.

In view of what is said in v. 5, what should we conclude in regard to certain boys and men parting their hair in the middle, also practice of certain girls and women parting their hair on the side? It should be discarded by all who respect God's idea of fitness of things among his people; likewise all other conduct which is unmanly on the one hand, and unwomanly on the other, should be carefully avoided.

**Deuteronomy chap. 23** records teachings intended to impress the mind of the Israelite with sanctity of the congregation of the Lord, also, sanctity of the human body in its perfection; importance of a clean birth record, and of never having done anything against God's people. God's interest in the Edomite because he was related to the Israelite, and in the Egyptian because Israel once dwelt in his land, we find recorded. Sanctity of the human body in its cleanness, and of the camp in its cleanness, is also set forth. Then are recorded instructions concerning treatment of a slave who fled from his master, a law against whoredom and sodomy, also against hire of a whore and price of a dog being placed in the Lord's treasury. Chapter ends with instructions concerning lending on usury or interest, concerning vows, and in regard to conduct in a neighbor's vineyard and standing grain.

Were women and children of Ammonites and Moabites responsible for mistreatment of Israelites mentioned in v. 4? No, Nevertheless God pronounced against them as nations.

Was there ever exception to law set forth in v. 3? Book of Ruth records exception in the case of a Moabitess, widow of an Israelite that lived for a time in land of Moab.

What should we learn by vs, 15, 16? That framers of the Constitution of the United States were perhaps, without exception, ignorant of those verses, or they would not have inserted a Fugitive Slave Law in that document. We learn also that all subsequent discussions and amendments of that law by both houses of the United States Congress in course of 70 or 80 years, or until it was blotted out by the life's blood of a million or more American citizens, resulted from inexcusable ignorance of God's word on the subject. Thus the crime of stealing Negroes from Africa and selling them to those who would purchase them in British colonies and in America was contrary to Exo. 21:16 and 1 Tim. 1:10. Thus that tolerated crime called "man-stealing", also the Fugitive Slave Law, which resulted in war between North and South in America, were both in opposition to God's civil or criminal law to Israelites. Both evils, considered separately or together, resulted from criminal ignorance of God's word on the part of American legislators. The mentioned traffic in slaves originated with the British, and was continued by the United States about 25 years after the Revolutionary War, or until 1808. But the Fugitive Slave Law remained in force 'til blotted out by the life's blood of American citizens in bloody war between North and South.

**Deuteronomy chap. 24** gives law concerning divorce and divorced ones, then law in regard to a newly married man, also law against taking a millstone as a pledge. Next a law against man-stealing, also precautions to observe law in regard to leprosy, then further directions in regard to pledges. Law concerning hired servants is next recorded, then statement that neither father nor children should be put to death for crimes of each other. Chapter ends with statement of God's care for strangers, for fatherless and widows.

What should we say concerning this divorce law? In Mat. 19:8 the Savior informs. In the

beginning God created one woman for the one man; when the Flood came God saved 4 men, each of whom had one wife; and the New Testament endorses that order.

What should we conclude from law in v. 5 about man remaining with his new wife a year to cheer her? When a woman left the home of her youth she needed to be cheered. Thus it was, thus it is, and thus it will be 'til close of time. The divine law reveals Divine considerateness for the heart of a woman when she leaves father and mother. Same is true of all laws of this chapter. They reveal tenderness of the Divine Father's care for the poor orphan, widow, servant and the stranger. Moreover the last verse shows God intended his people should remember their history, thus remember they were bondmen in Egypt.

**Deuteronomy chap. 25** shows what should be done in controversy in which a man would be found worthy of being beaten with stripes; then a statute is found concerning oxen used in threshing grain; then instructions in regard to a dead brother's name being continued in Israel by his living brother, also what should be done to the living brother who refused to take as a wife his dead brother's widow. Next we learn of severe penalty to be inflicted on the woman who would, in immodest manner, help her husband in conflict with another man. Law against unjust weights and measures and in favor of just weights and measures is next recorded, and the chapter ends with mention of Amalekites and what Israelites should do to them as a nation.

What may we say of the law concerning keeping a dead brother's name in Israel? It was considerate and touching, even as the law against the living brother who refused to take his dead brother's widow as his wife was severe and reproachful.

And what should we conclude in regard to the severe law against immodest women mentioned in v. 12? Should impress us that God condemns immodesty.

And what of the law against unjust weights and measures? Teaches that all guilty of using them among Israelites were "abomination unto the Lord".

Have we reason to suppose God is less displeased with dishonesty among Christians than he was with dishonesty among Jews? No. As it was among Jews so it is now, and will be 'til end of time. Dishonesty is abominable in God's sight!

**Deuteronomy chap. 26** gives directions in regard to what the Israelite should do and say when time would come each year for him to present first fruits of his harvest to the Lord; also directions in regard to what he should do and say every 3rd year when he tithed his increase according to Divine instructions. Chapter ends with statements concerning God's commands, assurances and purposes concerning Israelites as a nation.

What is meant by "a Syrian ready to perish was my father"? Read Hos. 12:12 also Gen. 29. Then in Gen. 31:24 we read of Laban as "the Syrian", and v. 41 of that same chapter states Jacob had been in Laban's house "twenty years", which means he was in that land 20 years. Besides, his mother was Laban's sister, thus was a Syrian.

What may we learn in regard to God's purpose in what he required the Israelite to do and say when time came for him to offer first fruits and his tithes? Implied by the record that the

Lord intended that Israelites should never forget their origin, thus remain humble. Isa. 51:1 suggests in this direction. Well for all mankind to remember their origin and always consider their destiny.

**Deuteronomy chap. 27** commands to set up great stones and plaster them over, then write on them all the law. Then instructions in regard to building an altar of whole stones, plastering them over, and writing on them all the law very plainly. Then mentions Mount Gerezim as the mount on which to bless, then mentions Mount Ebal as the, one on which to curse. Chapter ends with record of curses the Lord commanded to be pronounced by Levites.

What may we learn by considering those curses? The one in v. 18 should be regarded as implying severity against all who mislead the ignorant by false doctrines. Then the one in v. 24 is, by implication, severe against those who secretly slander neighbors and thus secretly smite the good name of those they slander.

**Deuteronomy chap. 28** sets forth more Jewish history than any other in the Bible. Records blessings God would bestow on Israelites even to extent and degree of setting them above all other nations, and always keeping them in that exalted position if they always obeyed him. Also records curses which should be inflicted on Israelites if they became disobedient. Some of those curses have been inflicted on the Jews ever since they became a scattered people, and will continue thus 'til Rev. 11 will be, fulfilled in them. V. 37, for instance, was fulfilled in them from destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70. When this chapter and history of the Jews in their disobedience are compared, the evidence that Moses was an Inspired prophet is overwhelming. V. 53 foretold that condition of the Jewish people when besieged by a nation of a strange tongue would be such that parents would eat their own children. If we should descend to uninspired history for evidence this was literally fulfilled we may find such evidence in "Wars of the Jews", by Josephus, 6th book, 3rd chapter, 4th paragraph. Thus, with Deut. 28 and the history of the Jews in their disobedience before us, there is but one reasonable conclusion concerning Moses, namely, that he was Supernaturally endowed to write in prophecy future history of his people. He was Divinely inspired.

What should we conclude in regard to Jews in times of their obedience? Impossible for any nation to succeed against them when they obeyed God. For instance, consider v. 7 in light of 2 Kings 18, 19. When the Jews were obedient to God, Isa. 54:17 was fulfilled in their behalf. Moreover Jer. 30:11 and 31:35-37 are still being fulfilled in behalf of the Jews notwithstanding their disobedience. The Lord still exercises care over them, and will preserve them as a separate people throughout the Gospel age, to accomplish ends he still has in view.

**Deuteronomy chap. 29** adds Moses' mention of God's covenant with them, then referred to what they had seen and heard of God's dealings with them, and next told of the covenant the Lord proposed to make with them. Also forewarned against doing wrong with idea that results of wrong-doing would not be inflicted. Divine judgments against disobedience, and what would be said concerning those judgments, we find near conclusion of the chapter.

What should we learn by reading the, last verse? That Jehovah has kept some things secret; also that we should be satisfied with what is revealed, and not try to be wise above what is Divinely recorded. That verse should be sufficient to cause us to suppress curiosity in regard to those things the Lord has not revealed.

**Deuteronomy chap. 30** sets forth statement of what the Lord would do for Israelites if they would repent, even after they should be scattered among the nations on account of disobedience. Then mentions that the word Jehovah spoke to them was near them, and not distant so they would need to send for it. Chapter ends with statements to the effect that the Lord set before the Jews life and death, blessing and cursing, followed by exhortation to choose life, and love the Lord who'd be their life and length of their days.

What shall we say of v. 6? Indicates spiritual meaning of circumcision, and suggests Ezek. 36:26. Such scriptures indicate fleshly circumcision was only an index to that spiritual separation from all evil the Lord intended should be always in his people.

**Deuteronomy chap. 31** tells of what Moses wrote concerning his age, of God's decision not to let him pass over Jordan, that the Lord would go before Israelites and drive out the heathen, and that they should be strong and of good courage. Next we read what Moses said to Joshua, then that Moses wrote the law God had given him and gave it to the priests. When to read that law to, all the people, is next commanded. What the Lord said to Moses and Joshua is next stated followed by command that Levites should put the law in the side of the ark. Chapter ends with prophecy in regard to corruptions to which Israelites would turn after Moses' death.

But if Levites had gathered the people together every 7th year and read to them the entire law, or even what was in Deuteronomy, what would have resulted? They would have been held by that law, specially if they had obeyed what is recorded in chap. 27 in regard to setting up great stones and plastering them over, and writing on them all the law; also what was enjoined in the same chapter in regard to writing the law on stones of the altar. But they treated with indifference Divine directions in regard to learning the law, and that resulted in such ignorance concerning the law as made them indifferent in regard to all God required of them. As further result what is written Isa. 5:13 and Hos. 4:6 was fulfilled in them.

What has ever been true of mankind during the Gospel age as it respects acquaintance with God's word? Same that was true of the Jews. Mat. 22:29 has been true of mankind in all generations. Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics and all Protestant sects are in error because they know not the Scriptures nor God's power. Same is true of statesmen, politicians, business men, husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, sons and daughters. All who err in relations to God and Christ, or in relations to each other, certainly err because they know not the Scriptures nor God's power. If it be said many know better than they do, it may be answered if they only knew all they could know they would be disposed to live up to fulness of their knowledge. God's word will not only banish ignorance from the mind and heart but will also banish pride of all kinds and religious indifference of every degree.

**Deuteronomy chap. 32** adds a song concerning Divine doctrine, greatness and goodness, mercy and might, power and vengeance, also concerning human weakness and waywardness, pride and perverseness, stubbornness and rebellion. Last of v. 20 declares Israelites were "children in whom was no faith". This expression sets forth secret of their evil disposition and final overthrow. Vs. 46, 47 record exhortation of Moses applicable to all mankind. Chapter ends with statement concerning death of Moses and why he should not be permitted to go into the land of Canaan.

What is meaning of "Jeshurun" in v. 15? Means "blessed", and was properly applied to Israelites because they were a "blessed" people, favored above all others. But in midst of peace and plenty they rebelled against God who had favored them and made them a "blessed" people.

Is the exhortation in vs. 46, 47 applicable now? Yes; and religious indifference prevails generally among mankind because that exhortation is not heeded.

**Deuteronomy chap. 33** refers to God's majesty, and sentences of blessing and blessedness.

What is meant by "Thummim" and "Urim" in v. 8? They mean "light and perfection", and were used to designate certain things connected with, or attached to, the high priest's garments. In light of Num. 27:21 and 1 Sam. 28:6 it is evident God's will in regard to secular matters was to be sought by consulting Him through them. Of what they consisted is not revealed and Deut. 29:29 should prevent our speculating in regard to them.

What is meant by v. 57 Simply that Moses was "king" in midst of the people called by a name which meant "blessed".

What should we then say of the statement that Saul, son of Kish, was first king over Israel? We should acknowledge he was first anointed to be king and 1st formally proclaimed king. But we should not forget Moses was called "king", nor what Judges 9 sets forth concerning a man named Abimelech, of the tribe of Manasseh, who became a king in Israel, though he never reigned over all the tribes.

**Deuteronomy chap. 34** gives account of Moses viewing the land of promise, then of his death, and of his burial in a secret sepulcher. Chapter ends with mention of age and physical health of Moses at time of death; of the period of time the Israelites wept for him after his death; of the fact that Joshua became leader of the Israelites in place of Moses; and of greatness of Moses as God's prophet.

Who buried the body of Moses? Jude 9 implies God sent Michael, the archangel, to bury it.

Who wrote the last chapter of Deuteronomy? We don't know. Moses may have been inspired to write it, or Joshua may have added it to the previous part of this book. "The secret things belong to the Lord our God" (chap. 29:29).

And now-- **Joshua chap. 1** records the 1st charge the Lord gave Joshua, who succeeded Moses in leadership of Israelites; also account of Joshua commanding Israelites in regard to getting ready to pass over Jordan and their response to him as commander.

What does "Joshua" mean? "Savior".

Was Joshua called by another name? In Num. 13:8 he was called Oshea; in 1 Chron. 7:27 he was called Jehoshuah; and in Acts 7:45 he was called Jesus.

What special assurance did the Lord give Joshua? That no man should be able to stand

before him, and that as He had been with Moses so He would be with him.

Was anyone able to stand before Christ and make successful speech against him? No; he always confuted his enemies.

Can anyone stand successfully against Christ's disciples who have studied the Bible until they understand it? No; the fear and dread of such disciples is in the hearts of all enemies who know them.

What shall we say of assurance officers of Israel's armies gave Joshua when they said that according as they had "harkened to Moses in all things" so they'd "harken" to him? It was all the chief commander of an army could wish as assurance from his subordinates.

Had those officers been obedient to Moses? They had.

What shall we then say of that which is recorded in Num. 13, 14? Those chapters give account of the army 1st numbered, which had been overthrown by Divine judgments; but the army Joshua commanded was last numbered and always obedient to Moses. Whoever does not know there were 2 numberings of men of war in the wilderness, and that Joshua commanded the army of the 2nd numbering, cannot understand vs. 16,17.

**Joshua chap. 2** sets before us account of 2 spies Joshua sent over Jordan to view the land, even the city of Jericho.

What should we say to those who state that favor shown to the harlot Rahab and commendation given her in Heb. 11:31 indicate God sanctions lying? We should remind them of difference between the blood of war and the blood of peace, mentioned in 1 Kings 2:5. So doing we should state that for one man to kill another by reason of enmity, in time of peace, is generally called murder; but in time of war it is not so called. On the same principle all deception, in word or deed, practiced in time of peace, is generally called lying; but in time of war it is simply "strategy". End in view is to overcome the enemy with least loss of life.

Is there other response that may be scripturally made to those disposed to criticize the Lord because he favored a woman who told a lie and in other respects acted as a deceiver? Yes, we may refer to Rom. 4:15 and 5:13, where we learn that, as the harlot Rahab had not received Divine law against lying, she did not transgress in telling a lie; for "where no law is there is no transgression". And "sin is not imputed where there is no law". God is not unjust, therefore he will not charge wrong against those who never had opportunity to know what is right.

**Joshua chap. 3** records approach of Joshua and Israelites unto Jordan. Directions to the people in regard to following the ark; next an account of dividing the waters of the Jordan; and passing of Israelites over Jordan as by dry land.

What is meant by "Come not near it, that ye may know the way by which ye must go", in v. 4? Indicate that by Israelites keeping themselves about 1,900 yards from the ark a much greater number could see it than if they followed it closely.

Was the Divine command obeyed? Yes, at least no disobedience was charged against Israelites at that time.

Did they not generally obey when they could walk by sight? Yes.

But how did they act when required to walk by faith? Often disobeyed.

How is this with Israelites according to the Spirit? They walk better by sight and reason than by faith. Wish for something in religion they can see with their natural eyes or which appears reasonable to their minds.

What may be justly said of all such Israelites? They are only pretenders, and are not children of wisdom nor of faith. Seen not to understand true faith nor what it requires. Professing to believe in justification by faith only, they seem not to know true faith's domain. Indicated by the fact that every Gospel requirement they do not think they can understand reason for they place among non-essentials. Such Divine requirements as do not fully test their faith they regard as essential to salvation, while such requirements as must be obeyed by faith unmixed, or unmingled faith, they speak of as non-essential to salvation. At same time these professors pretend to believe sinners are justified by faith only or faith alone.

**Joshua chap. 4** shows directions the Lord gave Joshua in regard to erecting 2 memorials in heaps of stones: one in midst of Jordan, the other at the 1st camping place of Israelites after passing over Jordan.

What was the Lord's purpose in commanding Joshua to erect such monuments? Last part of this chapter informs.

Are there any monuments, in form of memorial institutions, mentioned in the New Testament? Yes; the Lord's Supper and the First Day of the week are set before us to refresh Christians' minds concerning the fact that Christ died for our sins and was raised for our justification (Rom. 4:25).

**Joshua chap. 5** teaches, first of all, concerning fear kings of the Canaanites felt when they learned the waters of Jordan had been divided for the Israelites. Next we learn of instructions concerning circumcision, and meaning of "Gilgal". Chapter ends with statements in regard to manna ceasing, and concerning Joshua's interview with one who declared himself "captain of the host of the Lord".

What is meant by reproach of Egypt being rolled away from Israelites? In light of history of Israelites thus far given it can only mean the reproach of bondage in Egypt, indicated very forcibly by circumcision of male children born in the wilderness

What was meaning of Jewish circumcision? Separation of Jewish people from other nations, thus from sins of other nations. Also, separation of mankind from sinful life under the Gospel age (Deut. 10:16; 30: 6; Jer. 4:4; Col. 2:11; Philip. 3:3). Then in Rom. 2: 25-29 we learn more in regard to meaning of circumcision to Jewish people. Paul sets forth that it wasn't acceptable to God unless followed by separation from sin.

**Joshua chap. 6** informs in regard to the city of Jericho; of God's plan for overcoming that



city; also of success which attended Joshua and the army under his command when they executed the plan God gave them.

Was there any sense or reason in the plan God gave Joshua against Jericho? From a human viewpoint it was unreasonable.

What power moved Joshua to adopt the Divine plan for overcoming the city? Heb. 11:30 informs.

Did God's plan for accomplishing any end ever fail if faithfully executed? God knows what is best, and the wise always follow his directions. When Divinely arranged plans are faithfully executed Divinely re-tended results will always be accomplished.

How should modern deviations from the Gospel plan of saving sinners and perfecting believers be regarded? As evidences of lack of faith in God and Christ.

What should we say concerning those who teach mankind are justified by "faith only", but declare water baptism and weekly observance of the Communion are not essential to salvation, and give as a reason for so declaring, that they can see no reason in such ordinances? That class of teachers clearly show they don't know what faith is. Certainly they indicate they have no just idea of faith that is not mixed with sight or reason. Pure faith in God and Christ always moves those who possess it to do what the Lord requires and in his own Divinely appointed way.

What is meant by v. 26? Implies or intimates that whoever would rebuild a city accursed as Jericho was should, in so doing, suffer loss of his eldest and youngest sons (1 Kings 16:34).

**Joshua 7** informs in regard to a certain Israelite, Achan, of the tribe of Judah, who disobeyed the Divine charge in regard to spoils of the city of Jericho, set forth in v. 18 of previous chapter.

What may we learn by considering Achan's sin and its results? Danger of disobedience, importance of God's approval, and impossibility of hiding anything from God.

If ancient Israelites could not stand before their enemies when they had disobeyed God, what should modern Israelites conclude in regard to themselves? That they will not be able to stand before their enemies if they disobey God's commands or in any respect disregard his will.

Will God's approval rest on a congregation which covers iniquity in its midst? 1 Cor. 5 answers.

Will God hear and answer prayers of Christians if they do wrong and refuse to repent? Psa. 66:18 and the entire New Testament unite in teaching mankind must be pure within, as well as without, in order to be acceptable with God. Mat. 5:28, 23:25'28 and Jas. 4:3 indicate Divine teaching in the New Testament on this subject.

What of those who wrong one or several of their fellow mortals and refuse to repent, but

confess their wrongs to God and, perhaps, to persons they have not injured? They are rebellious in heart and cannot find acceptance with God.

What of those guilty of wrong doing toward others, and then, by prayer, charity toward the poor and contributions to the church treasury endeavor to balance accounts? They are self-deceived and will learn, when too late, they have made a fatal mistake.

**Joshua 8** gives account of directions to Joshua in regard to overcoming the city of Ai, and success which attended his observing those directions; also account of Joshua building an altar of whole stones, writing on them the words of the law, reading the entire law to the men, women, children and strangers of the entire congregation which crossed Jordan.

Is anything recorded in this chapter concerning spoils that were taken different from what is recorded in the previous chapter? Silver, gold and other metals of Jericho were commanded to be put in the Lord's treasury, while cattle and other domestic animals were slain (chap. 6:19, 21); but v. 27 of this chapter informs that cattle and other wealth of Ai the people took for themselves.

What should we learn from such difference? It was determined by Divine authority.

Is it still true acts right in one instance are wrong in others? Yes. For instance, all right official acts are wrong for those not in official positions. Same is true in regard to family relationship. This illustrates that musical instruments may be right as play things in the home where children are, but are wrong in the meeting house where Christians assemble for worship in spirit and in truth, and not for purpose of playing.

**Joshua 9** gives account of people called Gibeonites, and how they secured a league with Israelites, and its results.

What mistake did Joshua and princes of Israel make in dealing with men of Gibeon who came to them? V. 14 informs.

Are mistakes in regard to religion ever made in the Gospel age by mankind not asking counsel Of the Lord? All religious errors in this age are result of not seeking the Lord's counsel as set forth in the Bible.

Is the Bible so clear all who seek to learn the Divine will may succeed in finding it? Yes, if they will seek by the right method and with sufficient earnestness.

What is the right method by which to learn the Divine will? Study history found in the Bible in order to understand doctrine of the Bible; then study both history and doctrine in order to understand its prophecy.

**Joshua 10** records effort 5 kings of the land of Canaan made to destroy the Gibeonites because they made a league with Israelites; also of the Lord's overthrow of those kings by Joshua and his army.

What should Israelites have learned by facts recorded in vs. 24, 25? Sufficient to bare them and their descendants forever in submission to the Divine will.

What did Christ say to his apostles about giving them power of speech their adversaries should not be able to withstand? Luke 21:15 informs.

Is it true the Gospel is more powerful than any other religious doctrine? The Gospel in its fullness, in the mind, heart and life of Christians, has more power than any other religious doctrine. Even more powerful than all other religious doctrines combined.

What shall we say to those who approach us with criticisms on vs. 12, 13, saying the sun and moon don't move, as they seem, thus the writer of this book didn't understand astronomy? We should answer such criticism by saying the sun and moon do not "rise" and "set" as almanacs made by scientific men teach, and that those who criticize what is set forth in the book of Joshua about the sun and moon standing still would better correct their own almanacs before going farther in their criticisms. We should next say that statements to which they object in Joshua 10 are accommodative, even as the expressions "sun-rise" and "sunset" are accommodative.

What should we say if called to explain what is in this chapter about the day being lengthened that Joshua might slay his enemies? We should state God caused revolutions or rotations of the earth to be checked in their speed so the sun shone longer than usual, or, as the text says, the sun "hasted not to go down about a whole day".

But what should we say if told that to check rotations of the earth would permit the waters to overflow the earth? The same Being who did what is stated in Job 38:3-11 could check earth's rotations and still hold the waters in appointed places.

What should be our answer to those who tell us science so differs from the Bible in other respects as to show the Bible is not altogether true? What was called "medical science" for 2,000 years or more differed from the Bible in regard to blood being life of the flesh, and throughout that period medical science was wrong on that question. This is now admittedly physicians of every school, and they deplore that their science was ever guilty of the crime of undue use of the lancet in blood-letting. Besides, we should state Job 38:14, properly translated as in King James Version indicated motion of the earth; and Isa. 40:22 indicated its shape, while so-called "science" was in error on those subjects. This indicates all other so-called "scientific ideas" are wrong wherein they differ from the Bible.

What should we say to those who inform us certain inscriptions on monuments of Oriental heathen nations indicate some things set forth in the Bible are not correct? So much evidence exists that Orientalists are not always honest, that we should receive all testimony from that direction with allowance for dishonesty if it differs from the Bible. For instance, in a work titled "Explorations in Bible Lands During the 19th Century", by H. V. Hilprich, pp. 23, 24, we find: "In 1802 the genius of a young German scholar, Georg Frederick Grotefend, then only 27 years old, well versed in classical philology, but absolutely ignorant of Oriental learning, solved the riddle, practically, in a few days, that had puzzled much older men and scholars apparently much better qualified than himself. Under magical touch of his hand mystic and complicated characters of ancient Persia suddenly gained new life. But when he was far enough advanced to announce to the Academy of Sciences in Gottingen the epoch-making discovery, which established his reputation and fame forever, that learned body, though comprising men of eminent mental training and intelligence, strange to say, declined to publish the Latin of this little-known college teacher, who did not belong to the university circle proper nor was even an Orientalist by profession. Not until 90 years later

(1893) his original papers were re-discovered and published by Prof. Wilhelm Meyer of Gottingen".

With foregoing exposure of dishonesty of certain men engaged in deciphering Oriental inscriptions, what confidence can be placed in what any others of them now give to the public? Many are haters of the Bible, and others have not studied it sufficiently to understand its right divisions. As a result, their vision is so beclouded concerning the Sacred Text that they are liable to err at every angle of their moral vision and, as result, suppress whatever favors the Biblical record of events. Humility and candor, logic and reverence, are never found in the Bible's enemies, nor even in its professed friends who are proud of their learning. Just in proportion as mankind are proud of their learning, or of anything else they are too much blinded to be honest in regard to anything which wounds or humbles their pride.

**Joshua 11** briefly records the final battle against Canaanites.

What may we learn for our good by the record of that battle? Should impress on our minds that when the Lord's people are obedient to him in all things they're destined to succeed regardless of number and strength of their enemies.

**Joshua 12** gives brief statement of victories by Israelites under Moses on wilderness side of the Jordan, and then of victories under Joshua in the land of Canaan, now called Palestine.

How, many kings were overcome while Moses commanded the army of Israel? Two.

How many kings were overcome while Joshua was in command? Thirty-one.

Were kings in those countries rulers over much territory and many people? Sometimes ruled over not more than 1 or 2 cities.

What is meant in v. 2 that Sihon, king of Amorites, ruled "from the middle of the river"? In light of principles of law now in some, or all, civilized nations, that expression means when a river was a border line between 2 nations it was controlled by each to the middle of the river.

**Joshua 13** states concerning Joshua's age; and that much land remained unconquered; followed by statement of borders of the several parts of that land, and the rulers. Then statement of inheritances given to 2 ½ tribes on wilderness side of Jordan, and what should be borders of the 9 ½ tribes which had not yet received inheritances.

Was it important that boundaries of all inheritances should be named by the Lord? It was, in view of weaknesses of human nature. Had not those boundaries been named by the Lord many disputes would probably have arisen which could not have been easily settled.

What should this suggest to us? Importance of having terms of all contracts clearly stated and well understood.

**Joshua 14** is continuance of statements in the previous chapter concerning inheritances of several tribes; then account of interview between children of Judah, with Caleb as their

spokesman, and Joshua, in regard to their inheritance.

On what did Caleb base his claim for a certain part of the land? On the oath of Moses to him in regard to what part should be his inheritance because of his faith when he returned from spying out the land 45 years before.

Did Caleb manifest weakness common among old men of energy? He did, in stating he was as strong at 85 years as he was at 40.

**Joshua 15** states concerning boundaries of Judah's territory beyond what is in previous chapter.

What may we learn in regard to Judah's daughter Achsah? Married her cousin and showed good business foresight.

Does her marriage justify cousins marrying under the Gospel age? Observation and experience show among Gentiles cousins should not marry. While not religiously wrong yet it is physiologically dangerous; specially if cousins be of similar temperaments. Those of similar temperaments, who are not cousins, ought not unite in marriage. It has proved unfavorable for production of children having physical and mental vigor.

What of v. 63, that Judah "could not drive" Jebusites out of Jerusalem? In Deut. 7:22 the Lord told Israelites he did not intend to drive all out at once, and ff children of Judah undertook to do so before God's time arrived it was right for them to fail. But chap. 17:12, 13 informs that those who could not be driven out by children of Manasseh at one time, were later put to tribute, or made to pay taxes. This shows what men of Judah and all others might have done if they had only been faithful and in God's appointed time done their full duty.

What lesson should Christians learn by considering such facts in regard to fleshly Israel? When sinners become Christians the Lord does not propose to purge out all evil dispositions, but leaves them, as enemies to their peace, to be overcome as they grow stronger in the Divine life. We also learn if Christians do not grow in grace and knowledge of the truth their evil dispositions will overcome them.

**Joshua 16** gives account of the settling the tribe of Ephraim and half the tribe of Manasseh on their inheritance in the land of Canaan, and borders of Ephraim's inheritance are mentioned.

From whom did those tribes descend? Joseph.

Of what prophecy was settling of those tribes a fulfilment? Gen. 48:22 was then fulfilled. Jacob declared he had given Joseph a portion above his brethren fulfilled when the 2 tribes descended from Joseph received inheritances while descendants of each of his brethren received only one inheritance.

What was meant by Jacob's statement that he had taken Joseph's portion out of the hand of the Amorite? Speaking prophetically, and foresaw what his descendants would do in wars against Amorites.

Did Joseph's descendants drive out their enemies entirely? Contented themselves with placing them under tribute.

What was first result of failure to drive out their enemies entirely? God was displeased, as we learn by Judges 2.

What was final result of failure to do their duty against their enemies? The book of Judges informs they were brought under their enemies and oppressed.

Have professed Christians at any time failed to get rid of all wrong doctrines and practices? This has been their general weakness. They have failed to purge out the old leaven in doctrine and practice and, as result, error has so increased among them, collectively, and in them personally, that they have generally been overthrown.

Might not Christians have learned to do better than has just been stated? Yes, if they had only studied history of ancient Israelites they might have learned importance of purging out the old leaven of sin in both doctrine and practice.

**Joshua 17** informs concerning tribe of Manasseh and its borders, also of fulfillment of the promise Moses made to daughters of a man named Zelophehad, of that tribe; also an interview between Joshua and descendants of Joseph in regard to enlargement of their borders.

May Christians enlarge borders of the Church? It is their duty to do, so. The Church is required to repeat constantly the invitation in Rev. 22:17, and this means constant increase in its membership.

Did Joshua promise Ephraim and Manasseh enlargement of their borders regardless of strength of their enemies? The last verse answers.

May not the Church enlarge its borders regardless of strength of its enemies? 2 Cor. 10:3-5 informs on this subject. As it was with ancient Israel so it is now, and so it will be.

**Joshua 18** mentions setting up the tabernacle at Shiloh; also that 7 tribes had not at that time received their inheritance. Then we read of the plan adopted by Joshua in regard to giving those tribes their inheritances. Chapter ends with record of the tribe of Benjamin receiving inheritance, and of borders thereof.

What is meant by "cast lots" in v. 8? Prov. 16:33 indicates of the manner in which lots were cast by Jews and that, when casting lots was resorted to, the Lord so controlled the lot that it fell according to righteousness.

Did the church Christ's apostles established ever resort to casting lots? Silence of the Divine record indicates it did not.

**Joshua 19** records 6 tribes receiving inheritances as divided to them by casting of lots at the tabernacle door. Mention then of Joshua receiving his inheritance. Chapter ends with statement that an end was made of dividing the country.

Does the record inform of dissatisfaction on the part of any tribe with inheritance received? All seemed satisfied.

Might not Israelites have been peaceful, happy and prosperous until, close of time if they had always obeyed the Lord? Yes, and might have so increased as to have taught the truth concerning the only true God to all nations before the Messiah's appearance on earth.

What might Christians have accomplished if they'd only continued faithful from the first until the present? Conversion of all nations.

What may Christians accomplish even yet if they'll be faithful and so continue until Christ comes again? All honestly disposed in regard to religion may be led to understand the Gospel.

**Joshua 20** records directions concerning appointing of Cities of Refuge to which those might flee who might kill a person unintentionally, thus without malice.

How long was the person who killed another without malice to remain in the City of Refuge to which he might flee? V. 6 informs.

What is meant by standing "before the congregation for judgment"? Deut. 19:11-13 indicates if a man was guilty of malicious murder, then the City of Refuge he might reach should not be permitted to protect him; but the elders of his city should bring him out and deliver him to the Avenger of blood. The elders would act in behalf of the congregation in judging him.

What is meant by "death of the high priest" in v. 6? If the person guilty of killing another fled to a City of Refuge, and was not found guilty of wilful murder when judged by the elders in behalf of the congregation, then he should remain in that City of Refuge until death of the high priest who was living when the murder was committed.

How did death of the high priest affect such a case? It was end of the priestly administration under which the killing was done. Justice demanded punishment on the one who shed innocent blood, and the Lord decided what it should be and length of time it should be continued, according to his Divine wisdom, justice and mercy.

**Joshua 21** tells of giving 48 cities and their suburbs to Levites for their possession; also giving a possession to Caleb, son of Jephunneh. Chapter ends with statements in regard to fulfillment of God's promises to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob concerning land of Canaan as possession for their descendants.

Are Divine promises always fulfilled? If made as decrees, thus without conditions. But when God conditions a promise its fulfillment depends on conditions. What conclude because Israelites' enemies were unable to stand before them, and the Lord delivered enemies into their hands? Should hate caused Israelites unreserved allegiance to God, and to do all in their power to cause their descendants to always obey Divine law.

Who is able to stand before Christians with success if they be always obedient to Christ? None can succeed against them if only mental force is used. If physical force is used against

them they may be overcome for a time, but they will succeed in the end if they constantly obey Divine law.

**Joshua 22** gives Joshua's benediction on soldiers of the tribes of Reuben and Gad and of the half of the tribe of Manasseh, who had received inheritances east of Jordan. To this is added account of the altar those soldiers erected at the Jordan before they crossed the river, and of wrong inferences men of other tribes drew concerning purpose of that altar. Chapter ends with record of the explanation, and of satisfaction with which it was received.

What may be safely said with reference to inferences? Should generally be regarded with doubt. They may be wholly right or wrong, or a medley of right and wrong. Nearly all difficulties which arise among mankind are result of inferences partly or wholly wrong. All religious differences are result of such inferences. Difference between Divine testimony and human inference seems not understood by many. Christians should confine their thoughts to fact and truth, and avoid conclusions on mere inferences, specially far-fetched or fanciful inferences.

**Joshua 23** informs what Joshua said to leading men of Israel about his age, what he had done for Israel, and in regard to their behavior. Latter part of the chapter informs of warnings Joshua gave Israelites against disobedience.

What should we learn by the warning against mentioning names of other gods, as in v. 7? Disciples of Christ ought never to have talked about additions to worship and work of the Church. If no disciple had ever mentioned musical instruments in worship, nor church societies in work, of the Church, such innovations could not have been introduced. But those disciples who began talking in favor of such instruments and societies are responsible for evil results which followed.

**Joshua 24** gives Joshua's last speech to chief men of Israel also that he pressed Israelites to pledge themselves to serve God; then set up a stone as witness of their pledge. Chapter ends with mention of death and burial of Joshua; of faithfulness of Israel for a period then of the burial of Joseph's bones which had been brought out of Egypt; and finally record of death of Eleazar the priest and burial of his body in Mount Ephraim.

Can any man, in the Gospel age say what Joshua said about himself and family serving the Lord, and be in harmony with the liberty the Gospel gives? The most anyone can scripturally say on that subject, is that he will serve the Lord and try to persuade his family to do so. But in regard to serving the Lord, a man cannot speak positively except for himself. Christians have no such authority over faith of others as Jews had. During the Gospel age all service rendered to God must be result of conviction in order to be acceptable.

**Judges chapter 1** gives successes of Israelites against their enemies, and their omissions of duty in regard to driving out their enemies and destroying them.

Had the Lord commanded Israelites in regard to driving their enemies out of the land? Deut. 7th and 12th chapters answer.

What shall we say of the statement that Judah could not drive Canaanites out of the



valleys "because they had chariots of iron"? Josh. 17:18 informs that God promised other tribes should overcome their enemies regardless of "iron chariots". Then in v. 28 of this chapter we learn when Israelites became strong they put Canaanites to tribute. Shows they were strong enough to drive them out entirely if they had been so disposed.

What shall we say of the mistake Israelites made in omitting their duty with reference to driving out all enemies from the land God gave them? A fatal mistake, as this book clearly indicates. Led to marriages with Canaanites and even to adopting their religious abomination. As result, the Lord gave them into the hands of their enemies to be humbled.

Is the disposition to compromise with error common in mankind? It is. And yielding to that disposition has proved spiritual ruin of millions in every age of man's existence, The New Testament declaration that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1 Cor. 5: 6; Gal. 5:9) has always been true in regard to doctrine and practice, in Family and in State, in Church and in Individual. Banishment of every error in doctrine and of every evil in practice is the only safe plan for mankind.

**Judges 2** is brief history of Israelites during days of the Judges, beginning with Joshua.

What does that history reveal? Obedience and success, disobedience and failure. In proportion as Israelites obeyed the Lord they were blest, and in proportion as they disobeyed Him they were distressed.

What may we learn by considering v. 10? Shows Israelites did not do their duty in teaching their children concerning God's law nor of His works. In Deut. 6:6, 7 and 31:10-13 we learn what the Lord commanded in regard to teaching children. Had Israelites diligently obeyed what was there commanded, then that which is stated in v. 10 of this chapter could not have been true of their descendants.

Are Christian parents generally disposed to neglect teaching their children the Lord's word? They are; and, as result, their children are not fortified in mind against wrong doctrines and practices common in both the religious and the irreligious world. Failure on part of parents to do their full duty in teaching children the truth, in all departments, explains much of the religious, moral and even political corruption in all ages. But as parents cannot teach their children, what is right, except as they learn it themselves, it is evident all parents, specially Christians, should study what is right with all possible diligence for benefit of their children as well as for their own benefit. Men and women are not doing right when they bring children into this world, then feel indifferent to food and clothing of those children, physically or spiritually.

**Judges 3** mentions those heathen the Lord left to test Israelites; also of intermingling of Israelites with those heathen and becoming partakers of their ways. Then account of evil doing of Israelites, of their subjugation to the king of Mesopotamia; also their deliverance when they repented. Next we have account of their return to evil, of their subjugation to the king of Moab, likewise of their repentance and deliverance. Chapter ends with mention of a notable man named Shamgar.

How long were Israelites free from oppression by the king of Mesopotamia before they returned to their evil ways? Forty years; then they were delivered to Moabites.

How long were they free from Moabites before they again did evil? Eighty years.

Any resemblance between Israelites and modern religious denominations in regard to reformations and backslidings? Close resemblance in various respects, specially in regard to length of time a reformation maintained its reformatory principles without backsliding. Forty to 80 years has been the usual time that elapsed before backslidings in doctrine or practice, or both, have obscured reformatory principles of each denomination now in existence, at least as far as self-denial in practice is concerned.

Is there exception to this rule? Yes; churches of Christ now in existence are striking exception. They constitute a religious body which is, as a rule, becoming more and more intense each year in favor of the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible as its religious guide-book in theory and practice. This was the original position of that body of religionists, taken early in the 19th century, and, as time passes, large proportion of that body becomes more intensely devoted in its favor.

Does mankind's history, in or out of the Bible, furnish another instance of this kind? No. Reformations have generally lost their reformatory ideas or zeal within a half-century from the time they have become effective. The fact that the church of God, consisting of Apostolic disciples, is an exception to all rules in compromising tendencies among mankind, forms basis for hope that this church will continue 'til close of time without worse affliction than an occasional defection which will rapidly go to its own place. True, disciples should lift their hearts and hands in thanks to God that they are members of this church, and should daily strive to advance its interests by doing the Divine will.

**Judges 4** records Israelites again doing evil, and that God gave them into power of the Canaanites, who oppressed them 20 years; also that the Lord delivered them through a prophetess named Deborah, and how, by a man named Barak, the deliverance was accomplished.

What does v. 1 reveal? Illustrates what is in chap. 2:19. When God raised up a judge to deliver Israelites from their oppressors they generally served God while that judge lived, but as soon as he was dead they began again to corrupt themselves. This reveals while they had a man among them in whom they had confidence they served the Lord, but when he died they followed their own inclinations.

If priests had done their full duty, in, teaching the law, would the people have been as wayward and perverse as they were? No. Their frequent backslidings must have been result of ignorance of the Lord's law-and of their own history. Such ignorance was chargeable to priests and other leading men.

What should we learn by studying this book? We should be impressed with weakness and perverseness of human nature when left to itself; and should charge ourselves with importance of studying the Bible from beginning to end, in order that our spirits may be strengthened that they will be enabled to bring our bodies under and hold them in subjection.

Then only will we be able to obey 1 Cor. 6:20.

**Judges 5** records a song the prophetess Deborah and Barak (son of Abinoam) sang on the day Jabin, king of Canaan, and his host were overthrown. Also in that song the Lord was praised, and credit given, all who assisted in the overthrow; likewise a curse was invoked against those who did not come to help of the Lord against the mighty. Chapter ends with brief prayer against the Lord's enemies, and prayer in favor of those who love the Lord; and statement that the land rested 40 years,—which means Israelites were not oppressed by their enemies for that length of time.

What is meant by "they chose new gods; then was war in the gates" in v. 8? In view of historic limitations in which it is found, it must mean when Israelites chose to worship heathen gods they brought trouble on themselves. The reason was 2-fold. 1st, when Israelites chose to worship strange gods they offended the only true God; 2nd, outworkings of error are always troublesome.

Have disciples of Christ had experience in harmony with the statement that choosing new gods brings war into the gates? Yes; the fact that some chose musical instruments to be used with their public worship, and certain societies with other devices to be used in religious work, brought strife and contention among them.

Have those instruments and other devices in any respect resembled gods? In light of Ezek. 14 it is evident mankind while professing to worship God can set up idols in their hearts. Then, in light of misconduct of those disciples who became devoted to musical instruments and human societies in worship and work of the church, it may be safely said they bear marks of idolatry. For instance, covetousness is idolatry, and the covetous person is an idolator (Eph. 5:5; Col. 3:5). This being true—

What is the character of professed disciples who've coveted and taken meeting houses they did not build and, in some instances, which they did not help to build in any measure? Scriptures just referred to answer this question.

What is character of those who have shown if, they could not have the organ, or other musical instrument, in connection with worship of God they would refuse to worship Him publicly? and at the same time admitting a musical instrument is not essential to acceptable worship? Such persons clearly show they have set up an idol in their hearts, even as men in Ezek. 14 have done.

**Judges 6** records that Israelites again did evil in sight of the Lord, and were given under power of Midianites, who oppressed them so they cried to the Lord. Then mention of a prophet of the Lord speaking to Israelites in regard to what God did for them, and that they had disobeyed Him. Next that an angel of God appeared to a man named Gideon, of the tribe of Manasseh, and declared him a "mighty man of valor". Remainder of the chapter sets forth facts pertaining to preparing Gideon in mind and heart, then with an army, to overthrow Midianites.

**Judges 7** tells of Gideon's army of 32,000; what the Lord said in regard to it being too large, and how to reduce it so overthrow of Midianites when accomplished would be to God's glory, and not to man's glory. We further read of actual overthrow of Midianites, and how accomplished.

What may we learn from the Divine purpose to reduce Gideon's army so his men might not exalt themselves to think by their own might enemies of Israel had been overthrown? That God is jealous for his own glory, and zealous for honor of his own name. He has never consented to divide honors with anyone, nor has he ever been pleased with human assumptions of power and might. In Isa. 42:8 Jehovah said, "I am the Lord; that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images". All that is recorded in both Old Testament and New on this subject is to the same effect. Paul said to Corinthians, "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatever you do,—do all to glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31). To the same church he also wrote, "Therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's" (1 Cor. 6:20). On the other hand, God has always condemned human assumptions of power and glory which belonged to Him (Isa. 10; Acts 12:20-23).

**Judges 8** tells of Gideon's wisdom in response to men of the tribe of Ephraim; of his persistence in pursuing and overthrowing Midianites; of his refusing to rule over Israelites or permit his son to rule over them; and of his declaration that God should rule over them. Bible readers may next learn of Gideon's, weakness in requesting golden ear rings Israelites had taken from Midianites; of his mistake in use he made of those ear rings; also of length of time Israelites obeyed the Lord; of their idolatry after Gideon's death, and of their disregard of his family notwithstanding all he had done to deliver Israel from the oppressor.

What should we conclude concerning Gideon? He was a brave and wise man for war, but misused gold in time of peace.

What shall we say of conduct of Israelites toward him, his family, and toward the Lord? Showed themselves ungrateful to man and God.

What was secret of such ingratitude? Ignorance in the rising generation. Most of those who suffered oppression by Midianites had died within 40 years of time of their deliverance through Gideon under the Lord's directions. While they lived they failed to impress on their children an account of what they had suffered, and what the Lord did for them through Gideon. As result, they grew up in ignorance of oppressions their fathers suffered, and of the gratitude due to God, and respect due to Gideon and his family. As further result, they soon went into idolatry. Such was their history, and such has ever been history of mankind. They have suffered past history to repeat itself because they remained ignorant of what past history reveals.

**Judges 9** gives history of a bold, presumptuous, mighty man, named Abimelech, son of Gideon by a concubine who lived in Shechem, a city separate from his own home in Abiezer.

What may we learn from history of Abimelech? Reveals that Gideon's desire for children led him to go too far, and that the son born to him by his concubine in Shechem became

murderer of all his other sons except one. We learn also Abimelech usurped ruler-ship of the people and was proclaimed king. But his kingdom did not stand, for it was not sanctioned by the Lord. Nevertheless, as he reigned as king 3 years or more, all Bible readers should remember this fact, and not state without explanation that Saul, son of Kish, was 1st king who ruled over Israel.

**Judges 10** says a man named Tola, of the tribe of Issa-char, judged Israel 23 years; then that a man named Jair, of the tribe of Manasseh, judged Israel 22 years. Next a record is given of Israelites again doing evil in the Lord's sight, on account of which they were given into hands of the Philistines and Ammonites, by whom they were vexed and oppressed 18 years. Then account of people of Israel calling on the Lord to deliver them, of his answer, and their answer to him. Chapter ends with mention of inquiry of Israelites concerning the man who should be their leader in fighting against their enemies.

**Judges 11** is history of a man named Jephthah, of the tribe of Manasseh.

What evidence that Gilead, birthplace of Jephthah, was within domain of the tribe of Manasseh? Num. 32:40 is sufficient.

As Jephthah was son of a harlot, what shall we say of the fact that God chose him to lead Israelites against their enemies? Shows when God needed a man for important work, at that time, He did not reject a suitable man because his mother was a lewd woman.

Does this chapter give evidence that Jephthah was suitable to lead armies of Israel? Yes, he showed he was acquainted with history of his people and knew how to reason with their enemies.

What shall we say of Jephthah's vow? It was rash, and is terrible warning against rash and sweeping statements.

Did he offer his daughter for a burnt offering? The record so declares, and Lev. 27:28, 29 so authorized, and the Hebrew word translated "devoted" in that passage means "devoted to God without power of redemption". Besides, the distress of mind Jephthah expressed when he saw his daughter indicates he understood his vow required his daughter's death.

But what is meant by the monied estimation mentioned in former part of Lev. 27? Refers to monied estimation arranged at time the vow was made. Lev. 27:8 indicates this. But in case of Jephthah such estimation was not made. Moreover, God commanded Abraham to offer his son Isaac for a burnt offering and, in fulness of time, he gave Christ to fulfill a vow, or promise, he had made to man.

**Judges 12** shows complaint of men of Ephraim because not invited by Jephthah to fight with him against Ammonites; also the answer he gave, and war that resulted. Then we read of Jephthah as judge, of Ibzan as judge, of Elon as judge, and of Abdon as judge.

Was that the first time Ephraimites complained because not called to fight against

enemies of Israel? No. Chap. 8 informs on that subject. For some reason, best known to the Lord, he did not choose a man from their tribe to lead in delivering Israel, and then on 2 occasions they complained because God's chosen leader did not call them to battle.

Do men not chosen to do the Lord's work sometimes behave, in the Gospel age as did Ephraimites of the Jewish age? Yes, there are men who would not or could not prepare themselves to do the Lord's work; but they make themselves miserable by envy and jealousy toward those who have with diligence, and perhaps in., agony, prepared themselves to work of the Lord.

What shall we say of the fact that 42,000 men of Ephraim were slain because they could not pronounce aright a single word? In view of reproach they had cast on Gileadites, a test in speech was given, and it proved the Ephraimites were themselves somewhat like fugitives, as they could not pronounce a syllable that was common in language of Israel. Illustration of ignorance manifested by many who pretend to be learned.

**Judges 13** states that Israelites again sinned and were given into hands of the Philistines; also that an angel of God appeared to a woman of the tribe of Dan, promising her a son who should begin to deliver Israel from Philistines; likewise that the promised son should be a Nazarite from birth. Account then of interview of that woman with her husband in regard to what the angel told her; of the angel appearing to the man and his wife together and talking with them; also of birth of the promised son, of his growth, and that the Spirit of God moved him against Israel's enemies.

What does "Nazarite" mean? Separated. Num. 6 informs on this subject.

**Judges 14** is history of Samson's first love among Philistine women.

Is that love mentioned as specially of the Lord? Yes. But is in perfect harmony with fancies of mankind, as Samson did not try to give reason for wishing a woman of the Philistines except that she pleased him well.

Was that marriage of Samson a success for him or his wife? No. She proved treacherous from the first, and was given to another man.

What is true of marriages based on fancy in regard. to form, features or manners? Ill-founded, and liable to failures.

What are best qualifications for the marriage relation? Good physical health, common sense, and his reverence for God. These are not the only important qualifications for marriage; but whoever lacks these should keep clear of the marriage relation.

**Judges 15** is continuance of Samson's exploits.

What should we say to those who inquire where and how Samson caught 300 foxes he turned loose in Philistines' grain fields? We Should say we don't know because the Bible

does not inform us. Thus we should answer all other questions concerning Bible matters which are not answered in the Bible. Speculation should never be adopted nor indulged in regard to Bible questions. What is revealed should be accepted without addition, subtraction or modification? Human opinions and presumptions, likes and dislikes, concerning religion, must be disregarded and discarded by those who would understand the Bible. But we should always be careful to consider all Divine testimony that is given on each subject we examine.

**Judges 16** concludes history of Samson; gives account of his relations to 2 women, one of whom proved his ruin.

What lessons may we learn by considering Samson's life? Suggests a man may be very strong in body, yet not very reliable. Also, a man needs to be morally and spiritually strong to resist daily teasings, tauntings and pleadings of an unprincipled wife. A man needs to be morally and spiritually strong in order to resist nagging and carping criticisms of a captious wife. Whoever has such a wife will not need any other "thorn in the flesh" in order to keep him humble.

**Judges 17** tells of a man named Micah, who was not the best of sons, and whose mother possessed more religious zeal than genuine piety. Likewise an account of a young priest who traveled to "find a place" for himself, and found such a place as he desired in Micah's house.

What was condition of Israelites in Micah's day? V. 6 informs.

What condition of affairs now is closely connected with that of Israel in Micah's day? Religious sectarianism bears close resemblance to it. God was King over fleshly Israel, but he was not obeyed; so every man did what seemed right in his own eyes. Christ is now King over spiritual Israel, but religious people generally do not recognize him as King; so they do what seems right in their own eyes. As result, all sectarians have mixed worship. They treat Christ with some degree of respect, but seem to think in certain particulars he did not mean, what he said, or did not say what he meant.

What else do we find here? Micah's proposal to have a young Levite be his "father" and "priest". Here is first mention of a priest being called "father", and 1st mention of a hireling priest. The last verse also indicates confidence in regard to the Lord's blessing because of presence of a Levite as priest.

What may we learn by considering v. 5? That the 1st man who hired a priest, and hoped for the Lord's blessing because of his priest whom he wished to be his father, was an idolater. An index to all of that class who have lived in the Gospel age.

**Judges 18** sets forth concerning a portion of the tribe of Dan making advances on certain heathen; also concerning the hireling priest mentioned in the previous chapter.

What may we learn by reading vs. 19, 20? That the hireling priest was a genuine representative of hireling priests and pastors who have since lived. His "heart was glad" when he heard a louder call. Thus it has been, thus it is, and thus it will be, with hireling clergymen.

What shall we say of the last verses of this chapter? Show that Danites set up the graven image they secured from Micah's house, but made a man of the tribe of Manasseh their priest. This implies they ignored the Levite who would gladly have served them. and selected a priest, contrary to Jewish law, from a tribe not intended by the Lord to furnish priests. But as an idol was to be used in the worship it was appropriate to ignore law concerning choosing priests from the tribe of Levi.

What else was wrong with worship set up in the tribe of Dan? The house of God, consisting of the tabernacle, was at Shiloh, and no one had right to establish a permanent place of public worship elsewhere.

What became of the tribe of Dan? It was lost and, according to Lev. 7:5-8, was the only tribe lost from God's record. A warning to all religious sects and societies that establish places and orders of worship not ordained of God.

If He blotted out one of the most powerful tribes of ancient Israel for no reason, so far as the Divine record informs, except that men of that tribe set up mixed worship at a place not ordained of God, and chose a man to conduct it who was not of the priestly tribe, the question arises, What will He not do to those societies and sects which, in the Gospel age, arrange worship according to their own notions in regard to manner, time and place?

**Judges 19** records strange events which imply that among Israelites, at that time, human nature was suffered to show itself almost entirely without restraint.

Is anything here which gives light in regard to marriage relation in the Jewish age? "Concubine" is used with reference to a woman, and the man who took her is called "her husband", while the woman's father is called her husband's "father-in-law". This shows concubines were secondary wives. "Concubine" means "lying with", thus it is evident the marriage relation is determined by fleshly relations of man with woman.

1 Cor. 6:16 teaches the same doctrine. Shows by what act a man and woman become "one flesh" in Heaven's sight. Those who understand this will be prepared to regard sacredly the marriage relation.

**Judges 20** sets forth astonishing facts in regard to Israelites generally and concerning the tribe of Benjamin in particular.

How many men were slain in the 3 battles recorded in this chapter? 65,100 men—40,000 of whom were of tribes that came against Benjamin.

What may we learn from this chapter? 1st, that the occasion of Israel generally rising against Benjamin is found in over-persuasion mentioned in the previous chapter. If the father-in-law of the Levite mentioned there had not been so urgent, or if the Levite had been wise enough to leave his father-in-law in the morning, his wife might have lived, and 65,100 men might have been spared to live. Next lesson is that all men killed in battles resulting from shameful death of the mentioned woman might have been spared if Benjamites had only given up the men who caused that woman's death. Chap. 20 of 2nd Samuel shows how a war



was ended by delivering up the guilty man. Whoever undertakes to defend a guilty person will be endangered thereby.

What else may we learn here? That before Israelites who went against Benjamin offered sacrifices to God they were defeated but after they made proper offerings they were successful. After the 1st defeat Israelites "wept before the Lord"; but that was not sufficient to secure Divine favor. They needed to make proper offerings to God. When they had done so the Lord was with them and they succeeded. A suggestion for Christians, specially in light of 1 Cor. 3:6, 7. God has always desired to be acknowledged in every good work, and as the one to whom mankind are indebted for all good. Mankind must not depend on their own might nor power, but in all things they should acknowledge need of God's help in doing good.

**Judges 21** closes this book reporting evil results of rash swearing on the part of Israelites who went against Benjamites, also pitiable efforts by those Israelites in order to overcome or avoid evil results of their rash swearing.

What New Testament doctrine does rash swearing mentioned in the Old Testament suggest? Mat. 5:34-37 and Jas. 5:12; also Eccl. 5:2. Solomon said, "Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter anything before God; for God is in heaven, and thou on earth; therefore let thy words be few".

**Ruth chapter 1** mentions a famine in course of the time Judges ruled in Israel; then that a certain family of Israelites went into the land of Moab to live; then that the 2 sons of that family married women of Moab, and that the father and 2 sons died. Next is mentioned the widowed mother deciding to return to the land of Israel; of her advice to her daughters-in-law to return to their own people; also mention that by persuasion one went back, but the other refused, and left her own people in order to cling to her moth-or-in-law. Chapter ends with statement that the widowed mother and her daughter-in-law returned to the city where that mother was known, at the season of year designated as "beginning of barley harvest".

**Ruth 2** reveals additional facts in life of the 2 widows, also mentions an Israelite relative of the widowed mother's deceased husband.

How should we regard such facts as are recorded? All that is said about gleaning in the fields, after the reapers, pertained to the ancient method of harvesting small grain. The reep-hook was then used, and grain the reapers cut was bound up in sheaves. In such work some heads of grain would be missed by the reapers, and these were gathered by gleaners.

How should we regard the manner in which a God-fearing Israelite, such as mentioned in this chapter, addressed his reapers, and the manner in which they answered? Beautiful and appropriate.

What would be thought of a man who would now say to his reapers in time of harvest,

or to any other class of workmen laboring for him, "The Lord be with you"? He would likely be regarded as a religious crank. The Lord is seldom acknowledged in regard to anything except religion; and in regard to religion.. he seems to be considered, by many, as chiefly of importance by reason of hope that he will endorse and bless human devices irreverent religionists have adopted. There are professed Christians who seldom mention the name of the Lord except incidentally; and others who address Him in prayer or thanksgiving in their homes, or in the meeting house, seem afraid to speak loud enough for anyone to hear them. But the pious Jew, even in days of the Judges, would say his reapers in the harvest field, "The Lord be with you"; and they would respond, "The Lord bless thee". Christians should consider this in view of Rom. 15:4.

**Ruth 3** tells in regard to a nobleman of Israel, a widowed mother-in-law and her widowed daughter-in-law. We read of facts pertaining to ancient customs with reference to the threshing floor.

What is meant by "winnoweth barley"? The ancient method of separating chaff from the grain after it was threshed from the straw. All those processes were anciently done by the hands of workmen. A slow process, and sometimes much of it was done at night.

What is meant by "the part of a kinsman"? Next chapter informs.

What shall we say to those disposed to criticize behavior of Ruth under directions of her mother-in-law? Tell them customs of an age or country determine appearances.

**Ruth 4** closes this book by informing of certain customs connected with an Israelite taking the widow of a near kinsman, and raising up offspring to the dead husband so his name should not be blotted out from among his brethren.

Did the Lord ordain a man should take the widow of his dead brother, or other near relative, to be his wife if she had no children? Yes. Deut. 25:5-10 sets forth that law. Besides, it was a custom before the law was given (Gen. 38).

What did such law imply to the Israelite? That he was at liberty to have more than one wife. But as authority of the Jewish law was ended by introduction of the Gospel in its fulness, a Christian man is not under obligation to make a wife of his brother's widow. We are under Christ's authority; not under Moses.

What is special value of the book of Ruth to the Bible reader? A connecting link between Judah and David. Besides, it shows how a family could separate into 2 branches, then be reunited. The family of Te-rah, father of Abram (Gen. 11:27-81), was separated in the Israelites which sprang of Abram through Isaac and Jacob, from the Moabites who sprang of Lot, grandson of Terah. Those families, then separated about 8 or 9 hundred years, then were united by marriage of an Israelite named Boaz to a Moabite named Ruth, illustrates how the family of David could be separated in Solomon and Nathan, then, 1,000 years afterward, be united in Joseph and Mary as the earthly genealogy of Jesus, by Matthew and Luke, indicates, in view of these facts the book of Ruth is a necessary link in Bible history.

What should we say to those who call our attention to Deut. 23: '3-6, which declared a Moabite should never enter the congregation of the Lord; then, mention that Ruth was a Moabitess? Our answer should be that when women were not themselves partakers in an offense, as the Midianitish women were in corrupting Israel (Num. 31:15-17), the Lord did not hold them responsible. Again, as Jesus was Divinely intended to be Savior of Gentiles as well as of Jews, it was appropriate that he should be of Gentile as well as of Jewish parentage. Finally, Acts 10:34, 35 sets forth a principle which has always been true in God's dealings with mankind.

**1 Samuel chapter 1** sets forth account of a good man named Elkanah, who had made the mistake of taking 2 wives, which resulted in unpleasantness in his family; also touching account of the sorrow and prayer of his wife Hannah, distressed because she was barren. We are informed likewise her prayer was answered in birth of a son she named Samuel, whom she "lent to the Lord".

What adversary provoked Hannah? The record does not state explicitly except that she was a female, indicated by the words "she provoked her", in v. 7. But in view of common human nature it is implied the one who "provoked" Hannah was Elkanah's other wife.

**1 Samuel 2** sets before us account of Hannah's prayer and rejoicing, then mentions return of Samuel's father to his own home, then account of wickedness of sons of Eli the priest. Also mention of the child Samuel, who was under care, of the priest Eli, ministering before the Lord and being in favor with the Lord and with men. Chapter ends with account of what a certain prophet, the text declares was "a man of God", said to Eli in regard to his father's family, his own sons, and evil that should come on his family until close of time, because of his sons' wickedness.

What may we safely say of Hannah's expressions of praise to the Lord? Beautiful and touching, and should humble hearts of all who read them.

What of the statement, "For by strength shall no man prevail"? Means human strength, and is in harmony with all else in the Divine record. See Psa. 127; 33:16-18; 147:10,11. 2 Cor. 12:7-10 bears in same direction.

**1 Samuel 3** tells of Samuel ministering to the Lord and of absence of "open vision" from the Lord. Then we read concerning Eli the priest, whose sons were wicked, and of the Lord's revelation to Samuel in regard to Eli and his sons, also that Samuel made known to Eli the revelation he received concerning him and his sons. Chapter ends with favorable statements in regard to Samuel.

What was the special charge against Eli? That "his sons made themselves vile and he restrained them not".

How should fathers act in regard to their children? They should try to bring them up as Eph. 6:4 directs; but if bad associates lead children astray, fathers should not try to defend

them in evil, but should protest against it. Parents cannot always control their children, specially after they have grown up; but they can avoid shielding and defending children in wrong doing.

**1 Samuel 4** reports 2 battles Israelites fought against Philistines, and of evil results in the battlefields and at Shiloh.

What does record of Eli's wicked sons going forth to battle with the ark of God suggest to the Christian? Absurdity of immoral, ungodly and half-hearted men going forth to preach the Gospel, serving as elders or deacons of a church, or in any manner pretending to be church members.

But may not bad men deceive themselves and think they are fit to be church members? Yes. Self-deception is common weakness. Some persons are so constituted and perhaps so educated that they can, by false reasoning, justify themselves in almost any kind of error and any kind of life.

What mental constitution is favorable to such justification? Large self-esteem, large combativeness and small comparison, are essential conditions of brain for self-justification in any error.

Will not college training correct such unfortunate mental temperament? No. But a college education only prepares such temperament for greater mischief, specially if there be large memory connected with small comparison. College education exalts such men entirely beyond the sphere for which nature intended them, even as sons of Eli, because they were his sons, were exalted to the priesthood for which they lacked moral fitness.

What is result, in the Gospel age, of unfit men occupying prominent places in the Church? Glory of God departs from the Church even as it did in clays of ancient Israel. Thus it was, thus it is, and thus it will be.

**1 Samuel 5** shows the ark of God was troublesome to Philistines.

What is suggested by the fact that a heathen god fell before the ark of God? As the ark was God's bookcase and contained the law given to the Jews (Deut. 31:24-26), the fall of heathen gods and of all other falsehoods before the Bible is here suggested.

Will heathen gods or any other errors fall before the Bible if it be not advocated and defended by men and women of holy lives? No. Wicked sons of Eli could not defend the ark; neither can men who are unholy in doctrine or life defend the Bible.

**1 Samuel 6** records counsel sought and received by Philistines in regard to sending the ark back to Israelites after it had been in Philistia 7 months; also that the counsel received was obeyed, and that the ark was actually returned to Israelites. Near close of the chapter mention is made of many Israelites slain because they looked into the ark.

Did God condemn Philistines because they put his ark in a new cart? No. It was best they

knew in regard to moving it.

What should we learn from the fact that the Lord slew many thousands of men because they looked into the ark? That God did not intend his ancient people should be meddling. Deut. 29:29 and Rom. 15:4 are here suggested. Millions have been spiritually ruined by trying to look into matters which belong to God's secret things.

**1 Samuel 7** tells that the ark was taken charge of by certain Israelites, also that Israelites generally desired to serve the Lord, and that Samuel told them what to do and that he would pray for them. Next we learn Philistines came against Israelites, but that that Israelites trusted in the Lord and called on Samuel to pray for them; likewise that he did so, and the Lord heard him and overthrew the Philistines. Then mention of results of success of Israelites at that time, and certain statements in regard to Samuel's work as circuit judge.

Did Israelites ever fail in battle against their enemies when they repented of their sins and offered sacrifice to God according to his appointment, then called on him for help? No.

What promises does God make to his people in the Gospel age if they obey him? Heb. 13:5 informs that God says, "I will never leave nor forsake thee".

**1 Samuel 8** is statement that when Samuel was old he made his sons judges over Israel; that they walked not in ways of their father; that elders of Israel gathered at Samuel's home and asked for a king. Then we read Samuel was displeased with their request and prayed to the Lord, also that the Lord told him to yield to the request which had been made, but that he should protest to the people and state what a king would do to them. Samuel did so; but the people insisted a king should be set over them in order that they might be like all the nations.

What does v. 7 indicate in regard to sin Israelites committed in asking for a king? Indicates God regarded their request for a king to be rejection of him, and that he should not reign over them.

But did elders of Israel say they rejected God? No; but that was God's view of what their request meant? Moses and Aaron at the rock in the wilderness did not say they did not believe God nor that they rebelled against him. Nevertheless the Lord charged them with unbelief and rebellion (Num. 20:12, 24).

In light of Rom. 15:4 what should we learn by the Divine record of such events? To consider that any misconduct may be very different to the Lord from what it seems to mankind. Therefore the great and all important question in man's mind should ever be, "What saith the Scripture?" What the Bible says should be our standard of measuring in this life, as that will be the standard in the Final Judgment. What man thinks, presumes, supposes, prefers, likes or dislikes, will be of no value in the last Great Day. Call for a king was beginning of a new era in the Jewish nation. The people wished to be like other nations.

**1 Samuel 9** tells of the father of the first man Divinely ordained to be king over Israel, then of the man himself, also of events preceding his anointing by the prophet Samuel.

What do events preceding anointing of Saul, son of Kish, imply? That the Lord understands his affairs and knows how to accomplish his ends.

Is there special meaning in the fact that Saul had grown taller than his fellows and was of good appearance? Yes. Israelites wished to be "like all the nations", therefore they wished a king to judge them and "go out before" them and "fight" their "battles". Therefore as they desired outward show the Lord proposed to give them a good show. But in Hos. 13:11 God said to Israel "I gave thee a king in mine anger and took him away in my wrath". God gave Israel a king under protest, even as a father sometimes yields to an offensive request of a wayward son.

What is indicated by "a sacrifice of the people today in the high place", in v. 12? That Shiloh where Eli and his sons officiated as priests, had been abandoned, and that a place called "the high place" was adopted for offering sacrifice to God.

Was the ark ever taken back to Shiloh after it was taken into battle against Philistines accompanied by the 2 wicked sons of Eli? No.

Is chap. 14:3 against this conclusion? No. That verse refers to Eli as "the Lord's priest in Shiloh" before his death, and not his grandson Ahiah at a later date at Shiloh..

**1 Samuel 10** sets forth anointing of Saul to be king over Israel, then that the prophet Samuel who anointed him, foretold certain events so when they would come to pass the young king might be fully assured his anointing meant the Lord would be with him. The fact that the Spirit of God came on Saul, and thereby caused him to be numbered with the prophets, is next recorded. The record then informs concerning Samuel calling the people together and rehearsing certain facts in their hearing, after which he presented Saul as their king. The fact that the people shouted "God save the king" and what Samuel told them of the manner of the kingdom, and that he wrote what he told them and laid it up before the Lord, are here recorded. Chapter ends with statement that God touched the hearts of a band of men and inclined them in Saul's favor; also that certain bad men despised him, but that he held his peace.

Did Saul desire to be presented to all Israel when Samuel gathered the people together? He hid himself from Samuel.

Was he hidden from God? The Lord told where he was.

Is it possible for one to hide from God? Psa. 139 informs that it is not.

What would be effect in men's lives if all would bear in mind that God sees and knows them at all times? They would fear to commit crimes and misdemeanors that are now common because God is forgotten.

**1 Samuel 11** informs of king Saul's first battle against certain enemies of Israel, and of success which attended him, also what was done in Gilgal.

Did Saul behave as a manly man in regard to his first battle and all that soon followed? He did.

What does this indicate? What might have been his behavior during remainder of his life if he had only been careful to observe the Lord's word and heed guidance of God's Spirit.

Do young converts in the Gospel age sometimes behave much better than in after years? This is common.

Why is it common? Simply because young converts, later, often become careless about reading the Bible and praying, and thus become lukewarm and unhappy, then coldhearted and miserable. As result they become prepared to act contemptibly. Thus did king Saul, and thus will all do who neglect their duties and privileges as set forth in God's word.

**1 Samuel 12** gives Samuel's speech to Israel in regard to making a king, then his speech in regard to himself and his conduct as judge. Next we find record of what Samuel said to Israelites in regard to their former history and certain of their former sins, and deliverances God wrought in their behalf when they were in subjugation to their enemies. Then he referred to their king and their sin in asking for a king. Of that sin he then convinced them by his prayer and God's answer. Chapter ends with words of consolation and warning.

Does not this chapter imply God yielded to request of Israelites when he knew it was not best for them? Yes, just as a father sometimes yields to a perverse child in order to teach him a lesson he will not otherwise learn.

But what shall we say to those who refer to this chapter, specially v. 14, and base argument in favor of God's approval of human devices in the Church, even though he knows they are not best? We should remind all such that sinfulness and presumption of going contrary to God's wisdom and goodness was bad for ancient Israel; but it is far worse for those who live under the Gospel age.

But suppose they say v. 14 gives reason for hope they may be saved after having adopted their devices, if they only serve the Lord faithfully in other respects? We should tell them later history of Israelites shows they did not continue to obey the Lord, but that the king they chose became a snare to them, in nearly every instance, so that the kingdom was divided soon after reign of their 3rd king ended, and that finally both divisions of the kingdom went into captivity in a foreign land. Nor is this all Those who contend for human devices in the Church, and try to justify them by this chapter, should be referred to Gal. 4 and shown the Holy Spirit now regards all who lived under the Law as children and servants, while Christians are regarded as heirs and as men and women. By so doing we should endeavor to impress them with the idea that in contending for musical instruments and other devices in the Church they confess they're a set of children.

What may we safely say of Samuel's speech in regard to his own conduct as judge? Indicates he had been honest; and that speech should be studied by all judges, likewise by all other officials.

Why are many legislators and executors in civil governments dishonest? Because they

do not fear God.

Why do they not fear God? Because they don't study their Bible.

**1 Samuel 13** mentions the army king Saul chose after he reigned 2 years, also that Philistines came against him with a great army and the men with Saul were afraid to such degree that some began to hide themselves while others deserted him. Then we are informed the prophet Samuel, who was also a priest, did not come to Saul within the time that had been appointed and, as result, Saul became impatient and forced himself to act the part of a priest. The record then informs that Samuel came to Saul, reprov'd him for acting as a priest, told him the Lord had, on that account, rejected his family from succeeding him on the throne of Israel, and had sought a man to succeed him who would be after God's own heart. Near close of the chapter is account of dependence of Israelites on Philistines for many things they needed.

Why was it not right for king Saul to vet as priest? He was not of the tribe of Levi, from which God ordained priests should be chosen (Num. 4th and 17th chapters).

What was character of Saul's sin in performing as a priest? Strictly a doctrinal sin.

What should we learn from God's condemnation of that sin? Shows doctrinal sins were dangerous while the Jewish law was in force.

Is same true in the Gospel age? Gal. 5:1-4 so declarers.

What do we now find in the religious world like unto Saul's impatience and consequent presumption? Conduct of those religious people who say by implication the Gospel plan of saving mankind is too slow, or too inconvenient, for an emergency, and that therefore we should accept the doctrine of "faith only", and that sprinkling or pouring should be adopted for baptism. Saul's case should prove forewarning to all such.

**1 Samuel 14** tells of king Saul's exploits as a soldier, also of some of his chief men, including his son Jonathan. God's method of overthrowing Israel's enemies is also set forth.

What should we learn by considering Saul's rashness in pronouncing a curse on anyone who would eat food that day until evening? Danger of all rashness.

Did forbidding people to eat lead to another sin? Led to sin of eating flesh with blood. Suggests the fact that extremes beget extremes.

What may we learn from the fact that people refused to permit Jonathan to be slain? Folly of rashness because, in this instance, Saul's rash curse wasn't suffered to be executed. Eccl. 5:2 should never be forgotten by any responsible human being.

**1 Samuel 15** is record of the Lord sending king Saul on a campaign against Amalekites, also record of Saul's success and of his sins on the campaign. Then account of Saul's return from



slaughter of Amalekites, of the prophet Samuel reproving him for his sins in saving the king alive and suffering the people to save the best of the cattle and sheep. Next an account of Saul's stubbornness, then of his penitence, also of God's rejection of his being king. Chapter ends with account of what Samuel did and that the Lord relented of having made Saul king.

How shall we harmonize vs. 11, 28, 35? Jer. 18:1-10 reveals God sometimes repents by changing his sentence regarding mankind when they change their ways. Thus He represents himself in Jer. 18 as changing from a good to an evil sentence. On this principle His repentance in regard to making Saul king simply consisted of rejecting him from being king; then the repenting in v. 29 of this chapter simply means God would not change from his decision to reject Saul Thus God has right to repent when it is right for him to repent, and has right to refuse to repent when it would be wrong for him to repent.

From whom came the Amalekites? Gen. 36:12 indicates they probably sprang from Esau.

Did king Saul do nearly all God commanded him in regard to Amalekites? He probably performed 99 100ths of all God charged him to do against them.

And did God reject Saul because he omitted but small part of what he was required to do, then ventured to do some things God had not enjoined nor even intimated he would accept? He did.

In light of Rom. 15:4 what should facts just mentioned concerning Saul impress on minds of those who live in the Gospel age? With danger of trying to be saved while omitting in any degree what God requires, and while doing in any measure what the Lord hasn't mentioned with approval in New Covenant scriptures.

What should we learn by reading vs. 21-23? That a good purpose does not justify a wrong act.

**1 Samuel 16** informs concerning events connected with anointing of David to succeed Saul as king over Israel also that the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul and an evil spirit was sent to vex him, as result of which he became so unhappy that among his servants it was suggested a skillful musician should be secured to make music for him, thus make him feel better. Chapter ends with account of David, son of Jesse, brot to play for him; that David was highly esteemed by him, and that the music David made caused the evil spirit to depart from him, thus caused Saul to feel refreshed and well.

Did Samuel mistake in regard to appearance of the one who should be the Lord's anointed? He showed common weakness among mankind in that he judged by outward appearance. God gratified Israel by anointing one tall man of good appearance to be king but he made a crooked record. So the Lord proposed to choose a man possessed of the right kind of a heart. rather than noble personal appearance.

But was not David of handsome appearance? V. 12 so indicates as it respects his countenance, but nothing is said about his stature.

What may we learn by considering the account of effect of instrumental music on a

person possessed of an evil spirit? We may here learn of beginning of use of instrumental music as a substitute for repentance and prayer in case of backsliders. Only miserable backsliders in the Gospel age felt need of instrumental music in connection with religious worship in order to cause them to feel better.

Does sound of musical instruments, well played, really make people better? No. It is a sort of stimulant, or opiate, as determined by the style of music. Operates on the sensibilities and makes those affected thereby feel better than they really are, even as stimulants and narcotics operate on nerves of those who use them. What is called "martial music" is a stimulant, and deceives those affected by it so they regard themselves stronger than they really are. Ordinary instrumental music, has soothing effect on feelings of those who enjoy it. But whether the effect is stimulating, or soothing, it is always deception to extent and degree it is enjoyed by mankind. This is the reason for the clamor made for it in connection with religious worship; and this is why it should be discarded

**1 Samuel 17** informs concerning war between Israelites and Philistines, also of a giant on the side of the Philistines who defied armies of Israel; then account of that giant being slain by David, son of Jesse. Chapter ends with statement concerning David presented to Saul after he had slain the Philistine giant, and being inquired of in regard to his father.

What is meaning of "take their pledge", in last part of v. 18? Translation seems correct, and we are confined to the idea that Jesse wished to be assured of welfare of his sons in the army.

Why was anger of Eliab, David's eldest brother, kindled when he heard David inquiring about reward offered by the king to the man who would kill the Philistine giant? May have been several motives united to make him angry. Interest in David's welfare and in welfare of the sheep at home may have moved him. Then jealousy may have actuated him.

Was David discouraged by what Eliab said? No. And when it is God's purpose to accomplish an end through a man there is no way to defeat that purpose.

What may we learn by the fact that David would not go to battle with Saul's armor on? That preachers should do their own studying and keep clear of books on science of sermonizing. A book on homiletics is to a preacher what Saul's armor was to David.

What about David killing a lion and a bear, and finally killing a giant? All were done after the spirit of God came on him (chap. 16:13).

**1 Samuel 18** tells of love Jonathan, Saul's son, felt for David, and how he showed that love; then account of David's wise behavior; also of contrast expressed by certain playing women and of Saul's hatred for David by reason of what those women said. Account then of Saul's efforts to kill David, and of his plans to have him fall in battle with Philistines; also account of David becoming Saul's son-in-law, and that he be-hayed himself so wisely Saul feared him while others highly esteemed him.

What may we safely say of Jonathan's love for David? Unselfish, and proved unwavering. Beautiful contrast with selfish love commonly found among mankind.

What may we say of contrast expressed between Saul and David by certain playing women? Unfortunate for Saul and David, and all others concerned in their welfare. But on the principle expressed in Psa. 76:10 it was overruled for good to David and to all who have studied his history. Besides, it gave Saul opportunity to show how bad a man could be when abandoned of God; and this was intended to warn all others against being rebellious against God (Rom. 15:4). Behavior of Saul when abandoned of God suggests Pro?. 27:4, and suggests inquiry whether an envious or jealous person can be a Christian. The more wisely David behaved himself the more Saul hated him; and on the same principle it is true, the more wisely good men and women behave themselves the more hatefulness is found in envious and jealous persons who know them.

"Who is able to stand before envy?" This question of Solomon is far reaching in bearings. Capable, noble, generous persons spend and suffer themselves to be spent for good of others. As result they are praised by many; and when envious persons hear thereof they become hateful and try to damage the very ones they should rejoice to praise.

What may we learn by considering vs. 10, 11? Reveal that sound of musical instruments did not, in the Jewish age, make a bad man good.

Will sound of such instruments make men and women good in the Gospel age? The Church did not call for them until it had fallen from grace and even apostatized from the faith, for they were not much introduced until the 8th century of the Gospel era, thus not until Popedom had been established.

How is it now? As in the Jewish age and early part of the Gospel age, so it is now, and so it will be.

**1 Samuel 19** sets forth Saul's command to his son Jonathan and to all his servants, to kill David; and that Jonathan informed David of Saul's purpose to have him slain; also of Jonathan's reasoning with Saul and its favorable effect until after David again won great victories in battle. Then we read the evil spirit again came on Saul and he tried to kill David with a javelin; likewise that he tried to kill him in his own house, but that his wife informed him thereof and enabled him to escape. Next an account of David going to Samuel at Ramah, and that when Saul heard thereof he sent messengers who became, prophets; also that he sent other messengers who likewise became prophets. Chapter ends with statement that Saul himself went to Ramah and became a prophet.

What does the fact that the Spirit of God came on Saul so that he prophesied reveal to us? That God could send his Spirit into a bad man and use him for a good purpose, even as He did in case of Balaam, of whom we have account in Num. 23 24. Another case is in 1 Kings 13:20-22.

Is it not marvelous Saul did not become discouraged in attempts to destroy David? Not more so than that bad men do not now become discouraged by reason of unsuccessful attempts to destroy those who are good. "A sound heart is the life of the flesh; but envy the

rotteness of the bones" (Prov. 14:30). Thus it was, thus it is, and thus it will be.

**1 Samuel 20** gives further account of relations between David and Jonathan; of Saul's continued hatred for David, and its results in case of Jonathan.

What should we say of arrangement between Jonathan and David to mislead Saul in regard to reason, for David's absence from Saul's table? Not condemned in the Old Testament; but would certainly be wrong for Christians to state what is not true even in such circumstances as those which surrounded Jonathan and David. Rom. 4:15 and 5:13 should be considered in connection with the case of David and Jonathan misleading Saul. Divine law in regard to telling the truth was not given to the Jews as it is to Christianity. Besides, when war existed and life was in danger, truth became secondary. In such case mercy came first.

**1 Samuel 21** shows that David went to Nob, where the priest Ahimelech was, and misled Ahimelech in regard to reason for his presence there, his need of bread and need of a sword. Then is record of David fleeing to the king of Gath and acting the part of a madman.

What does record of such misconduct on the part of David suggest? That he had, for the time, lost faith in God's care for him, and seemed to think he would need to care for himself by any means he could adopt.

What is result when Christians lose confidence in God's care for them and conclude they must care for themselves any way they can? They act very much as this chapter records of David.

**1 Samuel 22** records David's departure from the king of Gath to "the cave Adullam", and that his kindred and certain discontented ones went to him; also that he went to the king of Moab and secured permission for his father and mother to dwell in the land of Moab awhile. Then a prophet named Gad told David where to go; next is account of Saul and certain of his servants in Gibeah, also of his speech to Benjamites, of his plea for sympathy, of what a certain Edomite revealed to him and of Saul's slaughter of 85 priests and every other living thing of the city of Nob. Chapter ends with account of the priest Abiathar escaping and going to David and making known what Saul had done, and that David told that priest to remain with him.

**1 Samuel 23** sets forth account of David's success against Philistines at a city named Keilah, and of Saul's purpose to catch him in that city; also that David thru the priest Abiathar, who had fled to him from the city Nob, inquired of the Lord and thereby learned he should not stay in Keilah. Next we read of David and his men in the wilderness, and of Jonathan going out to him and speaking encouragement. Then we read of Saul being informed where David was and going after him. Near end of the chapter is statement that Saul was turned from following David because he heard Philistines had invaded the land. Then that David dwelt in "strongholds at Engedi".

**1 Samuel 24** is further history of Saul following David for purpose of slaying him, in connection with which is account of Saul stepping into a cave where David and his men were, and where David cut off the skirt of Saul's robe. Mention of how David felt because of what he had done, of his calling to Saul and showing the skirt of his robe in his own hand, and of the effect on Saul's mind. Chapter ends with statement that Saul went home, but David and his men went "up unto the hold".

Did Saul remain convinced he should not try to slay David? No. Later he again went after him.

What may we safely say of such misconduct on Saul's part? Was outworking of his human nature, occasionally stirred by an evil spirit from the Lord being suffered to come on him.

Do men and women in the Gospel age ever act as Saul did? Yes, even some who profess to be Christians sometimes act on the same principle. They don't try to take the life's blood of those they envy and hate, but they try to ruin their good name, and never become discouraged in efforts to accomplish their evil ends. As soon as they are defeated in one plan they immediately arrange another, and never seem weary in trying to accomplish their evil purpose.

**1 Samuel 25** reveals more history of David and his men, in connection with which is account of a foolish rich man named Nabal, who had a sensible wife named Abigail.

What may we say of the speech of Abigail to David? Discreet from first to last, and specially the intimation that when David should be established in his kingdom it would be no grief to him that he had not avenged himself on Nabal, Abigail showed what a wise woman could do to protect a foolish husband. If all women were as wise as Abigail they might do much toward avoiding evil results which would naturally follow from foolishness of which some men are guilty, and they would greatly assist sensible men with whom they may associate, to do right.

**1 Samuel 26** brings account of another effort Saul with 3,000 chosen men made to destroy David; also of David's success in going at night into Saul's camp, accompanied by one of his men, and taking from his bolster his spear and cruse of water. Then account of a long-distance interview David had with Saul and his chief captain. In that interview Saul confessed he had "played the fool" and "erred exceedingly". Chapter ends with statement that "David went on his way and Saul returned to his place".

**1 Samuel 27** tells of David going into the land of Philistines with his men and their households; also that he dwelt for a time in the royal city with Achish, king of Philistia, and

then, on his request, received from Achish a city named Ziklag. Then account of David's cruel exploits and false reports, and of impression those reports made on the king of the Philistines.

What may we say of David's conduct revealed in this chapter? It is saddening because it reveals he ceased to trust God and inquire concerning his will; but seemed to think he would need to care for himself. Also saddening because of his false reports to the king of Philistia.

Was David at liberty to kill as many heathen as he could? Seems to have been no limit by the Lord on the number of heathen that should be slain. Heathen nations generally had filled up the measure of their iniquity; and when women and innocent children were slain they were simply taken from a world where they would learn evil continually. In regard to their future existence we have consolation that the New Testament gives assurance that mankind are only held accountable in Heaven's sight according to the light they are in this life permitted to enjoy, and pretend to enjoy.

**1 Samuel 28** records account of Philistines gathering to make war against Israelites; of king Saul's distress when the Lord would not tell him what to do; of his resort to a woman possessed of a spirit that gave her reputation for being able to confer with departed spirits; of Samuel's appearance and message to Saul; of its effect on Saul, and of the fact that the woman who possessed the evil spirit gave Saul something to eat before he had strength to leave her house.

What may we justly conclude from history of Saul in this chapter? That the doctrine "once in grace always in grace" is not true; but the very reverse is true. Saul was once in Divine favor, but he did not remain in; and when once entirely out he remained out.

What should be our conclusion in regard to the woman of Endor, said to possess "a familiar spirit"? She was a Spiritualist and numbered with those denounced by the Lord in Deut. 18 and spoken of in Acts 19:19.

How should we regard modern Spiritualism As Deut. 18:9-11 and Isa. 8:19, 20 indicate God commanded Jews with reference to it, also as Acts 19:19 shows the Gospel requires. Besides, in view of its evil effects on physical, mental, moral and spiritual health of those who have practiced it, we should avoid it with more care and dread than we would avoid smallpox or even leprosy.

When required to meet the doctrine of Spiritualism in debate how should we proceed? We should not attempt to deny alleged facts of Spiritualism, but should charge the entire doctrine to the devil, and prove our charge by the Bible.

**1 Samuel 29** sets forth account of position of the army of the Philistines, and that of Israel; also account of David and his men. Then we have record of what lords of the Philistines said in regard to David and his men, which resulted in the king of Philistia sending him and his

company back to Ziklag, where they had been previously appointed by the king to make their home.

What special saying concerning David did Philistines recollect? They recalled the song of certain women: "Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands" (chap. 18:7). That saying stirred the envy, jealousy and hatred of Saul, and was reported to the Philistines, by whom it was recalled and repeated. It did David much harm, but was all overruled by the Lord for his good.

What may be safely said of undue praise at any time, or in regard to any person or event? It is indiscreet. Mankind are generally too sensitive to hear another unduly praised on the one hand, or unduly censured on the other. Prov. 27:14 is an index in regard to this.

**1 Samuel 30** tells concerning robbing and burning of the city the king of Philistia had given him and his men for a home; likewise that David in his distress inquired of the Lord through the priest who was with him, and received encouraging answer. Then facts pertaining to David and his men pursuing their enemies and recovering their families with all the spoil which had been taken from Ziklag. Chapter ends with statement of a statute David made in regard to division of spoil, and that he sent presents to elders of those places where he and his men stayed while persecuted by Saul.

**1 Samuel 31** tells of a battle between Philistines and Israelites in which Israelites were defeated and Saul's 3 sons, including Jonathan, were slain; also that Saul was wounded and then committed suicide. We learn also that Philistines cut off his head, stripped him of his armor, then hung his headless body to the wall of a place named Bethshan. Chapter ends with statement that certain valiant men went and brought his body and that of his sons to a place called Jabesh, where they burned them, then buried their bones under an oak at the same place, after which they fasted for a period of days.

What may be safely said of king Saul's life? Illustrates what a large, bold, impulsive man can do. He rebelled against God and was stubborn in his rebellion. It illustrates also the hatefulness, foolishness and wickedness to which envy and jealousy will lead a man who yields to those evil and sinful dispositions. The record of his life should warn Bible readers against being envious of others who may be better than themselves by nature, education, circumstances or convictions, or by all these excellencies combined. The envious and those who are tempted to become envious should, in connection with Saul's history, study that of Haman in the book of Esther. They should remember also that "charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not, charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up" (1 Cor. 13:4).

**2 Samuel, chapter 1** mentions events preliminary to beginning of David's reign as king.

Was not Samuel dead before events occurred that are mentioned in this book? Yes Chap. 25 of the previous book records his death.

Why then is this book called the 2nd book of Samuel? It was continuance of his official work as prophet and priest in anointing David king over Israel (see 1 Sam. 16). This is perhaps the only reason which can be scripturally given for the name of this book.

How shall we harmonize statements in last chapter of the previous book and those in this chapter concerning Saul's death? All in harmony when considered in their order. Saul was wounded by archers or arrow-shooters; commanded his armor-bearer to slay him but he would not; then Saul fell on his own sword,—and that he did not die at once is reasonable, though dead in estimation of his armor-bearer; then the Amalekite came along, and his story is reasonable in regard to end of Saul's life, specially as he brought Saul's crown and bracelet to David.

What shall we say of David's lament over Saul? It was on the principle of charity the living generally feel in regard to the dead.

But did he tell the truth when he said Saul and Jonathan were "lovely and pleasant in their lives"? Yes; we can readily believe Jonathan was "lovely and pleasant", and Saul was perhaps "lovely and pleasant" occasionally. He may have been thus generally and only showed his worst disposition toward David, who had proved his best earthly friend when Goliath of Gath confronted his army, and who afterward showed himself a wise servant and valiant soldier.

Was king Saul exception to the rule among mankind in regard to hating his best friend? No. He simply showed common weakness. Majority of mankind at some time in life not only hate their best friends but love their worst enemies. This is true in all cases where children turn from good counsel of parents and other guardians, and take advice of those who seek their destruction. Same is true of men and women who suffer envy and jealousy or other evil disposition to cause them to turn against their best friends and give confidence to their worst enemies.

**2 Samuel 2** gives account of David inquiring of the Lord and being directed to a city named Hebron; also that he was there anointed king over the tribe of Judah and spoke kindly to those who buried Saul and his dead sons. Next we find account of Abner, Saul's chief captain, taking Ishbosheth, one of Saul's sons, and making him king over the other tribes of Israel. Then we read of war between David's army under Joab, his chief captain, and Ishbosheth's army under Abner, as his chief captain. Abner and his army were defeated.

What shall we say of the statement sometimes made that David reigned 40 years over Israel? Not strictly correct. He was king over Judah 7 years and 6 months at Hebron before he went to Jerusalem and reigned over all Israel.

**2 Samuel 3** informs of a long war between the house of Saul, represented by his son and chief captain, and David; also that the house of Saul became weaker while David became stronger. Then we read concerning David's family, of trouble between Saul's son and his chief captain, then that the chief captain, Abner, visited David and proposed to turn the kingdom under Saul's son, Ishbosheth, over to David. Next we read of Joab, David's chief



captain learning Abner had talked with David, and that Joab sent for Abner and killed him. Chapter ends with account of burial of Abner and David's lamentation over him, in connection with which he confessed himself weak, stating the sons of Zeruiah were too hard for him.

Who were Zeruiah and her sons? 1 Chron. 2:16 informs she was sister of David, and her sons were Abishai, Joab and Asahel.

What did David mean by saying those men were "too hard" for him? He could not control them.

Were they faithful to him? Yes, they were good soldiers, but there were times when they took affairs into their own hands. 1 Sam. 26:6-8 shows what manner of man was Abishai.

What may we say of v. 36? Reveals sycophantic disposition of multitudes in regard to a great man, or one that has attained greatness of position. Napoleon Bonaparte was not disposed to read after French journalists because, in his judgment, they only said what they thought would please him. But that was only while he was successful. "Nothing succeeds like success" in estimation of masses of mankind, But that same weakness shows in opposite direction when man of greatness meets with misfortune.

**2 Samuel 4** informs of effect of Abner's death on Saul's son, Ishbosheth when he heard thereof; then that 2 of his captains came to his house, slew him, and cut off his head and took it to David; also that David caused them to be slain because they killed their master. In connection with this is account of Jonathan's son Mephibosheth.

What shall we say of David's severe and swift judgment against men who killed Saul's son Ishbosheth? Severely just. They had shed blood of war in time of peace, (1 Kings 2:5) and deserved to die. Moreover David knew men who would act thus were dangerous. But did not Joab act thus when he killed Abner? Yes, and 1 Kings 2:5 informs David did not forget it.

**2 Samuel 5** brings the fact that all tribes of Israel went to David at Hebron and anointed him to be over them; then that David weave to Jerusalem, overcame Jebusites who had possession there; also that he dwelt in the fort and called it "the city of David". Next we learn he continued to increase in greatness so Hiram, king of Tyre, sent messengers, workmen and timber, and built him a house. Then an account of David extending his family circle. Chapter ends With account of war between Philistines and Israelites, in which David was directed and assisted by the Lord, and Philistines were overthrown.

What does v. 7 reveal? Difference between Jerusalem and Zion. Jerusalem was the city proper, while Zion was the stronghold, or fort, of the city David found when he went up from Hebron to dwell there.

What is meant by Jebusites saying to David that except he take away the blind and lame he couldn't enter Jerusalem? Seems to have been a taunt like this: "We put the blind and lame

against you, and if you can't overcome them you can't get in". Evidence that this was their idea is implied in last of v. 6 which states Jebusites thought he could not enter the city. They showed weakness common among mankind by expressing over-confidence.

Is such weakness found in friends of the Gospel? Very common among them. Many seem to think because the Gospel is the Divine plan for salvation of mankind, it is so strong it does not need their help.

**2 Samuel 6** records that David and 30,000 chosen men of Israel went to a place called Baale, otherwise Kir-jath-jearim, to bring the ark of God to Jerusalem; also that it was placed in a new cart, that one of David's men touched the ark to steady it with his hand, and was struck dead; that the ark was then put in the house of a man named Obed-edom, where it remained 3 months, after which it was taken to Jerusalem. Chapter ends with account of David playing and dancing as the ark was brought into Jerusalem, and that his wife Michael despised his conduct; what David said to Michael when she taunted him in regard

to his behavior, also of result of what he said to her.

Why did the Lord strike Uzzah dead for touching the ark? The record does not inform us, and it becometh us not to speculate. We are simply informed he committed "error".

What should we say if informed God killed him because he was not of the priestly tribe, therefore had no right to touch the ark? We should not be wise above what is written.

Why did David's wife Michael despise him in her heart when she saw him leaping and dancing before the Lord? V. 20 indicates she considered how he appeared before women in the procession, rather than his devotion to the Lord.

What is generally true of women in regard to their husbands? They dislike for them to do or say anything, specially before others, which appears undignified. All married men should consider this.

Was David honorable in response to his wife? No. He thrust at her the fact that God had chosen him before her father and all her father's house, to rule over Israel,—though she was in no respect to blame for her father's misconduct which caused the Lord to reject him. Besides, he seemed to forget she once informed him of her father's purpose to kill him, and let him down to the ground through a window, thus enabled him to escape her father's wrath. Finally, though it was not the playing he did to which she objected, but to his "leaping and dancing", yet when he responded to her he said "therefore will I play before the Lord". Thus his entire speech was illogical ungenerous and ill-tempered" Shows his association with musical instruments had not tended to make him a gentleman. Nor has such association tended to make a gentleman of any other man nor a gentlewoman of any woman.

But was David's wife justified in making the taunting, ridiculing speech to her husband? No. She showed same irreverence many other women have shown toward their husbands, and which, perhaps, has done more to bring men and women into divorce courts than any other one cause. Very few men have self control to hold their peace when assailed by their

wives as Michael assailed David. She made a belittling and bemoaning speech, having no regard for anything except her conception of dignity. Thus she was unwifely and unwomanly in criticism, and he as illogical and ungentlemanly in response. Christian wives should do better than Michael did on that occasion, and Christian husbands should do better than David did.

**2 Samuel 7** informs that when the Lord had given David rest from his enemies he thought of building a house for the Lord; but the Lord revealed through the prophet Nathan that he did not ask to have any one build him a house; also that the Lord would establish David's family forever and that one of his sons, yet to be born, should build a house for the Lord's name. Then we are informed when David received the revelation made to him, through Nathan, he sat before the Lord and expressed words of gratitude and prayer for Divine goodness toward him and his descendants.

What shall we say of assurance in v. 10? Conditioned on obedience to God by the family of David, and on Israelites, generally, doing the Divine will, though conditions are not here expressed.

What use should we make of this chapter in controversy with those who teach Christ's kingdom has not been established on earth? We should take this chapter and Psa. 89 and inquire what has become of Divine promises here set forth in regard to David's house. We should ask where his house or throne has been for the last 18 centuries. If told it has existed in the Anglo-Saxon race, supposed to be a residue of the "lost 10 tribes", we should answer, The Bible does not intimate 10 tribes of Israel were lost; and, even if it did thus intimate, still the objectors position would be hopeless, for David's house was of the tribe of Judah, thus was not with the so-called "lost 10 tribes".

But what should we say if required to show how and where the house of David has remained established? Resort to Acts 2:25-36 and show the promise to David, concerning his house being established forever, was fulfilled in Christ who was born of the offspring of David according to the flesh, and through whom a spiritual house of spiritual Israelites has been established which will remain forever.

**2 Samuel 8** sets forth account of several of David's wars and victories, and mentions what he dedicated to the Lord. Chapter ends with mention of David administering justice to the people; also that Joab was his chief captain, and who was his recorder, who were the priests, who was the scribe, and that his sons were chief rulers.

What is meant by the statement that David "went to recover his border at the river Euphrates", in v. 3? Gen. 15:18 indicates what is meant. The Lord intended Abraham's descendants to be a great people with much territory. David's victories indicated what they might have done, and suggest they might have enlarged in the earth and become the chief people, if they had only been always obedient to the Lord.

**2 Samuel 9** gives account of David in his prosperity remembering Jonathan, and desiring to favor any who were still living of the house of Saul, for Jonathan's sake; also that on inquiry he learned of Jonathan's lame son Mephibosheth, and had him called into his presence. Account then of interview between David and Mephibosheth, and its results.

Do all men exalted to greatness remember former friends? No. In many instances they forget them and feel too lofty to notice them, specially if they be poor, But David was not of that kind. He remembered Jonathan, and was humble before God all his life. Besides, he was always ready to be convinced of his sin and ready to repent when convinced. In this he differed from Saul.

**2 Samuel 10** tells of David's disposition to show kindness to the king of Ammon because of kindness received from that king's father, and of results of David's disposition in that direction, first, in the indignity inflicted on certain of his servants, and then in the great war which involved Ammonites and Syrians on the one hand, and armies of Israel on the other.

What may we conclude from the manner in which the Ammonites' king mistreated David's servants? David made mistake of misdirecting his kindness in that instance; but it was all overruled for good to David as the Syrians feared to help Ammonites again. This suggests if Christians misdirect kindness, in some instances, they should not become discouraged, as it may all be overruled for good.

**2 Samuel 11** records David's misconduct, his sins, his crimes in regard to Uriah the Hittite.

Is there apology that can be reasonably offered for David in regard to offenses here recorded? There is not. Explanation is that he was having an easy time, had been lying down while Joab and his other soldiers were battling against his enemies—and he was off-guard. Because he was king he suffered himself to think he could do as he pleased, even to taking another man's wife.

What shall we say of Uriah? He showed disposition of the genuine soldier in the highest degree.

And what may we safely say of David's effort to cover his crime? He committed an additional crime, he latter worse than the former.

What shall we say of a record in which such sins as those of David are recorded? It is impartial and thereby gives evidence of genuineness.

**2 Samuel 12** declares David was convinced of his sin in the case of Uriah the Hittite by a parable and its application which the prophet Nathan spoke in his hearing; also that David confessed his sin. Then account of God's judgment against him because of his sin; next that the child that had been born was struck with sickness of which he died. In connection with

this account is given of David fasting, and praying for the child, then of his behavior when he learned the child was dead, then that Bathsheba became mother of Solomon. Chapter ends with account of Joab, then David, warring against Ammonites and overcoming them, and the returning with all the soldiers to Jerusalem.

What may we learn from exposure of David's sin, and judgments threatened against him? Reveal that God is no respecter of persons, though he respects characters and positions. Thus while punishment threatened against David for his sins in the case of Uriah's wife, then in causing death of Uriah himself, was different from what it would have been in the case of an ordinary Israelite, yet that punishment was severe and, as history reveals, was terrible.

But what shall we say of the fact that Uriah's widow was Divinely permitted to become mother of Solomon through whom the Savior's genealogy is traced to David? Reveals fulness of the Divine pardon when that pardon is extended. The Lord "put away" David's sin in that he saved him from death and measured out justice to him in other respects; and that ended the matter except that a record thereof was made for our learning and warning.

**2 Samuel 13** informs there was serious trouble in David's family, which resulted in disgrace of a daughter, death of a son, and fleeing of another into the land of Syria. Chapter ends with statement that David was comforted concerning his dead son, and longed for the one who fled from his own land.

What may we safely say in regard to the story of Ammon and Tansy? Should be studied by all young people, specially by young women and girls, as it reveals disposition of some men. Their love for womankind is of a nature that is turned to hatred when an-lawfully gratified. What men are of that disposition no woman can prejudge, therefore all girls and women should avoid such gratification of men with more care and dread than they would avoid death.

What use should parents and other guardians make of this chapter? Should urge young people of both sexes, under their care to study it in order that they be warned against every unlawful act in relations to each other. This one chapter will do more by way of forewarning them against licentiousness than all uninspired books combined. In connection with this chapter young people and all others should remember words of Hagar: "Thou God seest me", in Gen. 16:13. Nor should they suppose they can remain chaste without daily obedience to what is commanded in Philip. 4: 8. Mankind are so constituted that if corruption be cherished in mind and heart it will, in many instances, have outworking in their life. Purity in thought and feeling is the only assurance against impurity in practice.

**2 Samuel 14** gives account of the scheme adopted by Joab, David's chief captain, to cause the king to send for Absalom to return to Jerusalem; and last part of the latter part of this chapter informs concerning the scheme of Absalom to secure an interview with Joab, so he might be brought into presence of his father.

Is there anything in this chapter about Absalom's personal appearance? Much praised for

his beauty.

Was his personal beauty before men an index to his heart? His record reveals he was treacherous in the extreme.

Is personal appearance generally an index to the heart? In some respects, but not that phase of personal appearance called "beauty". The mind determines what behavior shall be, and general behavior of every human being is an index to the heart. Special behavior on special occasions may be misleading, but general behavior reveals mind and heart of every individual. According to this principle a celebrated preacher answered inquiry whether he knew a certain man. He said, "I never lived with him".

Are there general principles on which we may judge persons without living with them? Those anxious to tell about themselves, thus show they are not willing to allow persons to judge them by ordinary speech and conduct, are generally unreliable. Those who'll not answer direct in regard to themselves when questioned, thus seem unwilling for others to know them, are generally unreliable. We should beware of those who talk too much, also of those who talk so doubtfully we cannot understand their positions or opinions.

**2 Samuel 15** records treachery and treason of Absalom, and result in causing David with family and friends to leave Jerusalem.

What may we safely conclude in regard to Absalom's treachery and rebellion? Fulfillment of what the prophet Nathan said to David in chap. 12:10.

Did David seem to regard it thus? He did, judging by his humility in vs. 25, 26.

How did David regard Ahithophel? Feared result of his counsel against him.

What does v. 11 reveal? That living men may be spoken of as not knowing anything, and is a Scripture which should be brought before those who try to prove the dead are in every respect unconscious, and who, in order to accomplish that end quote Eccl. 9:5. By referring them to v. 11 we can show that of living men it is written "they knew not anything".

**2 Samuel 16** sets before us account of a man Ziba meeting David with beasts for his household to ride on, and food for them to eat, also that a man Shimei, of the house of Saul came and cursed David. Humility of David is indicated by his refusal to permit his sister's son Abishai to go against Shimei. Mention then of Absalom and Ahithophel going to Jerusalem, and of counsel of Ahithophel in regard to what Absalom should do in order to cause himself to be abhorred of his father, and that those with him should be strong. Chapter ends with estimate in which Ahithophel's counsel was held by David and Absalom.

**2 Samuel 17** shows Ahithophel gave counsel to Absalom, also that Absalom asked for

counsel of Hushai, a friend to David, and that Hushai's counsel was accepted because it was of God that the counsel of Ahithophel should be overthrown. Then we learn account of Hushai's counsel was taken to David; also that when Ahithophel learned his counsel was not accepted he went home and hanged himself. Chapter ends with account that certain ones brought food for David and those with him.

What may we safely say in regard to the fact that Absalom was led to disregard counsel of Ahithophel? God can overthrow counsel of the shrewdest men (see Isa. 44:24, 25).

**2 Samuel 18** tells of David numbering and organizing his army and sending it in 3 divisions against Absalom's army; also his charge to his 3 captains to deal gently, for his sake, with Absalom. Then account of the battle, defeat of Absalom's army, of Absalom's death, burial and his pillar he had previously reared to keep his name in remembrance. Then record of men who bore tidings of the battle and of Absalom's death to the king, and how the king lamented.

What may we safely say in regard to any picture which represents Absalom's hair entangled in boughs of an oak tree? That idea is not in the Sacred Text, but is a fancy. His head was caught in the oak, and we should not be more definite than the Text.

**2 Samuel 19** sets forth account of David's continued lamentation over Absalom's death, of Joab's speech to David on the subject, and of the king hearkening to Joab. Then account of certain events preceding the king's return to Jerusalem, of his passing over Jordan and being met by the man who had cursed him, and by several others. Chapter ends with mention of strife between men of Judah and those of the 10 tribes called Israel, in regard to bringing back David to Jerusalem

What shall we say of David's decision to make Amasa captain over his host instead of Joab, as mentioned in v. 13? As Amasa was captain over Absalom's army (chap. 17:25) it was very unwise and resulted in Amasa's untimely death.

**2 Samuel 20** records account of a man Sheba, of the tribe of Benjamin who blew a trumpet and declared he with others of Israel had no part in David; also of the following he secured, and of David commanding Amasa to assemble men of Judah within 3 days. Then statement of the king sending Abishai after Sheba, and that Joab also went; also that Joab killed Amasa. then went on after Sheba. The record then states where Sheba was found, and how his head was secured through counsel of a wise woman. Chapter ends with mention of names of David's chief officers.

Was the fact that Joab killed Amasa ever charged against him? Yes. David mentioned it to Solomon (see 1 Kings 2:5).

**2 Samuel 21** records a famine in the land; that David inquired of the Lord for the cause and was informed it was because of a sin Saul committed in trying to exterminate Gibeonites. Then record of David inquiring of Gibeonites what they demanded, and of their request for 7 sons of Saul that they might hang them up before the Lord in a certain place called "Gibeah of Saul". Next we find their request granted; that the mother of 2 of those sons watched over the dead bodies for a period. Then we are informed of burial of those bodies with bones of Saul and Jonathan in the land of Benjamin. Chapter ends with statement of certain battles David had with Philistines.

What may we learn by considering that a famine afflicted the land because of Saul's zeal against Gibeonites? That God never forgets an oath nor guilt of innocent blood. Josh. 9:15 records an oath made in regard to Gibeonites; but that oath was disregarded by Saul who slew Gibeonites without cause, thus shed innocent blood.

What may we learn by the fact that the death of 7 sons of Saul was the satisfaction required by Gibeonites, and was accepted by the Lord? That guilt of innocent blood could then only be met by blood being shed for it; also that the 2nd command of the Decalogue, which threatened that iniquity of the father would be visited on his children, was Divinely intended to be fulfilled. That command sets forth God's last and severest earthly punishment for sin. Should prevent men from sinning when all else fails to keep them from sin.

What may we safely say of Abishai, mentioned in v. 17 as saving David's life when he became faint in battle? A splendid soldier. So was Joab his brother. They were sons of David's sister, and served him from the 'time he fled before Saul They never seemed jealous of David's prominence, but served him well Josh. seemed jealous, as indicated by the fact that he slew Abner (chap. 3:27), and slew Amasa (chap. 20:10); but in each instance he had good reasons for believing the king made a mistake in the confidence he gave to a former enemy. In chap. 3:89 David said sons Of Zeruah his sister were "too hard" for him. But their history shows they always considered his best interests. Chap. 12:27-30 is an instance of Joab's devotion to him.

**2 Samuel 22** consists of a song which is also found, with a few variations, in Psa. 18.

What are chief thoughts in this song? Adoration, praise and prayer. Also sets forth in poetic style some history of David's life in regard to his enemies and deliverances from them. Shows David's prayers were outgrowth of his trials, and that his thanksgivings were outgrowth of the fact that he had been brought safely through trials.

Is not same true on all other religious persons? Maw kind are so capable of being delighted with this world that they are constantly liable to forget God unless trials be suffered to come on them so as to make them feel need of God.

What may we safely say of v. 31? Reveals what should be daily considered by every rational being. God's way is perfect. He makes no mistakes. He can't err. Though the Bible tells God repented of certain things he did, yet that only means he changed his sentence on account of change of conduct on the part of man (see Jer. 18:1-10; also Jonah 3).

What else may we learn here? That the Lord's word is tried, thus not hastily nor



inconsiderately given. God framed his word in view of all ages and circumstances. In Psa. 12:6 we find more on this subject. As every wise man endeavors to purify his speech so it will be as clear as possible and free from error, so the Lord, infinite in all his attributes, gave to man kind tried and perfect words.

**2 Samuel 23** brings before us David's last 'words also account of mighty men in his army.

Is Joab praised as one of those mighty men? He is not, though incidentally mentioned.

What was wrong with Joab? He was an excellent soldier and commander of soldiers, but he twice shed the blood of war in time of peace.

What does v. 2 indicate? That the spirit of God in David gave him verbal inspiration. Declares God's Spirit spoke by him, and that the Divine word was in his tongue. Index to all else found in the Sacred Text on the subject. Those who deny verbal inspiration up Moses, David and other Old Testament prophets certainly cannot consistently regard those writers as worthy of ordinary confidence. Seventy times or more Moses declared, "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying"—then proceeded to give exact words God spoke to him. Isaiah, Jeremiah and all other prophets were equally defiant in regard to the source from which they received messages they delivered. Therefore, if not verbally inspired, they were self-deceived, or deliberate deceivers. In either case they should be regarded as impostors, and unworthy of confidence.

But was all the Old Testament given by verbal inspiration? If ally part was not written by verbal inspiration it has certainly been endorsed by inspiration, for the Savior endorsed it as a record without criticism. Therefore those who deny verbal inspiration of the Bible cannot consistently accept it even as a good book.

**2 Samuel 24** sets forth numbering of Israel according to David's command, then his repentance, then God's judgment on Israel according to a choice David made; then the Lord's change of sentence, his command to David in regard to an altar, David's obedience and the fact that the Lord accepted his offering and was entreated so his judgment against Israel was not further executed.

How can v. 1 and 1 Chron. 21:1 be harmonized Each verse mentions something the other omits. Taken together they set forth that the Lord's anger was kindled against Israel, and He decided to give David opportunity to be involved in the judgment He would inflict. Therefore He suffered Satan to provoke him to number Israel.

What does Joab's speech to David indicate? That David's command that Israel should be numbered was outgrowth of pride in regard to number of people under him; also that Joab was then wiser than David.

Did the Lord give a law in regard to numbering Israel? In Exo. 30:12 he told Israelites through Moses that when they would number the people they should give every man a

ransom for his soul. But David overlooked that law and ventured to number men fit for war without giving ransom money.

What lesson should we learn by considering this record of David's sin? A warning against trying to secure statistics in spiritual Israel. An argument based on great or small numbers is abomination to the Lord, and should be regarded as abomination by the Lord's people.

But how can the last of this chapter and 1 Chron. 21:25 in regard to the price David paid for the threshing floor be harmonized? V. 24 of this chapter states what David paid for "the threshing floor and the oxen", while 1 Chron, 21:25 mentions what David paid "for the place", which may have embraced much more than' the threshing floor.

What may we learn by David's decision not to offer to the Lord what did not cost him anything? Would be wholesome decision for Christians. We should be always disposed to make self-denials for the Lord's sake. God gave his Son for us, and his Son gave Himself for us, without regard to cost in self-denial and suffering. Therefore we should give ourselves to God and Christ, and support the Lord's cause without refusing self-denial or suffering.

**1 Kings, chapter 1**, sets forth fact concerning David's physical condition when he became very old, and what was done for him; also that his son Adonijah tried to usurp the throne, and facts connected with anointing and enthroning Solomon Chapter ends with mention of Adonijah fearing Solomon, being brought before Solomon and told to go to his house.

**In 1 Kings 2** we find account of close of David's life, his charge to Solomon and certain events connected with beginning of Solomon's reign.

What may we learn by considering v. 5 in connection with vs. 31, 32? In light of 2 Sam. 21 there was danger in suffering Joab to live, as he had shed blood of war in time of peace. Solomon indicated this in what he said in regard to his command to slay Joab (see v. 31).

What shall we say of Solomon's promise to his mother not to deny what she might ask of him, then violating his promise? Pitiabale and condemnabale, if we consider it in light of the Gospel. But Solomon was not a Christian, and we cannot justly measure him by Gospel strictness.

Was killing of Adonijah necessary? We may not be able to judge aright in his case. But it is generally true a man who has usurpation and traitorship in heart can never be trusted. Thus Adonijah was spared from death he seemed to think he deserved for usurping his father's throne, and soon he asked for a woman, who had ministered to his father, to be his wife. Mature observation among mankind enables the reflecting mind to learn the envious, jealous and ambitious are never satisfied while anyone is greater than themselves, and they are always liable to show their evil disposition.

**1 Kings 3** records account of Solomon forming alliance with Pharaoh king of Egypt, in marrying his daughter; also account of sacrifices offered to the Lord in "high places", and reason why. Next we find the Lord appearing to Solomon in a dream and asking what he desired, also of Solomon's answer; then what the Lord said in response. Latter part of chapter records Solomon's wisdom in deciding controversy between 2 women.

Did Solomon show wisdom in asking for wisdom? He knew enough to understand his chief need, and that is always a mark of wisdom.

What is meant by the statement of Solomon that he knew not how to "go out" nor "come in"? He knew wisdom was required for him to go out and come in before people in that manner which would be in harmony with his position as king. Same is now true even in case of those not kings in ordinary sense. Good degree of wisdom is required in every man to enable him to go out and come in before his fellows with such dignity as will be always in harmony with true manhood. Likewise, in order for a woman to go out and come in before others with such dignity as will indicate true womanhood certainly requires wisdom. Both men and women can show themselves lacking in wisdom by their walk and talk, their rising up and sitting down and, in some instances, by every move they make. Therefore Solomon's desire for wisdom showed wisdom.

**1 Kings 4** informs of Solomon's princes, then of officers who provided food for his household. Next, of people of Israel and Judah being very many, and what provisions were required for Solomon's household for one day; likewise of safety of the people during his reign. Account of his horses, chariots and horsemen, is then given; next, account of his wisdom, and his reputation, for wisdom among other nations.

What may we say in regard to the account of Solomon's horses? Reveals Solomon's wisdom was not sufficient to prevent his disregarding God's law in regard to multiplying horses to himself. In Deut. 17:16 a special statute was given against the king, who might be chosen to rule over Israel, multiplying horses But that was disregarded by Solomon' and great evil resulted as other parts of his history indicate. If Solomon with all his wisdom did not know enough to conduct himself aright without being guided by law of the Lord, what hope is there for ordinary specimens of humanity? None. All deviation from God's word is damaging and destructive to mankind as certain as that Psa. 18:30 states truth in regard to God's way and Word.

**1 Kings 5** gives account of beginning of friendly relations between Solomon and Hiram king of Tyre, also of preparations for building the temple the Lord promised David his son should build.

Were the preparations extensive? They were. What shall we say of the league Solomon and Hiram made, mentioned in v. 12? Affirmed by some to have been beginning of Free Masonry.

Was there an oath between them? The record does not so record.

Is this a good beginning for an oath-bound society? No. It lacks the essential element.

Might not Free Masons find better foundation for their order in Josh. 9? Yes, for in that chapter We read of a league confirmed by an oath, made without consulting the Lord, thus in 'ignorance and error.

What may we safely say in regard to secret orders and sectarian denominations-using Scripture to make a show of support for their societies? All Scripture thus used is perverted. Neither as a whole nor in any part was the Bible given to serve as support for a man-made society.

How many societies did God arrange on earth? Two —the family and the Church,

Is either secret? Yes, the family is, in certain sense, a secret society, and should be maintained as such according to directions in the Bible.

**1 Kings 6** mentions when Solomon began to build the temple, also account of building and finishing the temple.

What shall we say of the date here of time when building the temple was begun? In light of what Acts 13:19, 20 sets forth there seems discrepancy of about 100 years, and it is reasonable to suppose in transcribing this record such mistake may have been made and Suffered to remain, in order to accomplish the Lord's purpose with quibblers (see last part of 2 Sam. 22:27). There are many evidences the Lord, in giving the Bible, made no provisions against the dishonest mind.

But is there no explanation of this discrepancy except to suppose error on part of a scribe who copied this part of the Sacred Text? Yes, we may reasonably suppose Israelites had not really come out of Egypt 'til the reproach of Egypt was roiled off at Gilgal (see Josh. 5:9). By this reasonable supposition the discrepancy of 100 years or more may be largely reduced but not entirely covered. Then we may add another supposition that the expression "until Samuel the prophet" covers the entire period of Samuel's life as judge. This supposition is scriptural, as the next verse states 'afterward they desired a king' (see Acts 13:20, 21). But 1 Sam. 8 informs the Israelites did not call for a king 'til after Samuel was old and, possibly, had served as judge 50 years or more. These several suppositions modify the discrepancy as it first appears. Next we should consider in Acts 13:20 Paul declared God gave Israelites judges "about the space of 450 years", which implies the period of judges may have been more or less than 450 years. When all these reasonable and scriptural suppositions are considered the apparent discrepancy is "about" covered.

On a certain occasion, a certain man proposed to join a certain church, but said a certain very unworthy member would need to be dismissed before he would unite with that church. The one to whom that proposal was made was a preacher, and he at once said "I often wondered why the Lord permitted that unworthy brother to remain connected with the church, but now I know. It has been to keep such fools as you out of the church". On this principle it may be safely said good reason exists for certain discrepancies found in the Bible. 1 Cor. 11:19 touches this subject.

**1 Kings 7** mentions length of time Solomon was occupied in building his own house, and of what kind of material he built it; also that he built a magnificent house for his Egyptian wife. Then we read of Solomon securing a man named Hiram, called Hiram in Second Chronicles four, who was an Israelite on his mother's side, and used him as his chief workman in brass. Account then of riches worked into and connected with the temple.

Did God require such riches? No. But he permitted a wise king to arrange and beautify the temple as he desired.

Was not the tabernacle a beautiful and costly structure? It was. Besides, its beauty and costliness were ordained of God. Was it not therefore appropriate that Solomon should build a beautiful and costly temple? Altogether appropriate.

What did the tabernacle and temple foreshadow? The Church, which is called "the house of God" in 1 Tim. 3:15.

What should we say to those who try to justify building costly meeting houses by referring to the cost of the tabernacle and temple? Tell them they err, not knowing the Scriptures (Mat. 22:29). Earthly riches and beauty of Old Testament houses of worship were intended to refer to and foreshadow spiritual riches and beauty of the Church of God in the Gospel age (see 1 Cor. 3:9-17).

**1 Kings 8** gives account of moving the ark from the city of David called Zion, to the place prepared for it in the temple; then report of Solomon's prayer.

What may we say of this prayer? Complete in both Godward and manward bearings. Mentioned Divine goodness to David and Solomon; then besought the Lord to accept all prayers, of Israelites and strangers, who would at any time turn their faces toward the temple and pray to God.

**1 Kings 9** tells that when Solomon finished the temple and his own house, then the Lord appeared and told him He had heard his prayer and would fulfill to him the promise He had made to David, if he would only walk before Him in uprightness as David did; also the Lord told what evil he would bring on Israel if he turned aside to other gods. We next read that Solomon gave Hiram, king of Tyre, 20 cities of Galilee, and that those cities did not please Hiram. Then we read of a tax Solomon laid on the people; also of what the king of Egypt gave his daughter who was a wife of Solomon; then further account of Solomon's doings and greatness.

**1 Kings 10** sets forth account of the queen of Sheba coming to, Solomon to hear his wisdom, also of presents she made him, Then account of the king of Tyre bringing presents. Amount

of gold he had is mentioned also that silver was regarded as not worth much in his day. His horses, horsemen and chariots are also mentioned.

In accumulating horses, silver and gold, what law of the Lord did Solomon disregard? See Deut 17:16, 17.

What shall we say of Solomon's disobedience? More inexcusable, we might say, than any other recorded in the Old Testament, and was the secret of Israel's ruin.

**1 Kings 11** says Solomon went after many strange women, and that they turned his heart from the Lord to such extent that he built places for them to worship their heathen gods in Jerusalem, or near it. Then we learn the Lord was angry with Solomon and told him he would divide the kingdom, but on account of his father David he would not make the division 'til after his death. Next we learn the Lord stirred 3 prominent enemies against Solomon, the 3rd being one of his servants, Jeroboam, to whom the prophet Ahijah promised 10 tribes of Israel. Chapter ends with mention of Solomon's death and his son Rehoboam reigning in his stead.

What may we safely say of Solomon's history in this chapter? In some respects, the most saddening chapter in the history of God's ancient people.

Of what benefit to us? We should learn by considering it that a servant of God should not enter marriage with an idolatrous woman or man.

But who are idolaters? All worshipers of idols, whether in form of man-made images, creeds, confessions of faith, meeting houses, preachers, popularity or wealth.

What else may we learn by considering this chapter of Solomon's history? If Solomon, with all his wisdom, could not control himself when he disregarded God's law, there is no hope for others who disregard it.

What that exists in modern times may be likened to "high places Solomon built for worship by his idolatrous wives? Platforms built in meeting houses as "high places" for musical instruments to be used in efforts to make the Church popular with the World. thus in worshipping what may be called "the god of popularity", in some respects resemble "high places" Solomon made for worship of idols by certain of his wives.

**1 Kings 12** sets before us enthroning of Rehoboam as successor of Solomon, dividing of his kingdom, and that Jeroboam, Solomon's servant, became king over 10 tribes who afterward bare the name Israel, while the part of the kingdom that remained loyal to Rehoboam, Solomon's son, was called Judah. Account then of Rehoboam's purpose to make war against the 10 tribes that rebelled against him, but that the Lord prevented his so doing at that time. Remainder of the chapter informs of certain misconduct on part of Jeroboam in setting up golden calves for Israel to worship, and choosing men for priests who were of "the lowest

of the people and not of the tribe of Levi", also of his arranging a feast in a month which "he devised of his own heart".

What may we learn by considering this chapter? That Solomon was an oppressor of his people. He had no need of a standing army of men, horses and chariots; and the fact that he kept an army was a matter of pride on his part and resulted in burdening the people. Thus it was, thus it is, and thus it will be.

What shall we say of Rehoboam's answer to those who wished their burdens made lighter? It was foolish, and has been followed by many who have sought counsel of the young rather than of the old.

But was not Rehoboam's foolish answer fore-ordained? V. 15 so indicates. Because of Solomon's sins the Lord decided to take part of the tribes from his son Rehoboam; thus it was that Solomon's sins laid foundation for all evils which afterward came on the Israelites. The wisest and richest king the Israelites ever had proved their 'greatest curse because he disregarded God's law in Deut. 17:16-20.

What should we learn from all this? That we should be satisfied to live the life of plain, humble people, always striving to do the Divine will.

What may we say of Jereboam ordaining a feast on the 15th day of the 8th month? He was perhaps not more presumptuous than many religious people have been in the Gospel age who have, of their own hearts, decided to Commune once a month, once a quarter, once a year, or simply when the preacher is present.

But are not religious people now living less excusable than Jereboam was, as they have his evil history and record of its evil results set before them as a warning? They certainly are, for 'unto whomsoever much is given of him shall be much required" (Luke 12:48).

**1 Kings 13** tells that a man of God was sent from Judah to cry against an altar king Jeroboam made; also that when he cried against it he uttered a prophecy, then gave a sign which was at once fulfilled. What Jeroboam then did, and its result; what the prophet did and its results; what Jeroboam proposed to the prophet and his refusal are next recorded. Then we read of a lying prophet, not far distant, and what he said and did, and its results.

What may we learn by considering this chapter? That we should not suffer ourselves to be turned from what the Lord has said in his Word, but should abide by the word of the Lord regardless of what others say. Evil that befell the man of God, mentioned in this chapter, because he listened to a false prophet, should serve as forewarning to all Bible readers against giving confidence to those who differ from God's word and devise departures therefrom (see also Deut. 13:1-5).

Did Jeroboam repent of his wickedness when he received evidence he had been doing wrong? He was a rebel against Divine government and cherished rebellion in his heart all of his life. 2 Chron. 13:20 indicates he died by special judgment from God. His record should warn all other rebellious ones.

**1 Kings 14** mentions the son of Jeroboam, king of the 10 tribes, being sick, and his father sending his mother to the prophet Ahijah to inquire what should become of him, also that she should disguise herself so as to appear as another woman. Then, what the Lord said to the prophet on the subject, and what he said to Jeroboam's wife when she came; also that what the prophet said concerning her child came to pass when she returned home, after which mention is made of death of Jeroboam and that his son Nadab reigned in his stead. Then we read of Rehoboam's reign over the tribes of Benjamin and Judah, also of his evil conduct and that Shishak, king of Egypt, made war against him and of treasures Shishak took with him. Chapter ends with statement that Jeroboam died and his son Abijam reigned in his stead.

What may we safely say of Jeroboam's idea of having his wife disguise herself, then consult a prophet of the Lord? Illustrates the low idea rebels against Divine government have in all ages entertained. Psa. 78:36 informs concerning that idea being held by Israelites in the wilderness. Religious hypocrites seem to think 'they can deceive God. They disguise themselves before men, and by their prayers try to disguise themselves before God. All such should read Psa. 139.

What should be our conclusion when we consider that a king of Egypt carried away treasures of the temple and of the king's house in Jerusalem? That it was appropriate, as Solomon disobeyed the Lord by marrying a daughter of a former king of Egypt.

What has transpired among disciples of Christ like unto facts just considered? Many disciples have formed alliances with sectarians and, as a result, have caused divisions, thus have been robbed of glory of their distinctive plea of oneness on the Bible as their only creed. Rehoboam lost his "shields of gold" and had nothing left but brass of which to make his shields. Thus it has been with certain disciples.

**1 Kings 15** tells of a bad king named Abijam, then of a good king named Asa ruling over the kingdom of Judah. Next is record of a bad man named Baasha, of the tribe of Issachar, conspiring against Nadab, king of Israel, and slaying him and all others of the house of Jeroboam, according to the prophecy of Ahijah in chap. 14:10-16.

Why should Baasha be called a bad man, seeing he did the Lord's will against the house of Jeroboam? The last verse informs that he was bad.

And did God raise up a bad man to execute His will? Yes, on the principle mentioned in Psa. 76:10.

**1 Kings 16** sets before us prophecy against the house of Baasha, king of Israel, like that he had himself executed against the house of Jeroboam. Next we learn the prophecy against the house, or family, of Baasha was executed by a man named Zimri soon after his son Elah began to reign. Chapter then informs of a man named Omri rising up and causing death of Zimri, then division of the people for a time. Next, Omri did evil and died and his son Ahab reigned in his stead; also that Ahab did worse than anyone who previously reigned over



Israel. Chapter ends with statement concerning building of Jericho and refers to what Joshua said on that subject.

What should be our reflections as we consider history in this chapter and in others somewhat on the same order? We should remember Prov. 28:27

Have other nations had similar experience to what the kingdom of Israel suffered? Yes, with few exceptions the traitor, usurper murderer, who has come to a throne, has been soon deposed and, perhaps, slain. Thus has been fulfilled the Scripture: "The seed of evildoers shall never be renowned" (Isa. 14:20).

What important information in v. 24? Concerning origin of the word Samaria and building of the city called by that name.

**1 Kings 17** tells of Elijah the Tishbite as a prophet of the Lord; what he said to king Ahab in regard to a famine; and what the Lord said to him in regard to where he should stay. Also account of miraculous manner in which he was fed at both places he stayed. Chapter ends with account of Elijah being means of restoring to life the son of a certain widow, and the confession of faith she made by reason of what Elijah had been instrumental in accomplishing for her.

**1 Kings 18** tells the Lord's command to Elijah to show himself to king Ahab and that as he went he met Obadiah, governor of Ahab's house, then an interview between Elijah and Obadiah. Next, account of interview between Elijah and Ahab, what Elijah proposed as to determine who should be God, his proposal executed, and result.

What may we say of Ahab asking Elijah, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" Ahab showed disposition common in modern times among those who rebel against Divine government and wish to do as they please. They charge those with "troubling Israel" who contend for perfection of the Divine arrangement and rebuke them for their compromising disposition. What may we say of Elijah's mocking of Baal's prophets? He used what is sometimes designated "irony" where he ridiculed them. That is to say, he said to them what their folly in calling on a dumb idol implied; and not what he sincerely thought with reference to their idol.

What practices in modern times are suggested by loud praying and other evidences of excitement recorded of Baal's prophets? Loud, unscriptural praying and other disorderly performances of modern sensational religionists are suggested.

What may we say in regard to Elijah when viewed from standpoint of majorities? He was, in one sense, certainly in minority, for he was alone with God. But results proved he was greater than the majority that was against him.

What effect should this record have on Christians? Should encourage them to do right regardless of majorities.

Have not majorities always been on the wrong side of true religion? They certainly have except for a brief period after the Flood, if we may judge by history.

Do majorities ever reform? Never; but have always gone from bad to worse until overthrown. Ancient Samaritans seem to have been a rare exception. Thus it has been, thus it is, and thus it will be in near or about every instance.

**1 Kings 19** gives account of Ahab reporting to his idolatrous wife, Jezebel, what Elijah had done. Then that Jezebel sent to Elijah a threatening message. Next, the effect on Elijah, also that an angel spoke to him in regard to something to eat and that he should take a long journey. Then account of Elijah going to Mt Horeb, of what the Lord said to him, how the Lord appeared to him, and of the Lord's command in regard to anointing 2 men to be kings and one man to be a prophet.

**1 Kings 20** gives information concerning a king of Syria named Benhadad making war against Samaria, thus against Ahab, king of Israel who lived in Samaria. His demands of Ahab, revolt of Ahab, what a prophet of the Lord said to Ahab, and result of the first battle. Then account of what the prophet of the Lord further said to Ahab about Syrians, also results of another battle. Chapter ends with account of Ahab's failure to inflict justice on the king of Syria and what the Lord said with reference thereto.

What may we learn from the fact that God helped Ahab, a wicked king, against his enemies? The Lord was jealous for the honor of His name, and did not propose the Syrians should exalt themselves with the thought that they had succeeded against Him. The king of Syria was boastful against the God of heaven, and threatened Samaria in the name of his gods, as indicated by v. 10.

What may we say of Ahab's response to him in v. 11? A good precaution, and should be observed by all mankind; only the idea of boasting when the armor is taken off should not be entertained. The creature man should never boast, as he is dependent of his Creator for every breath.

What may we conclude from the fact that Ahab did not inflict justice on the king of Syria? The record of the Lord's displeasure by reason thereof indicates man must not try to be more merciful than his Creator.

What is meant by facts mentioned in vs. 35, 36? They set forth a parable to illustrate sin of Ahab in not smiting the king of Syria as justice demanded.

What is meant by vs. 39, 40? They also set forth a parable to illustrate Ahab's error in not smiting the king of Syria.

What effect should these parables and their application have on nations in dealing with each other in regard to carnal warfare? Nations should learn to deal severely with those who incite, urge and wage unjust wars.

**1 Kings 21** records account of Ahab coveting vineyard of a man named Naboth; that he was displeased when Naboth refused to sell it to him or trade it for another; also that Ahab's wife Jezebel arranged to have Naboth killed so her husband could get the vineyard he coveted. Chapter ends with statement of what the Lord said to Ahab through the prophet Elijah; also statement of Ahab's repentance and the Lord's promise by reason of his repentance.

Against how many kings of Israel did the Lord pronounce the same sentence—utter destruction of their families? Three, namely, Jeroboam, Baasha and Ahab.

**1 Kings 22** tells of alliance between king Ahab of Israel and king Jehoshaphat of Judah, in regard to going against a place in Syria called Ramoth-gilead; also that certain false prophets were consulted in regard to the proposal to make war against the Syrians, and what they said. Then mention of a true prophet called Micaiah, being called for and questioned, and what he said. Effect of that response on king Ahab is next mentioned, and facts are set forth in regard to Ahab and Jehoshaphat going to battle against Syrians, which resulted in Ahab's death. Latter part of this chapter mentions certain facts concerning Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, also that Ahab's successor in ruling Israel was his son Ahaziah. Chapter ends with account of Ahaziah's evil character.

What may we safely say of Jehoshaphat's disposition? Too affable—too much inclined to be accommodative—and thus formed alliance with a bad man.

What may we learn by considering the record of the prophecy of Micaiah? Indicates he was first possessed of the evil spirit that was in Ahab's prophets; but when he was adjured, or called on to prophesy under oath, the Lord would not permit him to say anything which was not true.

Has God right to send an evil spirit into men to accomplish certain evil ends? Yes; he is the Creator, the Author, of every being in existence; and though some beings he has created have made themselves bad, yet he has right to control and use them to accomplish his will against wrong doers.

**2 Kings chapter 1** informs that Moabites rebelled against Israel; that Ahaziah, king of Israel, had a dangerous fall and was sick; that he sent messengers to a heathen god to inquire concerning himself; that those messengers were turned back by the prophet Elijah, who told them their king should die. We are informed also that when Elijah was described to the king of Israel he recognized him, and sent a captain and 50 men for him, Who were consumed with fire from Heaven. Then we read that a 2nd captain and 50 men were like' wise sent and consumed; but that a 3rd captain was spared, and Elijah went with him to the king and told him he should die; which was accomplished, and Jehoram reigned in his stead.

Who was Jehoram who reigned over Israel after Ahaziah died? A son of Ahab, therefore a brother to Ahaziah (chap. 3:1).

What practice in modern times is suggested by Ahaziah sending messengers to inquire of a heathen god? The practice of resorting to professional "fortune tellers in order to learn concerning the future, also the resort made by certain disciples to sectarian customs in order to secure "success" for the Lord's cause.

What may we say of Elijah's severity in calling fire down from heaven on the 2 companies the king sent after him? In Luke 9:51-56 the Savior teaches he would have us deal more mercifully than Elijah did.

**2 Kings 2** informs of Elijah taken from earth by a whirlwind, and that a portion of his spirit as prophet rested on Elisha; also that his mantle fell to the ground as he went up, and was taken up by Elisha. Then record of 3 miracles performed through Elisha.

What should we learn from the last miracles? It was very severe and, according to Rom. 15:4, was written to teach children and all others not to make fun of old people. This one instance properly read or related to children will do much toward impressing them that they should be respectful toward the aged and the infirm.

**2 Kings 3** tells of evil conduct of Jehoram, king of Israel, but that he did not go to full extent of his father Ahab in doing evil. We read also that after Ahab's death the Moabites rebelled against Israel, and that Jehoram formed alliance with Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, also with the king of Edom, to help him against Moabites. Next, that armies of those 3 kings were about, to perish for want of water, but that God supplied them water through the prophet Elisha, also that he delivered the Moabites to be overthrown by them. Chapter ends with record of the king of Moab offering his eldest son as a burnt offering; then the kings that were against him returned to their own land.

What do we find here concerning Jehoshaphat? Another manifestation of his affable disposition. So accommodative that he formed alliance with a bad man. 1 Kings 22:4 informs of former alliance with a wicked king.

What may we say to those who base argument in favor of instrumental music in church services on the fact that the prophet Elisha used a minstrel? We may safely say they might as reasonably argue in favor of making ditches in a dry time in order to have a supply of water, as Elisha commanded the king of Israel to do. They might also as reasonably argue in favor of putting salt in water and pouring it into a spring in order to improve the water in a district of country, as Elisha did to waters of Jericho.

**2 Kings 4** informs of 5 miracles wrought through Elisha. First, was increase of oil for a widow that was in debt. Second was granting a son to an aged man and wife. Third was

restoring that son to life after he had been dead for hours. Fourth was counteracting of poison in a pot of food. Fifth was miraculous increase of food.

What was moral character of the miracles? Each was a deed of mercy or, at least, a charitable deed.

Did not God always show himself in mercy and goodness to his obedient ones? Yes. (See Psa. 18:25.) But in some instances God's mercy was for a time hid' den from view of his people. The Savior did several severe miracles, but all for good.

**2 Kings 5** tells of Naaman, a Syrian leper, being cleansed of leprosy, and what he did and said before and after he was cleansed, also of what the servant of the prophet Elisha said and did after Naaman was cleansed, and of evil results to that servant.

What may we conclude in regard to Naaman's idea of what the prophet Elisha would do and say in regard to cleansing him from his leprosy? That idea showed his human nature. He thought great events should be accompanied by great demonstrations.

But what was the Lord's idea? Isa. 55:8,9 informs us.

What may we say of Naaman's idea expressed in v. 18? First statement ever made of the doctrine of indulgences, which has in the Gospel age been adopted by the apostate church. Naaman desired to arrange with God's prophet to permit him to bow down, and act the part of a hypocrite, in the house of his master's heathen god. Thus it was with him; thus it has been with others; thus it will be with many more even 'til end of the Gospel age. Secret belief in God and outward conformity to the world together reveal common condition in mankind. Their wish to be popular with their fellow mortals prevents their serving God outwardly. Therefore they act the part of moral cowards and hypocrites. Those commonly called 'hypocrites' make a show of faith they don't possess; but those like Naaman have faith they are unwilling to show at all times.

**2 Kings 6** informs of men called 'sons of the prophets' proposing to go to Jordan and build a house to live in, and that Elisha went with them; an ax was lost in the water, then was made to float. Next, the king of Syria arranged to wage war against the king of Israel, and became confused because Elisha informed the king of Israel of situation of the Syrian camp. Then the king of Syria sent to take Elisha, and the men he sent were struck with blindness in answer to Elisha's prayer; so the proposed war was abandoned. Later the Syrians came against Samaria and caused great distress so that the king of Israel thought to kill Elisha.

What may we say of disposition of the king of Israel when he proposed to kill Elisha? Showed a common weakness. Mankind are often disposed to censure the faultfinder more than they censure the fault maker. Thus the man who exposes error is often more censured than the one guilty of committing the error. Such disposition is dangerous where it exists. Its tendency is to intimidate friends of truth, thus deprive mankind generally of the admonition of the wise and good among them.

**2 Kings 7** sets forth prophecy of the Lord through Elisha that distress then existing in Samaria should be relieved, and that in about one day from the time he prophesied thereof food should be cheap there. Next we read of Elisha's prophecy against a man who did not believe what had been foretold about food being cheap. Remainder of the chapter sets forth how the Lord accomplished what he authorized Elisha to say.

What may we learn by considering this chapter? That the Lord knows how to manage his affairs, therefore knows what to say, and how to accomplish his word he has sent forth. This should give us entire confidence in all God says and does.

**2 Kings 8** tells that Elisha commanded a certain woman to take her family and go to live where she could because there would be a famine in the land of Samaria 7 years. Next, the woman went to the land of the Philistines and dwelt 7 years, after which she returned to Samaria and called on the king for her land and house. Then an interview between the king of Samaria and Elisha's servant. Then account of Elisha at Damascus of Syria, and prophecies he uttered there. Then statements concerning certain kings of Judah and of Israel.

What may we say of Elisha's prophecy in regard to the king of Syria recovering from sickness. It set forth that though his sickness was not such as to end his life, yet he should die; which implied his life should be ended by another cause.

Did the king's servant Hazeal report to his master correctly what Elisha said concerning his recovery? He did not, but changed the expression 'mayest certainly recover' to 'shouldest surely recover', and omitted the words 'he shall surely die'.

What do such change and omission suggest? A common method by which wrong impressions are constantly made. Such impressions are always, more or less, dangerous, specially in religion. Wrong impressions made in regard to religion by misquoting, misapplying and omitting Scripture are liable to result in eternal ruin of those misled thereby.

**2 Kings 9** gives the fact that the prophet Elisha commanded a son of the prophets to go and anoint a man named Jehu to be king over Israel. Then what the one who did the anointing told Jehu he was commissioned to do. Then record of what Jehu did in fulfilling his commission.

Against how many kings of Israel was the same sentence pronounced? V. 9 informs.

But why was not the sentence against Ahab inflicted while he lived? 1 Kings 21:27-29 answers.

What may we say of punishing a man's descendants for his sins? It is mentioned in the

2nd command of the Decalogue, and in 2 Sam. 21:1-14 the reason is given.

**2 Kings 10** tells of Jehu as king and of his exploits, also of damages inflicted on Israel by Syrians.

What may we safely say of Jehu? The right man, officially, for work he was commissioned to do.

Did the Lord ever make a mistake when he called a man to do special work? No. He always chose the right man.

But what may we say of Jehu in regard to personal character? He was not a pious man, or he would have destroyed the golden calves Jeroboam made, and restored the true worship.

What class of men among disciples resemble Jehu in character? Those who hate error in others more than they love truth in themselves. They are zealous to expose erroneous positions of others, but do not read the Bible and pray sufficiently to desire unmixed truth for themselves.

What was the character of Jehonadab, mentioned in v. 15 as finding favor with Jehu? A record is given of hint in Jer. 35.

What general lesson may we learn by considering this chapter? God always means what he says, and says what he means.

**2 Kings 11** informs concerning a wicked woman named Athaliah, mother of king Ahaziah whom Jehu had slain, also concerning Joash otherwise called Jehoash, one of Ahaziah's sons, being saved by his aunt Jehosheba, from Athaliah's slaughter of the seed royal.

Then a record of Joash being made king over Judah by Jehoiada the priest, and that Athaliah was slain, also that worship of Baal was destroyed from among the people.

**2 Kings 12** tells of reign of Joash and the good he did under instruction of Jehoida the priest, who assisted in saving his life and made him king, and protected him while he was a child. Latter part of the chapter informs of Hazael king of Syria, and how Joash prevented his coming against Jerusalem. Chapter ends with account of death of Joash by the hand of certain of his servants, and the statement that his son Amaziah reigned in his stead.

Why did servants of Joash slay him? 2 Chron. 24: 17-25 informs that, after death of Jehoida, Joash suffered himself to be flattered by certain princes, and did evil in the Lord's sight.

**2 Kings 13** records reign of Jehu's son Jehoahas, in which is account of his evil deeds, and what Israel suffered on that account from Hazael king of Syria. Account also of death and burial of Elisha, and what he said to Jehoahaz before his death; also that the dead body of a man was brought to life when laid in Elisha's tomb. Chapter ends with statements concerning Hazael king of Syria, as an oppressor of Israel during the days of Jehoahaz king of Israel; also of the Lord's compassion for Israel, and that, after death of Haze-el the son of Jehoahaz prevailed against Syrians and recovered certain cities.

What may we learn by what Elisha said and what Jehoahaz did in regard to smiting the ground with arrows, in vs. 18, 19? A valuable lesson. The Lord's prophet told a king to smite on the ground, but didn't tell him how often. Therefore he should have continued to strike till he was told to cease. But instead of so doing he ceased smiting of his own accord. By so doing he limited the smiting of his enemies, which his son should do after his death, as the last verse informs us. Illustrates that when Christians learn what they should do in obedience to Divine commands they should continue in obedience until the Lord indicates they have done enough. When that indication is given, at time of their death, they will have laid the foundation for grand victories by the next generation of disciples.

**2 Kings 14** informs of a king in Judah named Amaziah, who did right in some respects, warred against Edomites with success, was exalted thereby and proposed war against Jehoash, king of Israel; was advised by that king to rejoice in his success over Edomites, but not to meddle to his hurt. Also that he would not heed the advice given, went to war, was defeated in battle and afterward killed by some of his subjects who conspired against him. Account then given of his son Azariah being made king in his stead, and of what he did for Judah, also account of Jeroboam, son of Joash, who became king of Israel and did evil, following in the sins of Jeroboam, son of Nebat, who was 1st king over the 10 tribes as a separate kingdom, and who made Israel to sin by setting up 2 golden calves as gods for people to worship. Chapter ends with statement of death of Jeroboam and that his son Zachariah reigned in his stead.

What may we safely say of Amaziah, who became exalted because he defeated Edomites? Like some preachers now. Because they can defeat a sectarian in debate they become exalted and meddlesome.

Does this chapter omit any facts concerning Amaziah? 2 Chron. 25:14-16 answers.

What is meant by the word 'hostages' in v. 14? Men whose life should be guarantee of performance of an agreement.

**2 Kings 15** tells of Azariah, called Uzziah, reigning over Judah, and doing right in some respects but wrong in others; also that he was smitten with leprosy and his son Jotham reigned in his stead while he was a leper and after his death. We read also of reign of 6 successive kings of Israel. Chapter ends with account of the reign and good deeds and death and successor of Jotham king of Judah.



Why was Azariah, also called Uzziah, smitten with leprosy? This is answered in 2 Chron. 26:16-21.

What may we learn from such instance? Danger of sin of presumption.

What may we learn by considering the short reign of many kings? We may learn meaning of Prov. 28:2

**2 Kings 16**—Of what king of Judah do we read in this chapter? Of Ahaz son of Jotham: of his weakness, his wars, his altar, and his commands in regard to worship. Likewise of his perversion of certain sacred things, of his death, his burial, and his successor on the throne of Judah.

What may we learn by considering his altar and offerings he commanded to be offered thereon? He was a representative of some who live in the Gospel age. Ahaz ordered an altar built according to the pattern of one he saw in Damascus of Syria; and some now live who wish to arrange the Gospel after a pattern they find among those who are not true worshipers. Thus it was in the apostasy from New Testament worship; thus it is now; thus it will be.

Did Ahaz have a priest willing to obey his orders? Urijah the priest served him well.

Of whom might Urijah be regarded as a fair representative? Of hireling clergymen of modern times who will, generally, conform to wishes of people who employ them, regardless of authority of Christ.

By what did Ahaz desire to inquire? Last of v. 15 informs he wished to inquire by "the brazen altar".

Was that according to law of the Lord? Num. 27: 21 indicates otherwise. Besides, silence of the law in regard to inquiring by the brazen altar was against such procedure.

But was anyone ever forbidden to inquire by that altar? Not explicitly by special statute.

Was he not then at liberty thus to inquire? Not except by presuming he was at liberty to do what ever was not explicitly forbidden.

Is such presumption adopted in modern times? It is the foundation of the apostate church and all sectarian denominations. The Church of God or Church of Christ, authorized by the New Testament, is the only church which can be supposed to have right to exist except on presumption that whatever is not explicitly or expressly condemned by Heaven's law is allowable in Heaven's sight. But that presumption would have justified Ahaz in changes he made in the Divine worship, as set forth in this chapter.

**2 Kings 17** records reign of Hoshea king of Israel, His subjugation by Shalmanezzer king of Assyria, then of Hoshea's treachery and utter overthrow, and captivity of all Israel over which

Hoshea reigned, and that Israel was taken into the land of Assyria. Brief history of Israel is given, and account of how the land of Samaria was again peopled; then a record of mixed worship of the new inhabitants: thus we have beginning of Samaritanism as a religion.

Had a former king of Assyria taken part of Israel into captivity? Chapter 15:29 answers.

What may we say of mixed worship of Samaritans, who feared the God of heaven yet served their own idols? Very much like that which exists in all religious sectarianism found in what is designated as Christendom. Apostate churches and all those which have sprung from them, or imitate them, have a mixed worship. They fear God and have faith in Christ in some degree, but serve their own ideas, and in many instances think so much of their ideas that they can't be induced to read the Bible so as to learn God's will. Their ideas thus become idols set, up in their minds and hearts (see Ezek. 14).

Did Samaritans continue their mixed worship? From what we read of them in the New Testament it seems they had improved some; but John 4:22 informs they did not know what they were worshiping.

**2 Kings 18** records of a good king named Hezekiah, who reigned over Judah 29 years. It is stated he rebelled against the king of Assyria and served him not, also that when Sennacherib king of Assyria had come against all the fenced cities of Judah and had taken them, then Hezekiah sent that king a present and endeavored to prevent his coming against Jerusalem. But the presents were in vain. The king of Assyria sent a great host against Jerusalem and threatened it. We find also record of a boastful speech one of his captains, Rabshakeh, made and thereby tried to induce Jews to surrender.

What is meant by "high places" in v. 4? Places of worship generally on high ground.

Who was the 1st king that established them in Jerusalem? Solomon (1 Kings 11:7, 8).

How long did such 'high places' as Solomon built for his strange wives continue to be tolerated in Jerusalem? About 350 years.

Did Hezekiah take away 'high places' Solomon built? No. Josiah was the king who destroyed them (chap. 23: 13,14). But Hezekiah took away other 'high places' (v. 4).

What may be said of Solomon? His example was to Judah what the example of Jeroboam son of Nebat was to Israel. Solomon built 'high places' to accommodate his heathen wives, and Jeroboam made 2 'calves of gold' to be Israel's gods. Those calves continued to be snares to the kingdom of Israel 'til the captivity mentioned in the previous chapter; thus for about 250 years, even as Solomon's example of 'high places' was a snare to Judah for about 350 years.

What then may be safely said of Solomon and Jeroboam? They were leaders in wickedness which wrought ruin among their people.

Which of the two was more inexcusable? Solomon. If we consider his father's devotion

and writings, then consider the extra wisdom God gave him, it is evident Solomon was most inexcusable in wrong doing of any man mentioned in the Old Testament.

What explanation can be justly made in his behalf? His life was one of unbroken peace and prosperity 'til after he sinned, and such a life could not be endured even by a man of extra wisdom.

What should this teach us? We should not wish for unbroken peace and prosperity. It might occasion our ruin if we be freed from trials.

**2 Kings 19** records what Hezekiah did when, he heard of the speech of Rabshakeh; and what he did when he had, from the same source, received certain letters; also of what the Lord said to Hezekiah through the prophet Isaiah. Chapter ends with statement that an angel of the Lord killed of the army of the Assyrians 185,000 in one night; also that the king of Assyria went and dwelt in Nineveh and there he was killed by 2 of his sons, and that another son succeeded him on the throne of Assyria.

**2 Kings 20** records of king Hezekiah becoming sick and being told by the prophet Isaiah that he should die. Then we read of Hezekiah's prayer, and that the Lord heard him and promised to lengthen his life 15 years: of which promise He gave him a sign. Next we read of messengers from the sort of the king of Babylon calling on him and giving him letters and a present from their master; also that Hezekiah showed them all the treasures of his house, on account of which misconduct the Lord sent him a message by Isaiah. Chapter ends with statement of death of Hezekiah, and that his son Manasseh reigned in his stead.

How may we explain the sign mentioned in this chapter as having been given to Hezekiah? Just as we would explain that a man who made a clock or watch knows how to regulate it, and even turn the hands backward, or turn the entire machinery backward. The Maker of the universe certainly knows how to manage its machinery just as easily as the maker of any material machine knows how to manage it. When God's infinity is acknowledged then all miracles are of easy acceptance.

**2 Kings 21** brings before us that Hezekiah's son Manasseh reigned 55 years, thus longer than any other Jewish king. We learn also his reign was more wicked than that, of any other king; and that when he died his wicked son Amon succeeded him on the throne of Judah; also that when Amon died he was succeeded by his son Josiah.

What religionists imitate Manasseh's wickedness as recorded in v. 5? Those who build platforms in the meeting house for musical instruments to be used in worshiping the God of Popularity; and who imitate wickedness mentioned in v. 7. Those who put musical instruments in midst of the congregation which is required to worship God in spirit and in truth.

And what shall we say of wickedness mentioned in v. 16? It was perhaps not greater than that of those who show, by their misconduct in thrusting innovations into assemblies of saints, that they hate their brethren who do not agree with them, and thus become murderers at heart (1 John 3:15).

What is meant by v. 13? That God would treat Jerusalem as he had treated Samaria; and reference is made to the common custom of a man turning a dish upside down, when he wipes the bottom of it.

**2 Kings 22** mentions age of Josiah when he began, and that he reigned 31 years. Then that he did right, and that when he had reigned 10 years he ordered the house of the Lord repaired. Next we read of the Book of the Law being found in the house of the Lord, and that the king was distressed when he heard it read; also that he sent to Huldah the prophetess who dwelt 'in the college'. Then what the Lord said to Josiah by the mouth of Huldah.

What is implied by the fact that Josiah tore his clothing, thus showed distress of mind when he heard the Book of the Law read? Implied that he had grown up without knowing what the Law contained.

What may we conclude by considering the omission from previous chapters of the book of Kings of all reference to reading the law of the Lord? That the kings generally knew little or nothing of God's written word, therefore all God had said in Deut. 6:6-9 and 17:14-20 and 27:1-8 and 31:9-13 had been ignored by Israelites. As a result the kings of Israel and Judah as well as the common people grew up in ignorance of the Law. This was the secret of national and personal miseries of the Jews, even as ignorance of the Bible is now the secret of spiritual miseries and many physical miseries of mankind. It is the secret of all infidelity concerning the Bible.

What shall we say of 'the college' in Jerusalem? The record mentions it without comment, and we may do the same.

Where was the Book of the Law, the written word of God, found? V. 8 informs it was 'in the house of the Lord'.

Where is the written word of the Lord, and thus the truth of God, in documentary form, now found? In 'the house of God, which is the church of the living God' (1 Tim. 3:15).

What relation did 'the college' in Jerusalem have to the written Word? Not any that is recorded.

Do colleges now have relation to God's word? Not much except a negative relation. Comparative view of college professors would probably reveal more ignorance of the Bible than can be found in the same number of any other class of educated men.

But what may we say of those professors of colleges who profess to be Christians, and who teach the Bible, in some respects, to their pupils? In teaching any part of the Bible as college professors they imply the college, the college, the college, is the pillar and ground of

the truth, rather than the Church. Such implication is contrary to the Holy Spirit's words on this subject (1 Tim. 3:15). Moreover it has been the cause and occasion of more irreverence with reference to the Bible, thus of more doctrinal errors, in what is designated as 'Christendom', than all other causes and occasions combined, from the time of the Alexandrian school of so-called philosophy in Egypt 'til the present day.

**2 Kings 23** tells of Josiah's thorough reformations, also that the Lord approved what he did. Then, of the Lord's refusal to pardon wickedness committed by Manasseh. Next, account of Josiah going against the king of Egypt; that he was slain by him, after which his body was brought to Jerusalem and buried. Reign of Jehoahaz son of Josiah is next mentioned, also that he was captured and put in bonds by Pharaoh-nechoh king of Egypt, who had slain Josiah his father. Chapter then records the king of Egypt made Eliakim, son of Josiah, king in place of Jehoahaz, then changed the name of Eliakim to Jehoiakim. Chapter ends with statement that Jehoiakim did evil.

What may we learn by considering v. 13? That Solomon was corrupter of all Israel by establishing places for idolatrous worship to gratify his idolatrous wives.

Does anything now exist in that part of the religious world designated as 'Christendom' which is like Solomon's 'mount of corruption'? Yes, everything, high or low, which has been done, or is now being done, as a religious compromise, and to gain favor with the world, may be justly spoken of as a 'mount of corruption'. All conduct on the part of religious persons, having popularity with the world in view, may be safely regarded as offering incense to mammon; and every place where such incense is offered is a place of 'corruption'.

**2 Kings 24** informs that Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came against Jehoiakim, and the results. Death of Jehoiakim and reign of his son, Jehoichin, are next mentioned; also that he did evil and that against him came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, and that, he went out to Nebuchadnezzar with his family. What results were to Jerusalem is next stated, and that the king of Babylon made Mattaniah, brother of Jehoiakim and uncle of Jehoiachin king, and changed his name to Zedekiah. Last part of the chapter informs he did evil and rebelled against the king of Babylon.

What may we learn by considering v. 4? What everyone capable of thinking should consider:—the sacredness, sacredness, sacredness of 'innocent blood'. The verse implies the Lord might have pardoned all else Manasseh did, but he would not pardon 'the innocent blood' with which he 'filled Jerusalem'. This and all else in the Sacred Text on this subject should be impressed on every mind and heart.

**2 King 25** sets forth capture of king Zedekiah, death of his sons, putting out his eyes, destruction of the temple and of every great man's house, and carrying away riches of the city, including sacred vessels of the temple. We read also of a governor appointed over the poor of the land, and that he was slain, after which the poor people who were intended to

have privilege of remaining in the land went into Egypt. Chapter ends with statement of favorable treatment Jehoiachin received of the king of Babylon who succeeded Nebuchadnezzar.

What general lesson should be impressed on minds of Bible readers as they consider records in the books of Kings? We should all be impressed that 'the way of transgressors is hard' (Prov. 13:15), and that they hand join in hand, yet shall not the wicked go unpunished' (Prov. 11:21). We should also be impressed that, in dealing with the Jewish people God did indeed visit iniquity of the fathers on the children in national calamities He brought on them though, as Ezek. 18 indicates, He intended every man should be personally responsible for his own sin. But as the Jews desired a king to rule over them they were held responsible for his official sins.

Does God now visit iniquities of fathers on their children? He does regarding physical, financial, political and national relations, but He does so now on the principle of cause-and-effect rather than by special judgments. Natural outworking of evil sometimes extends to the 3rd or 4th generation, and in some instances may continue indefinitely. In this fact is found God's last and severest warning against wrong doing, at least in regard to results which may be manifest in this world.

**In 1 Chronicles 1** we read names of prominent men who lived during the 1st 2300 years of man's existence on earth.

What does the word "Chronicles" mean? "Words of days", and is justly applied to a book in which is a record of names and events.

What is value of this book? Very important because of information it gives the Bible reader concerning successive generations of mankind from the beginning, and with what individuals, certain nations originated, besides what it set a forth concerning the Jewish nation.

What do we find in this chapter? Mentions successive generations of mankind from Adam to Noah, then from Noah to Abraham, also from Abraham to Isaac and Jacob. Mentions likewise Ishmael as Abraham's son and his descendants, then Abraham's children by Keturah, and ends with account of Edomites who sprang from Ishmael.

**I Chron. 2** mentions Jacob, called Israel, and his sons; then account of his son Judah and his descendants. Chapter ends with mention of Kenites of whom came the Rechabites, mentioned with honor in Jer. 35.

**In 1 Chron. 3** we read of David and his wives and sons; also of his descendants who were kings beginning with Solomon and ending with Zedekiah. Then mention of Jeconiah a descendant of David, and of descendants of Jeconiah for many generations.

**In 1 Chron. 4** we read of Judah and his descendants through many generations. In course of this account we learn the tribe of Judah increased very rapidly (see v. 27).

**In 1 Chron. 5** we learn what is said of Jacob's 1st-born son Reuben, and why he received not the birthright which belonged to him because he was the first-born. We learn also the birthright was given to Joseph, and that Judah prevailed above his brethren. Mention then of Reuben's descendants, then of descendants of Gad another son of Jacob. Half the tribe of Manasseh is next mentioned, then that the Reubenites, Gadites and half the tribe of Manasseh so offended the Lord they were carried into captivity in days of certain kings of Assyria.

**1 Chron. 6** mentions Levi and his descendants, also their work in the priesthood. Then mention of cities given them for dwelling places. In course of the account mention is made of priests David set over the song service, and of the one who officiated in the temple Solomon built.

**In 1 Chron. 7** we find account of the, tribe of Issachar, of Benjamin, likewise of Naphtali, then of Ephraim and Asher. Mention also of number of men found in the days of David in several tribes able to bear arms.

**In 1 Chron 8** we find another record of the tribe of Benjamin in which is found mention of Saul son of Kish and his descendants for many generations, traced through Jonathan's son Mephibosheth, but who is called Meribbael in this chapter (see v. 34).

**I Chron. 9** mentions that all tribes of Israel were reckoned by genealogies or according to ancestry. Reference then to books of the kings of Israel and Judah, and mention of captivity to Babylonians. Then mention of Jews who first returned from captivity, and when that which is here recorded is compared with Ezra 2 the indication is that Ezra compiled the books of Chronicles. Also mention is made of return of 'Israelites' and 'children of Ephraim and Manasseh' in addition to 'children of Judah and children of Benjamin'; which confutes the idea that there were 10 tribes lost in the captivity that never returned to Palestine.

**In 1 Chron. 10** we find account of king Saul's last battle, his death and burial, as recorded in last chapter of 1 Samuel. This chapter is very nearly an exact copy of the closing chapter of 1 Samuel, with a few remarks added concerning reasons why the Lord caused Saul to be slain.

**1 Chron. 11** gives account of Israel gathering to David to make him king over all the tribes; also account of David going to Jerusalem and overcoming Jebusites; likewise account of David's increased greatness and of his great men.

**In 1 Chron. 12** we read of David and of the warlike men who came to him before Saul's death; then of the number of men of war who came, to him at Hebron to make him king. Mention also of the Levites who came to him at Hebron. Chapter ends with account that they were all with David 3 days eating, drinking and rejoicing.

**1 Chron. 13** says David consulted leaders of his army about moving the ark, and that it was moved from Kirjathjearim but not to Jerusalem at that time because a man named Uzza was killed by the Lord when he touched the ark, as an account thereof is given in 2 Sam. 6.

Did David consult the Lord in regard to moving the ark? The record does not so inform us and we have no right to presume he did, but the record declares he 'consulted with captains of thousands and hundreds, and with every leader'.

Did he not have men enough in counsel to enable him to arrive at the right conclusion? Yes, but as he left the Lord out of his counsel he reached the wrong conclusion, at least in regard to his method of procedure.

How many ideas common in modern religions did David adopt in moving the ark? By implication he adopted the ideas found in modern experimentism, expedientism, substitutionism and no-harmism. It was an experiment for Israelites to put the ark in a cart; it was regarded as expedient or proper in circumstances at, that time; it was a substitute for the Lord's method of moving the ark; and it was regarded as having no harm in it.

But what did results prove in regard to that idea of David? That it was wrong in every particular.

How did he get that idea? By consulting with his captains and other leaders, or from his own head and heart when he omitted consulting the Lord.

What may we learn by considering this record? That every religious procedure the Lord does not authorize, but which originated in the human mind and heart, is liable to be as intensely wrong as was David's idea in regard to moving the ark in a new cart.

Is that all we find here? No. We have an instance of much religious rejoicing on the part of David and others while doing wrong.

What does this teach? That mankind are so constituted they can rejoice intensely while engaged in wrong doing; thus that the doctrine that conscience is a safe guide in religion is false.



**In 1 Chron. 14** we read of the king of Tyre, Hiram, sending messengers to David with timbers and work men to build him a house; also that when David perceived he was established in his kingdom he enlarged his family relations. Next we read of 2 great battles with the Philistines who, came against him, and of results.

What did David do with gods of the Philistines which came into his possession? Burned them.

Did all kings who succeeded him do the same? No. 2 Chron. 25:14 informs of king Amaziah who worshiped gods he captured in battle.

What in history of 'the disciple brotherhood' was similar to conduct of Amaziah? Conduct of a certain church in St. Louis, Mo., which won all organ in a lawsuit, then used it in a manner which suggests idolatry.

**In 1 Chron. 15** we find David built houses for himself and a tent for the, ark in the city of David, otherwise called Zion. Then is account of David's statement that no one should carry the ark but Levites; of his assembling the Israelites, and specially the Levites; also that he spoke to the chief Levite and confessed the mistake in the former attempt to move the ark. Mention next that the Levites sanctified themselves and carried the, ark on their shoulders as Moses commanded. Then account that David appointed a choir of singers with musical instruments. Chapter ends with account of David dancing and playing, and that his wife Michal, daughter of Saul, saw him dancing and despised him.

Does this chapter inform that David consulted the Lord in regard to appointing singers with instruments of music.? It does not, and we have no right to presume he did. As far as the Divine record informs, David arranged that service according to his own ideas. No provision for it in the law and it was an innovation on the Divine order.

But was such innovation in harmony with the Jewish order of things? It was. That order largely consisted of outward show of imposing ceremonies.

What may we safely say of those who add choirs and musical instruments to simplicity of worship set forth in the New Testament, and refer to David's example as justification? We may say what Christ said to Sadducees in Mat. 22:29. They show, by such reference to David's example, that they don't know the difference between the shadow found in the Old Testament and the substance found in, the New. If the al" tar and sacrifice and candlesticks foreshadowed something spiritual, so did the musical instruments, even if Divinely ordained, or had been used in the holy place of the tabernacle and the temple.

What should Bible readers learn by the confession in v. 13? That in Old Testament times God had strict regard for his order, and in light of Rom. 15:4 we should regard it at our eternal peril that we depart from His order set forth in the New Testament.

**In 1 Chron. 16** we find the ark was set in midst of the tent David pitched for it, also that sacrifices and peace offerings were made. Then mention that when offerings ended David gave every man and woman something to eat and drink. Next is account of the order of Levites for religious exercises David arranged, then a psalm he gave for the service. Chapter ends with statement that the people went to their homes and David went to bless his house.

Of what do we read concerning the Lord's tabernacle? In vs. 39, 40 we learn the tabernacle of the Lord was then in the high place at Gibeon, thus that the ark was separated from its place in the tabernacle; therefore that 2 places of worship were established.

What tabernacle is referred to? Chap. 21:29 answers.

What does all this indicate? Disregard for the Divine order. Before Eli's death the ark was separated from the tabernacle at Shiloh and fell into the Philistines' hands and was trouble to them (see 1 Sam. 4, 5). Then it was sent away and taken in hand by Israelites at Bethshemesh, and placed in a city called Kirjath-jearim (see I Sam. 6, 7). Then chap. 13 of this book informs that David sent to Kirjath-jearim to bring the ark to Jerusalem, and chap. 15 informs that he brought it there and placed it in a tent prepared for it. At some date, meantime, the tabernacle was set up at Gib-con and the ark not placed therein.

**1 Chron. 17** gives account of David's wish to build a house for the Lord, also of what the Lord said to him through the prophet Nathan, then what David said to the Lord, as recorded in 2 Sam. 7.

**1 Chron. 18** is repetition of 2 Sam. 8 concerning David's exploits against nations around him: also of gold, silver and brass he dedicated to the Lord.

**In 1 Chron. 19** we read of David's mistake in sending condolence to the king of Ammonites in regard to his father's death of which David heard, and that the mistake resulted in 2 great battles with Ammonites, in one of which Syrians helped the Ammonites, and in both of which the Israelites were victorious: all recorded in 2 Sam. 10.

**In 1 Chron. 20** we find record of David sending his chief captain Joab with an army into Ammonites' country, and of his success; also of certain wars with Philistines and Israelites' success.

In what other places do we find facts here mentioned? In 2 Sam. 11:1 also in 21:15-22.

What significant facts of David's history are, omitted from this record? All pertaining to his sin in case of Uriah the Hittite, and David's family troubles in regard to his sons Amnon and Absalom.

**1 Chron. 21** sets before us account of David's sin in regard to numbering Israel and its results recorded in 2 Sam. 24.

What are chief differences between records in these 2 places? Difference in price recorded as paid by David for the threshing floor, difference in the name of the man from whom he bought, and mention in this chapter of the tabernacle, omitted from. 2 Sam. 24.

Was it sin for Israel to be numbered? Exo. 30:12-16 does not so indicate, as instruction is there given on the subject.

Why then was it such a great sin for David to have Israel numbered? Indications are that he ordered it done in order to gratify his pride as ruler over a great many people, and having a great army. This is indicated by Joab's words in 2 Sam. 24:3 and v. 3 of the chapter now considered. Besides, he did not give the ransom money required by the law.

What should we learn by this record? Should be warned against basing argument on great or on small numbers.

How may we harmonize difference in prices mentioned in this chapter and 1 Sam. 24? By considering, the expression 'the place' in this chapter means more territory than is meant by 'the threshing floor' in 2 Sam. 24:24.

And what shall we say of difference in names of the man from whom David bought the place to build an altar? Explained in the fact that it was true then as now, that, men sometimes had more than one name. In 2 Sam. 6:6 and 1 Chron. 13:9 we find illustration of this which should be sufficient.

Was any building erected on the place David bought of Ornan? 2 Chron. 3:1 informs.

**1 Chron. 22** informs in regard to David's preparation of material for the house of the Lord, of his purpose to build a house; that the Lord told him he should not build it, but that a certain son of his should. Also, the speech David made to Solomon in regard to the house of the Lord and to the princes of Israel in regard to helping Solomon.

Did the Lord give a reason why David should not build Him a house? V. 8 informs.

What does the Lord's reason imply? That shedding blood and building a house for the Lord were not in harmony even in the Jewish age.

Did Christ authorize his disciples to shed blood or inflict personal damage on any one, to advance, His gospel, or even in their own defense when persecuted for religion's sake? No; but he rebuked those disciples who thought of calling fire from heaven on those who did not receive Him (see Luke 9:51-56).

What may we safely say to those infidels who charge persecutions inflicted by the apostate church on those it designated as 'heretics', to the religion taught by the Savior? We may say what Christ said to Sadducees in Mat. 22:29.

Unto whose name was the 'house' mentioned in this chapter to be built? 'Unto the name of the Lord'.

But after whose name was it generally called? The name: 'Solomon'.

Why? There was so much of Solomon's magnificence in it that it was and still is designated by his name.

What do we find in 'Christendom' that involves the same principle? All man-made religious creeds, confessions of faith and books of discipline, likewise all churches that originated with men. All may be charitably regarded as having originated in desire to honor the name of God. But so much of their human founders' ideas were incorporated in every one of such books and churches that they have been generally called after their names. Nor is this all. Advocacy of each wrong religious doctrine has required so much of its advocates own reasoning that those who accepted it have been unscripturally attached to such advocate. Thus all converts to a wrong religious position have been converts to the man who, converted them rather than to Christ whom they professed to receive. On this principle is explained much unreasonableness of religious sectarians and all extremists who profess to be disciples of Christ.

**1 Chron. 23** sets forth account of what David did and said in making Solomon king and arranging the priesthood, officers, judges and singers according to his ideas.

What may we learn by considering v. 5? That David desired to be recognized as originator of musical instruments which were adopted. Indicated by the expression "which I made". That expression indicates David thought he had done something extra in making musical instruments with which to worship God, and he wished his extra something to be known. Thus it has been, thus it is, thus it will be, with all who are possessed of sufficient conceit to make additions to God's arrangements. Amos 6 should be read in this connection.

What other changes did David make in God's arrangement? In Num. 4:47 God ordained that from 30 to 50 years old the Levites should go in to do service of the ministry in the tabernacle, and in Num. 8:24 he ordained that from 25 years old they should wait on the service or be helpers. What had been thus ordained continued 'til David's day and through his active life. But v. 27 declares 'by the last words of David the Levites were numbered from 29 years old and above'. David's religious deviations from God's law may therefore be summed up in these statements:-He ordained choir singing, made musical instruments to be used in connection with choir singing, and ordained that younger men should be added to service of the priests than God authorized. All these deviations were adopted by Solomon who added 'musical instruments ... of all sorts' (Eccl. 2:8), married 'outlandish women' (Neh. 13:26), sanctioned idolatry (1 Kings 11:6-8), on account of which God was angry with him and decided to divide the kingdom and give part of it to his servant (1 Kings 11:9-11); and as a result the Israelites became a divided, sinful people even into the hands of their enemies because of their sins.

How might all this evil have been avoided? By David spending his time teaching Solomon the 'aw of the Lord instead of spending it inventing musical instruments and organizing choirs.

**1 Chron. 24** gives account of divisions of the sons of Aaron the Levite, made with reference to serving in the priests' office; also that the divisions were made by casting lots.

**In 1 Chron. 25** we read 'David and the captains of the host' arranged a choir service and use of musical instruments, and that the arrangement was made by casting lots. Then mention is made of those on whom the lots fell.

**1 Chron. 26** informs concerning divisions of 'porters' or gate-keepers, and for men to preside over the 'treasures', also for men to attend to 'the outward business over Israel'; then mention of men called 'Hebronites' whom David appointed over the tribes of Reuben, Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh, who dwelt on the wilderness side of the river Jordan.

**1 Chron. 27** sets forth that David had 24,000 men called 'chief fathers, and captains of thousands, and hundreds and their officers', that served him by courses; then mention of those who served him each month. In vs. 23, 24 is mention of David's sin in causing Israel to be numbered, also the results.

Is there indication in any of these accounts that David provided for reading of the law to all the people, as God ordained in Deut. 31:10-13 should be done, every 7th year when the land should rest? There is not.

Early in the days of the kings the 7th year as a year of rest and release was disregarded, so, when the Jews were taken captive by the Babylonians the land had been robbed of 70 sabbaths. This means the sabbath for the land had been disregarded nearly 500 years (see 2 Chron. 36:21). This implies disregard of the sabbath for the land began about middle of Solomon's reign David laid the foundation for that disregard of the sabbath for the land by disregarding Divine directions for its observance.

What then may we safely say of David? He was a good organizer and arranged all externals of his kingdom in perfection, as far as we can judge. But he omitted the one thing needful: arrangement for constant reading of the law of the Lord to the people and causing them to understand it. As a result idolatry was introduced, the kingdom was divided, and history of the Israelites became the most shameful in existence, if their opportunities for exaltation be considered.

What institutions in modern times make similar omission to that which David made? Sectarian colleges. They have departments for many branches of learning but omit the one

thing needful: the consecutive reading and study of the whole Bible. As a result infidelity possesses them.

**In 1 Chron. 28** we read of David assembling those officers who ministered by course to him and the speech he made to them in regard to his purpose to build the Lord a house, and why he was not permitted to build it. Then we read of what he said about God liking him and making choice of him to rule; then that his son Solomon was to succeed him and build the Lord a house. Next we read of his charge to them all to obey the Lord's commands, also of the charge he gave Solomon. Then we are told David declared the Spirit of God made him understand the pattern he gave Solomon in regard to the house of the Lord and what pertained thereto.

Are we not here informed that David enjoined on his officers and Gn Solomon that they should obey the Lord? Yes. But that was like many exhortations in modern times urging persons to study the Bible without making arrangements for so doing. Actuality of studying the Bible and doing all else required in serving the Lord must be stated, then exemplified by practice, before many persons will think they understand it well enough to put it into practice. An exhortation is not all that is needed, but actual demonstration is required.

**In 1 Chron. 29** we find David's last speech in regard to the temple, in which is set forth that he prepared for it with all his might, and gave of his own estate liberally; also that he stirred the, chief of the fathers, the captains, and other officers and rulers, to follow his example. Then mention that all who gave willingly rejoiced. A prayer of David is recorded, also that the people blest the Lord; then mention of burnt offerings to the Lord. Then that Solomon was made king in his father's stead, also that the people obeyed, and the Lord magnified him. Chapter ends with mention of David's death, and of his greatness while he lived.

Is it strange that officers under David rejoiced when they gave willingly and liberally for building the house of God? No. Thus it was, thus it is, and thus it will be 'til end of time. Those of mankind in submission to the Divine will rejoice in proportion as they give liberally and willingly to the Lord's cause. Satisfaction Christians have in hoarding their surplus is as nothing in comparison with the joy of giving it to the cause for which Christ died.

**2 Chronicles chapter 1** sets forth that Solomon was strengthened in his kingdom and magnified, also that he and his officials with others went up to Gibeon, where the tabernacle was, and offered many burnt offerings. Then the Lord appeared to Solomon in the night and told him to ask what he desired. The record informs of Solomon's answer and what the Lord said to him. Chapter concludes with statement of what Solomon did in gathering horses, horsemen and chariots, also in making gold and silver plentiful.

What may we learn from the fact that the Lord gave Solomon wisdom above all others, yet Solomon did that which the Lord ordained in Deut. 17:16, 17 that he as king should not do? We may and should learn the highest wisdom the Lord ever gave man is not equal to the

written word of God. Besides, we should learn the highest wisdom God ever gave a mere human being was not sufficient to regulate him when he was attended with constant peace and prosperity as Solomon was. From this we should further learn the trials the Lord suffers to attend his people should be regarded as blessings. 2 Cor. 12:7-10 sets forth a wholesome lesson on this.

**2 Chron. 2** says when Solomon determined to build a house to the Lord he selected 70,000 men to bear burdens, 80,000 to hew in the mountains, and 3,600 to oversee them. Then, we read that Solomon sent to Hiram, elsewhere called Hiram, king of Tyre, and requested a skilled workman in metals, also timber for building a house to the Lord, stating what he would furnish by way of provisions for Hiram's servants who would prepare the timber. The record then informs that Hiram gave Solomon favorable answer. Chapter ends with statement that Solomon selected his workmen from strangers in the land.

**2 Chron. 3** tells that Solomon began to build the house of the Lord in Mount Moriah where David bought the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite, also that he began to build in the 4th year of his reign. Dimensions of the house are stated, also dimensions of the cherubim. Chapter ends with statements concerning 2 pillars and names he gave them.

**2 Chron. 4** tells of the brazen altar, of the sea of brass for priests to wash in, then of 10 layers to wash burnt offerings in. Then we read of 10 golden candlesticks, 10 tables and much else that pertained to service of the temple.

**2 Chron. 5** mentions finishing of all work for the house of the Lord, then that things David had dedicated were placed among treasures of the Lord's house. Next that Solomon assembled elders of Israel and others to bring the ark from Zion, city of David, to place it in the house he himself built. When this was done a 'cloud', called 'the glory of the Lord', 'filled the house of God'.

**2 Chron. 6** tells of Solomon's address to the Lord in which he mentioned God dwelling in thick darkness, but that he had built a house for the Lord as a dwelling place. Then Solomon blest the congregation, bless the Lord, mentioning the purpose of David to build a house for the Lord and that the Lord said his son should build it, and that what the Lord said had been accomplished. Then Solomon's prayer while kneeling on the brazen scaffold he made.

**2 Chron. 7** mentions that fire came down from heaven and consumed sacrifices offered, and the glory of the Lord filled the house; effect of the glory and fire on priests and people generally. Next we are informed concerning numbers of oxen and sheep offered, also of the

musical service, and what Solomon' did to make more room for sacrifices offered to the Lord. Length of the feast is then mentioned, also its ending and joy of the people when they went to their homes. Finally we read Solomon did Whatever came into his heart in regard to the house of the Lord, then what the Lord said to him in assurances and threatenings.

What may we learn by v. 11? That Solomon fully adopted the idea of beautifying, adorning, enlarging and improving on the Divine order established by the Lord through Moses.

But was not all he did in harmony with a worship which largely consisted of outward show? It was.

Why did the Lord give such order of worship? Gal. 4 informs that Jews under the Law were Divinely regarded as children, and the Lord knew children needed to be taught by outward show of object lessons. Besides, Heb. 10 informs that the Law consisted of 'a shadow of good things to come'.

In view of this, what shall we say of those who refer to magnificence of the outward show of the Jewish law, of the tabernacle and temple, and the service in each, as justification for resort to outward show in the Church of God under the Gospel age? By such reference they illustrate Mat. 22:29, and confess themselves a set of children.

But what shall we say of the fact that Solomon became a backslider after all the wisdom, direct assurances, promises and warnings given him? He was the most inexcusable backslider that ever lived. Moreover, as his backsliding is directly charged to 'outlandish women' he married, there is, in his ease, a fore-warring which should never be forgotten,.

But what was the capital defect in arrangements by David and Solomon in regard to government of the Jews and worship they were to render to God? No provision was made for obedience to Deut. 31:10-13. As a result, ignorance, oppression, wickedness and idolatry soon took possession of the Jewish nation. As further result the Lord decided, in course of Solomon's reign, to divide the kingdom, and executed that decision in early part of the reign of his son Rehoboam.

Has anything resembling events must mentioned occurred in modern times? Yes. History of 'the disciple brotherhood' in the 19th Century closely resembles history of the Jewish people in days of David, Solomon and Rehoboam. That brotherhood was established and enlarged by religious warfare. Then men arose who desired to beautify and adorn the brotherhood by outward show, doing whatever came into their heart for the Lord's house, even as Solomon did. In course of the period during which those men flourished the brotherhood became divided in sentiment, and soon afterward became formally divided, and thus remains. The larger part has revolted and is going toward captivity as rapidly as possible, while the other part tries to maintain Gospel liberty.

**2 Chron. 8** gives account of building Solomon caused to be done after he built the house of the Lord and his own house, Then statement of Solomon's arrangement in regard to strangers being placed under tribute while men of Israel served as soldiers and rulers. Mention of



Solomon's Egyptian wife, offerings he made and that worship was conducted as David arranged. Chapter ends with statements concerning what Solomon did in regard to securing gold of Ophir.

What may we learn by v. 11? Presents the ridiculous idea that Solomon, as a servant of God, had a wife not fit to live in a city which had been hallowed by presence of the ark of God?

**2 Chron. 9** gives record of the queen of Sheba visiting Solomon to learn concerning his wisdom, and a statement of the impression his wisdom, wealth and splendor made on her mind; also record of riches brought to Solomon from many countries so that he surpassed all other kings of the earth in riches and wisdom. A statement then of vastness Of his domain, of his death, and of his successor Rehoboam.

What may we safely say of Solomon's extensive gathering of gold? He was a 'goldite', and 1 Kings 12:4 with chap. 10:4 sets forth that he was an op-presser of the people, who made their yoke grievous to be borne.

What of Solomon's history is omitted from this chapter? Nearly all that is in 1 Kings 11, where is record of his alliances with strange women, and his endorsement of idolatry, with its evil results.

**2 Chron. 10** gives account of division of the kingdom in early part of reign of Solomon's son Rehoboam, and statement of some evil results as set forth in 1 Kin. 12.

What may we safely say of Rehoboam's disposition to seek counsel of young men who had grown up with him, instead of adopting counsel of older men? Illustrates disposition of multitudes of young persons in the Gospel age. They seek advice that will be in harmony with their earthward desires, and not for that which will do them most good. They wish to be encouraged to do as they please rather than do that which is certainly right and will benefit them in its results.

**2 Chron. 11** records purpose of Rehoboam to fight against Israel, and that he was prevented, by the word of the Lord through a prophet, from executing that purpose. Then we learn he built many cities of defense in Judah, also that he had the tribes of Judah and Benjamin on his side. Next we read of priests and Levites in all Israel resorting to him because Jeroboam, king over the 10 tribes which revolted, had thrust them out from the priesthood, having ordained priests of his own choosing to conduct such worship as he arranged. Then what Rehoboam did by way of enlarging his family, and he is complimented as having acted wisely as a ruler.

**2 Chron. 12** gives account of Rehoboam forsaking the law of the Lord, and of the king of Egypt coming against him. Then we find Rehoboam and princes of Israel humbling themselves and calling on the Lord. Next, of the Lord suffering the king of Egypt to rob the temple and the king's treasures. Chapter ends with statement of Rehoboam's death and that his son Abijah reigned in his stead.

**2 Chron. 13** records reign of Abijah, son of Rehoboam, wherein is account of a war he waged with Jeroboam king of Israel, also of a speech he made in regard to differences between him and Jeroboam. Then account of the most extensive slaughter recorded of any battle mentioned in any history. Mention then of death of Jeroboam by special judgment of the Lord; also of the might of Abijah and enlargement of his family.

What is omitted from this record of Abijah, also called Abijah? The fact that he sinned against God even as Rehoboam and Solomon had done, recorded in 1 Kings 15:3.

What may we say of the statement in the last of v. 9? Suggests terms of annual and life memberships in man-made missionary societies.

**2 Chron. 14** brings history of king Asa, son of Abijah, in which we find account of good deeds and of a war with Ethiopians in which, by help of the Lord, he made grand success.

**2 Chron. 15** sets forth account of what the Lord said by a prophet to king Asa, and to, all Judah and Benjamin when they returned from battle against the Ethiopians; also what Asa and people of Judah, Benjamin and others who came to him from Israel said and did in worshipping the Lord and entering into covenant with him. Then further statement of earnestness of Asa in behalf of the true worship.

**2 Chron. 16** gives saddening account of latter part of life of king Asa. When Baasha, king of Israel, came against him he depended on the king of Syria instead of the Lord; and when a prophet was sent to tell him of his mistake, and what would result, he became angry with that prophet and shut him in prison. Mention is made also of the fact that he oppressed some people at that time, also that later he was diseased in his feet and sought help of physicians rather than of the Lord. Chapter ends with account of his death and what was done at his burial.

**2 Chron. 17** gives account of Jehoshaphat son of Asa, and of his good deeds, among which are recorded his arrangements for teaching the Book of the Law thru all cities of Judah. Account also of his greatness, and that fear of the Lord fell on nations round about Judah so that they made no war against Jehoshaphat. Latter part of the chapter records strength of his

army.

What may we say of the fact that Jehoshaphat arranged for teaching the Law to people in cities of Judah? First account of anything of that kind in the en-

tire record of kings of Israel and Judah, and as a result fear of the Lord fell on other nations so that for a long time Jehoshaphat had peace. Thus it was, thus it is, thus it will be. There is much dignity, grandeur and impressiveness in God's people meeting and reading the Bible and studying it together. A meeting for that purpose, properly conducted, will always do much toward causing people in any community to fear God.

**2 Chron. 18** sets before us account of Jehoshaphat forming alliance with Ahab, king of Israel, to wage war against Syrians; also account of consultation of false prophets and of one true prophet, and of results, as recorded in 1 Kings 22.

**2 Chron. 19** records what the Lord said to Jehoshaphat when he returned from helping Ahab, then account of Jehoshaphat's endeavor to have justice executed in all the land.

What may we learn by considering mistake of Jehoshaphat in helping a wicked king? We may and should learn the Lord was not pleased for his people to form alliance with the ungodly. Then we should read Rom. 15:4.

**2 Chron. 20** gives account of 3 nations gathering themselves against Jehoshaphat and people over whom he reigned, with effect their purpose to make war against him had on him and his people. Then, what he did in calling on the Lord, of the Lord's answer, also of results of following the Lord's instructions. Chapter ends with statements concerning Jehoshaphat's mistake in forming alliance with Ahaziah, king of Israel, who was wicked. Results of that mistake are also recorded.

What may be safely said of king Jehoshaphat? One of the best kings of Judah but weak on the side of friendship for 2 wicked kings of Israel. Reproof he received for affinity with Ahab (chap. 19:1, 2) seems not to have been sufficient for him, but he sinned a. gain in that direction.

What should we learn by record of Jehoshaphat's mistakes? To keep clear of entangling alliances with the ungodly.

**2 Chron. 21** records death of Jehoshaphat and reign of his son Jehoram, also death and burial of Jehoram.

What may be said of Jehoram's record? One of the worst given of a king of Judah and

attended with many evil results to the Jewish nation.

What reason for his evil conduct? V. 6 indicates it was chargeable to his wife.

What was true of Jehoram's wife's family? Members thereof all bad.

What does this suggest to us? There are certain families of people badly arranged by nature, thus so constituted they are very strongly inclined to do evil. Very few of that class are ever brought under influence of the Gospel, and fewer still remain under its influence 'til death. Christians should avoid marrying such, and avoid other close relations with them except to try to do them good.

**2 Chron. 22** records reign of Ahaziah, youngest son of Jehoram, then account of his death and that his mother Athalia usurped the throne and reigned 6 years.

What shall we say of the statement that Ahaziah was 42 years old when he began to reign? It is a mistake, as we may learn by reading 2 Kings 8:17 in connection with chap. 21:5 of this book. Both scriptures declare his father was 32 years old when he began to reign, and that he reigned 8 years. Therefore Ahaziah's father was only 40 years old when he died, while v. 2 of this chapter declares Ahaziah was 42 years old when he succeeded his father, which would make him older than his father! Therefore we should consider the statement of this v. 2 in regard to Ahaziah's age as a clerical error, corrected in 2 Kings 8:26.

**2 Chron. 23** records of Jehoiada the priest, beginning of reign of Joash, also of close of Athalia's reign and that people rejoiced when she had been slain.

What may we say of Jehoiada? Made an excellent record and illustrated what a good man, resolute in behalf of truth and righteousness, could do in opposition to a wicked ruler.

What effect should his example have on us? Rom. 15:4 indicates it was written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.

**2 Chron. 24** records concerning reign of Joash from which we learn he was a good king while the priest Jehoiada lived, but after Jehoiada's death he suffered himself to be flattered by princes of Judah, so that he did evil. Also that when he and people under him were reproved for their evil they would not hearken, but killed a son of Jehoiada who prophesied against them. Then we read that the Lord gave him into hands of the Syrians and afflicted him personally, also that certain of his servants conspired against him and put him to death, and that his son Amaziah reigned in his stead.

**2 Chron. 25** shows good and bad of king Amaziah's reign. He first slew murderers of his

father, then marshaled his army, after which he hired 100,000 soldiers out of the kingdom of Israel. But he was prevented by the Lord from taking the hired soldiers into battle. Then we read that by the Lord's help he was successful against Edomites who arrayed themselves against him. Next we learn he worshipped gods captured from Edomites, and was reproved for it; also that he became angry at the prophet who reproved him. Record then given of his war with the king of Israel and its results, also that a conspiracy was made against him by which he was killed.

What may we learn by what the Lord said to king Amaziah in regard to hiring soldiers out of Israel to help him against Edomites? That God did not desire that his ancient people secure help from the ungodly, but wished them to depend on him to help them in time of need. Then by light of Rom. 15:4 we can understand bearing on ourselves on such revelation as just considered in history of fleshly Israel.

What may we learn by considering misconduct of Amaziah in worshipping gods he captured? Weakness of man is illustrated in a high degree by such misconduct, and should serve as warning to us in all departments of life.

Do any of the human family now show such weakness? Yes, all show it who worship wealth, fame beauty or anything else of things of this world.

Anything unusual in Amaziah's words to the prophet who rebuked him for his idolatry? Nothing unusual when considered in light of Prov. 15:10. Solomon says, 'Correction is grievous to him that forsaketh the way'. It is generally true of those who deliberately forsake the right way that they rebel when correction is offered. Same is now true of these disciples who once learned the truth but have turned from it for sake of popularity. They generally become angry when their errors are exposed. Thus it was, thus it is, thus it will be.

How were God's prophets treated by heathen kings? The king of Nineveh, also Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar all believed God's prophets, even when the prophecy was against them (see books of Jonah and Daniel). But with few exceptions kings of Israel and Judah became angry when reproved by a prophet of the Lord. On the same principle we now find worldlings more ready than religious sectarians to hear reproof. This shows a false religion, or even a mixed religion is worse than no religion.

**2 Chron. 26** sets forth history of Uzziah, king of Judah; his goodness and success, his sin and affliction.

What important department of business did he specially favor? V. 10 declares he 'loved husbandry', thus that he delighted in farming.

What was secret of the sin he committed? V. 16 informs.

Have any others of mankind become lifted up when they became strong? Yes, it is common weakness.

What kind of sin did Uzziah commit when he entered the temple and proposed to offer

in, cense? A doctrinal sin. As he was not of the tribe of Levi he had no right to act the part of a priest.

What should the sin of Uzziah and its results teach us? That doctrinal sins are as dangerous as any other kind.

**2 Chron. 27** is brief account of Jothan, son of Uzziah, who reigned over Judah 16 years. Mentions his goodness, his works, his might, his war, his success, his death and burial, also that his son Ahaz reigned in his stead.

**2 Chron. 28** is account of Ahaz as king of Judah, also his wickedness and distress, and finally of his death and burial, also that his son Hezekiah reigned in his stead.

What may we learn by considering reasoning of Ahaz in v. 23? He reasoned as all disciples do who bid for popularity, thus worship the god of popularity because sectarian denominations seemingly succeed by such procedure. They say 'choirs, organs, fairs, festivals, cantatas, rummage sales, societies, etc., have helped the sects, thus they resort to them for help, even as Ahaz sought help of heathen gods. He said 'because gods of the kings of Syria help them, therefore will I sacrifice to them that they may help me'.

But why did he feel need of their help? Because he had done wrong and thereby forfeited the Lord's help.

Why have certain disciple churches felt need of sec-tartan practices to help them? Because by their ungodliness they forfeit help of the Lord.

But have they not succeeded by use of humanisms in religion? They have made a show, a show and a show of success, which is without foundation in truth and righteousness. As result, they are divided in regard to inspiration of the Sacred Text, also in regard to forming alliance with leading sectarian denominations of the Protestant world. Besides, they are to strife and confusion with reference to several other questions, evident by the following quote from a paper called Christian Standard, Aug. 22, 1903—

"It is therefore with no little sorrow we see signs multiplying that there, is determined effort on foot, through manipulation of officials of these societies, with connivance of certain editors, to commit our societies to a policy directly reverse of that to which they are sacredly pledged and to induce them to inter fore in matters not only never committed to their keeping, but positively prohibited by the very terms of their existence. The proposition of editors of the Pacific Christian and the Christian-Evangelist to make them the medium of official surveillance of our churches and members is not the only item in this unholy scheme. It is far move comprehensive, and embraces a plan to control our colleges and the very literature of the brethren. If it were possible for them to carry out their scheme, it would place in their hands education of our preachers, editorship of oar weekly journals, and preparation and distribution of our Sunday-school supplies ... Our readers will not fail to connect this ambitious scheme with the desperate effort by others of like sympathies to gain control of our

weekly press and colleges and to convert our missionary societies into an ecclesiastical machine. We have not unearthed all parties to it, but we have developed the fact that the headsprings of these seemingly separate efforts are one and the same. Some, figures are still quite shadowy, but every day reveals their identity more perfectly. Several show none too dimly the 'official' stamp. Enough to say we have traced the umbilical connection between this Sunday school trust and a similar scheme for control of our weekly press, also the desperate effort to commit our missionary societies to like unhallowed ends. Always and everywhere it is the men bent on undermining the simple New Testament faith and practice. In no ease do we find a single straightforward representative of conservative Bible teaching. This of course does not refer to those led into seeming approval on partial view, without knowledge of other parts of the scheme"

**2 Chron. 29** is account of beginning of reign of Hezekiah and his restoration of worship God ordained and David amended.

What was the first work in restoring Divine worship? Cleansing the temple.

What is first work necessary for erring disciples in order to restore the worship ordained by the Holy Spirit in New Testament teaching? Cleansing the mind, heart and life by wholehearted repentance.

What may we say concerning v. 25? The translation is in doubt; but as commonly given it implies God 'by his prophets' commanded use of musical instruments in the Jewish age. But that implication simply means that by Divine authority an amendment was made to the worship first arranged by Moses, and for that reason it was right. That amendment however was in perfect harmony with the showy and shadowy age introduced by the Jewish law for those who occupied the position of minors and servants (see Gal. 4 and Heb. 10).

But what bearing should the verse under consideration have on us? It is without any bearing whatever. But, if we take that verse in all it states explicitly and all it implies, it shows the Jews had Divine authority for their musical amendments to the worship ordained through Moses, and this suggests Christians should not have a musical amendment to worship ordained by the Savior until they can have it by Divine authority. But there is not, there is not and there is not such authority for musical amendments made by certain professed Christians. Therefore all such amendments have been by human presumption and by human presumption; not by Divine authority.

Nor is this all that may be safely said on this subject. Musical amendments to the Jewish law were in harmony with that law and were made by an inspired king. But musical amendments to the Gospel are not in harmony with Gospel teaching and were made by 'that man of sin, the son of perdition, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming'. This being true, the difference between the musical amend-meant to the Jewish law in the Jewish age and the musical amendment to the gospel of Christ in the Gospel age is as the difference between Heaven and Hell.

Why then do certain professed Christians who bid for popularity cling to musical instruments in their worship? For the same reason the ancient idolater clung to his idols, as

expressed in Isa. 44:20.

**2 Chron. 30** brings account of keeping the Passover more extensively than at any time from days of Solomon.

Was there provision in the law for keeping the Passover in the 2nd month of the year? Num. 9 answers.

What may we say of Israelites who 'laughed' and 'mocked' when invited to the Passover king Hezekiah proposed to keep? They acted as many professed Christians do when invited to the spiritual feast offered in the Gospel.

What became of those Israelites who 'laughed' with 'scorn at messengers of Hezekiah and 'mocked' them? They went into captivity under hands of their enemies.

What will become of those who scorn the Gospel feast? They will finally be given wholly into power of the enemy of souls, if they will not repent.

**2 Chron. 31** sets forth account of destruction of idols and places of idolatrous worship. Next, of Hezekiah appointing priests, and courses of priests, and all else pertaining to the worship; also account of the king commanding to give tithes as the law required, and willing obedience the people rendered. Then is record of arrangements for taking care of abundance the people brought. Chapter ends with statement that Hezekiah sought the Lord with all his heart, and prospered.

**2 Chron. 32** sets forth facts concerning Hezekiah (given more in detail in 2 Kings 18-20), which show he was one of the best kings of Judah, and that only one offense was charged against him: after he recovered from sickness he was unguarded when approached by messengers from Babylon.

What is here stated as reason why messengers came from Babylon? To inquire concerning the wonder done in the land.

What wonder? The only one here recorded was restoration of Hezekiah from sickness and the sign given him, as mentioned here and recorded in 2 Kings 20.

Why were the messengers suffered to try him? In order to reveal what was in his heart (see v. 31).

**2 Chron. 33** tells of a king named Manasseh and His wicked reign, even as recorded in 2 Kings 21. But we find a record here of Manasseh overcome by the king of Assyria, and that he, was taken to, Babylon, that he humbled himself, prayed, was heard and restored to his



kingdom, after which he was a better man. Chapter ends with account of death and burial of Manasseh also of reign of his son Amen, who was slain by his servants; then the record states that people of the land slew those who had slain Amen, and made Josiah his son king in his stead.

Is the account in this chapter of Manasseh overcome by the king of Assyria, repenting and being heard of the Lord, found in 2 Kings? No, we don't find slightest intimation in 2 Kings that Manasseh ever repented.

How long did he reign? Fifty-five years; thus longer than any other king ever reigned over Israel or Judah.

**2 Chron. 34** records part of the reign of Josiah son of Amon, in which his good deeds are stated after the manner they are recorded in 2 Kings 22, 23.

What may we learn by considering vs. 14:22? That the book of the law was found in 'the house of the Lord', while the prophetess was found in the college. Then by reading v. 18 we learn that hearing the law read produced conviction in Josiah.

What difference do we now find between the house of God and the college? We find the law of the Lord in the 'house' or 'Church of God', and the professor of learning in the college. Then we generally find college professors so full of human learning they have no time, place nor disposition to study the Bible.

**2 Chron. 35** is record of Josiah and all Jews he could induce, to unite with him keeping the feast called 'the passover' according to the Jewish law. Then we read of Josiah going out to fight against a king of Egypt named Necho, and refusing to be dissuaded from fighting against him, as a result of which he, was wounded so that he died. Chapter then states lamentations made over his death and burial.

**2 Chron. 36** informs concerning reign, wickedness and overthrow of a king named Jehoahaz, also one named Jehoiakim, and one named Jehoiachin, and one named Zedekiah. We read likewise, a statement in regard to transgression of the chief of the priests, and of people generally, so that God gave them into hands of the king of the Chaldees, who treated them cruelly. Then account of vessels of the temple and the king's treasures taken to Babylon. Next, of the time they were destined to spend in Babylon, and why that time was so long. Chapter ends with statement of what a certain king of Persia commanded in regard to Jews and the house of the Lord in Jerusalem after the captivity ended.

**Ezra 1** informs that a king of Persia named Cyrus made an important proclamation concerning Jewish people under his rulership; also in regard to beginning of results, of that proclamation.

Does any other part of the Sacred Text inform concerning Cyrus king of Persia? In last of Isa. 44 and beginning of 45 we, find mention of him as the one who should give command in regard to Jerusalem and the temple, and should also have charge of Jewish people when the time would come for them to return to Jerusalem.

How long did Isaiah write before Cyrus made the proclamation mentioned in this chapter? About 170 years.

What does this show in regard to Isaiah? That he was inspired of God, for he wrote concerning Cyrus and named him, and told what he should do, 100 yrs. or more before he was born.

What does this indicate in regard to God's providence over nations—even heathen nations? What is stated in Dan. 4:25 in regard to the God of heaven ruling in the kingdom of men. It indicates also that, God fore-ordained official characters to accomplish his will, even in heathen lands. Psa. 22:28 declares God is governor among the nations. Rom. 13:1-6 indicates the same for it informs that God regards all civil officers in official capacity as His servants. Therefore God will hold them accountable for their official wrongs.

**Ezra 2** records names of chief Jews who went up from the kingdom of Persia to Jerusalem; also their number, wealth, and what they did after they reached Jerusalem.

What may we say of their numbers and wealth? They were not held as slaves in drudgery under the king of Persia but were in positions under him according to their abilities.

Has that been true of Jews in modern times? Yes. Their business abilities and faithfulness in official positions often enabled them to occupy high positions in many nations.

**Ezra 3** informs concerning re-establishing worship at Jerusalem, and different emotions that stirred in the Jews when they beheld the foundation of the temple.

According to what instructions was worship re-established? All that pertained to making offerings was arranged according to the law given through Moses; but all pertaining to song-service was arranged according to David's directions.

What did those 2 departments of Jewish-worship fore-shadow? Offering our bodies according to Rom. 12:1, 2, and making melody in our hearts according to Eph. 5:19, also Col. 3:16.

What may we say of those who refer to David's use of musical instruments as authority for use of such instruments in the Gospel age? They show they don't know difference between a shadow and the substance. To reason in favor of using musical instruments in worship because David used them is as absurd as it would be to reason in favor of literal animal sacrifices because Moses used them.

**Ezra 4** tells what Samaritans proposed when they heard the temple was being rebuilt: then what they did to hinder it from being built.

What may we safely say of conduct of those Samaritans? Illustrates disposition sectarians have often shown toward disciples of Christ. They have first proposed to help them build a house of worship if we would make of it a sort of 'union chapel'. But when we objected to doing so they endeavored to hinder us by every means they could adopt.

Would Jews have done wrong to have allowed Samaritans to help them build the temple? Certainly, for mixed worship would have been at once introduced.

Have disciples made mistakes in building 'union chapels'? They have.

How may we explain that the Lord named Cyrus 100 years or more before he was born, and ordained he should command to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem, then suffer Samaritans to hinder His people from building it even in days of Cyrus and afterward in days of several of his successors? Next chapter informs that after the prophets Zechariah and Haggai had stirred Jews in regard to building the temple, they were so much in earnest, they reasoned with those who tried to hinder them, and reasons they gave were incorporated in a letter to king Darius. When he considered those reasons he made search and found the decree of Cyrus in regard to, the temple, and ordered it executed. This implies if Jews had been sufficiently in earnest they might have gone forward without delay in building the, temple in days of Cyrus because his decree on that subject was clear.

**Ezra 5** mentions prophets Haggai and Zechariah and their influence on Zerubbabel, Jeshua and others in regard to, building the temple; also that they began to build, and when attempt was made to hinder them they mentioned their captivity and the decree of Cyrus that the temple should be rebuilt. This chapter informs that what they said on that subject to those who tried to hinder them was brought before king Darius in a letter from the governor of Samaria and from others with him.

What may we learn from this record? Importance of being in earnest, and not becoming discouraged in regard to good work. The Lord desires his people shall be always deeply in earnest.

**Ezra 6** records Darius causing search made for the decree of Cyrus, and when it was found he caused it to be executed to the extent that he ordered the governor of Samaria and others to, let the Jews alone and not hinder them, also that they should encourage them by giving them certain things; which order he enforced by threat of punishment. Mention then of the work going on 'til the temple was finished, then that it was dedicated, also that the Passover was kept with much rejoicing.

Why is Darius called 'the king of Assyria' in the last verse? For same reason, far as we

can judge, that in Isa. 10:5 Nebuchadnezzar was called 'Assyrian', namely, he ruled over much, or all, of the territory formerly under control of kings of Assyria, or he may have been of Assyrian parentage.

**Ezra 7** is record of the writer of this book, also of the letter king Artaxerxes gave him and, finally, of Ezra's thanksgiving for what the Lord did in causing the king to favor him.

Was the Artaxerxes in this chapter the same that is mentioned in 4:7? No. Judging by his disposition, and that he is mentioned after dedication of the temple, it is evident he is the one of Neh. 2.

**Ezra 8** records those who went up to Jerusalem with Ezra; also of the gold, silver and other treasures the king and other nobles had given him for work and worship at Jerusalem.

What may we learn of history of Ezra in this chapter? He was a man of faith and good business ability.

What difference between treasures here mentioned and those in the 1st chapter? These were treasures Artaxerxes and others gave Ezra; but those were vessels Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon took from the temple when he destroyed it at the time his army destroyed Jerusalem.

**Ezra 9** records that Ezra was informed of Jews who intermingled with Gentiles in the marriage relation. then of the effect such information had on him. The prayer Ezra offered at time of evening sacrifice is then set forth.

What may we say of Ezra's emotions when he heard some Jews intermingled with heathen around them? He felt as every true Israelite had good reason to feel.

And what shall we say of his prayer? He prayed as every true Israelite had right to pray, and as preachers of Christ and all other Christians should now pray, as they behold misconduct of many disciples in intermingling with sectarians and worldlings in worship and work.

**Ezra 10** sets forth effect of the prayer in the previous chapter, and reveals that people who intermingled with the heathen had reverence for God's word and were disposed to do right; also that they showed disposition to do right by actually agreeing to put away their strange wives and children born to them by those wives.

Were any Jewish women involved in trespass of intermingling with the heathen at that time? The record does not so indicate.

Who were chief in that trespass? Chapter 9:2 declares princes and rulers chief transgressors.

How has it been in modern times? Leading men and women have been prominent in mixing with sectarians in worship and work.

Does the New Testament inform that a man or woman was commanded to separate from wife or husband in order to obey the Savior? The Gospel record does not indicate to that effect nor give intimation in that direction.

What should we say of preachers who urge example of certain Jews, under influence of Ezra's prayer, as illustration of what persons who have formed unlawful marriages should now do when they obey the Gospel? We should say they don't understand difference between Israel according to the flesh and Israel according to the Spirit. Separation of fleshly Israel from all fleshly corruption fore-shadowed separation of spiritual Israel from all spiritual corruption. Clearly indicated by difference between fleshly circumcision set forth in the Old Testament and spiritual circumcision set forth in the New (see Gen. 17:10-14 and Col. 2:11).

**Nehemiah 1** informs concerning a Jew named Nehemiah, by setting forth that he heard of Jerusalem unfavorably, and as a result he wept, mourned, fasted and prayed before the Lord. His prayer is then recorded and near the close of the chapter states he prayed he might receive favor before the king of Persia whom he served as cup-bearer.

What may we learn from the statement to Nehemiah in regard to Jerusalem's condition? That Jews who first went to Jerusalem and those who went with Ezra (numbering over 50,000) seemed indifferent about rebuilding the city and its walls after the temple was built and worship established.

What does that indifference suggest? What was done in the 19th century of the Gospel age. In early half of that century certain men re-established the Church and its worship, then became indifferent concerning protection of the Church and its worship. As result, many devoted themselves to increasing their wealth, then gave part of it to build colleges and support missionary societies instead of devoting themselves to studying the Bible and training faithful men to conduct church worship and work as Divinely ordained. Instead of obeying 2 Tim. 2:2 they spend most of their time and money in doing what the Lord never ordained.

What should be chief business of disciples during the 20th century and onward 'til end of the Gospel age? We should rebuild walls of Jerusalem by establishing Bible readings, even as Ezra did in days of Nehemiah.

**Neh. 2** mentions Nehemiah's appearance of sadness when he brought wine before the king; record of the king's question with reference to his appearance, his answer and its results on the king's mind. Then mention of Nehemiah receiving letters of favor from king Artaxerxes and an escort from the king's army, also of effect all this had on minds of certain ones who

did not desire Jerusalem's welfare. Remainder of the chapter sets forth what Nehemiah did after he reached Jerusalem and its effect on enemies of Jews in that part of the country where Jerusalem was situated. Nehemiah's answer to those enemies is then recorded.

What does this record of Nehemiah indicate? That he was deeply devoted to welfare of God's people, and was possessed of firm faith in God,—which indicates what every other Jew should have been and what every Christian should now be.

Did the Jews' enemies laugh to scorn at work Nehemiah proposed to do? They did.

Was he discouraged? No.

Do enemies of the Church laugh and scorn at work Christians propose to do? They do.

How should we treat them? Even as Nehemiah treated his enemies.

**Neh. 3** informs of building the wall around the city of Jerusalem from the sheep gate which was, for some distance, repaired by the high priest and other priests, then by other Jews was repaired around the city to the sheep gate on the other side, which was finished by goldsmiths and merchants.

Did any rulers of the people help repair the wall? Vs. 15, 16, 18 indicate certain rulers assisted.

Did all 'nobles' help? V. 5 informs certain 'nobles' did not.

Did Jewish women assist? V. 12 informs daughters of a man named Shallum helped him.

What does all this indicate in regard to building the wall of Bible intelligence around the Church of Christ by daily reading and searching of Scripture? That all disciples of Christ, women as well as men, should assist.

What has thus far been chief weakness in churches of Christ? Unacquaintance with the Bible. Members of the church have generally failed to consider bearing of Rom. 15:4 and 1 Cor. 10:6-11. They have not considered use Paul and other New Testament writers made of the Old Testament. As a result probably not one in a thousand disciples has properly estimated value of the Old Testament nor even thought of trying to understand the whole Bible. As further result most pitiable ignorance of the Bible has prevailed in churches. 'In many instances it has been but little better than the shocking ignorance found among Protestant sectarians or the horrible ignorance found among members of the Catholic communion.

What is remedy for this condition of mind? Every man and woman in the brotherhood should imitate disposition of Ezra and Nehemiah, thereby imitated Bereans mentioned in Acts 17:11.

**Neh. 4** informs of difficulties under which the wall of Jerusalem was built.

Do enemies of the church now speak against the Bible readings conducted by apostolic disciples, even as Sanballat spoke against building of the wall of Jerusalem by faithful Jews? They do, sometimes using ridicule and burlesque against us.

How should we meet them? Even as Nehemiah met his enemies, except that we should pray for repentance and final salvation of those who oppose us.

What has opposition apostolic disciples have suffered made it necessary for them to do? They have found it necessary to spend much time in defensive warfare, or in preparing ourselves to defend truth against unjust criticisms.

But should we on that account fail to go on with the Lord's work? No. We should all learn to advance truth as well as defend it.

**Neh. 5** shows building the wall of Jerusalem was a serious burden on many Jews and brought them into debt. We learn also while willing workers impoverished themselves others were lending them money, exacting interest and taking mortgages. Then we are informed Nehemiah made a speech against such Jews, which caused them to change from their money loving disposition.

Has anything been done in the disciple brotherhood which has been closely related to what is set forth in this chapter? Yes; willing workers have generally been impoverished while many others have loaned money, exacted interest and taken mortgages even, of those willing workers.

What do all such deserve? They deserve to be told of their faults even as Nehemiah exposed faults of his penurious brethren.

Did he buy land while walls of Jerusalem were not built? No.

Should rich men now increase their wealth while the Lord's cause suffers for lack of help? No.

Should those not rich burden themselves to increase their wealth? No; and they should be specially careful not to do so while the Lord's cause suffers for lack of their help in regard to Bible intelligence as well as in regard to money. Men and women of the disciple brotherhood have remained ignorant of the Bible in order to secure more money than they needed, then have often, used their surplus money in such ways as damage Christ's cause. All who constitute that class and strive in that direction should consider this chapter and all else the Bible says on subjects there set forth.

**Neh. 6** records efforts by Samaritans to mislead Nehemiah, and when those efforts failed we are informed they tried to make him afraid. Conclusion of the chapter mentions an allegiance

between 'nobles of Judah' and Samaritans.

Who were those Samaritans and whence did they come? 2 Kings 7 informs they were originally heathen placed in the land of Samaria after the 10 tribes had been taken into Assyria; but by certain Jewish priests they were taught to fear the God of heaven though they continued to hold to their idols.

What may we say about their scheming against Nehemiah? Suggests much of the scheming since done against God's faithful ones.

Was Nehemiah equal to the occasion? He was; and the, course he pursued is good example for the faithful in all generations to follow.

What may we safely say of the fact that certain 'nobles of Judah' exchanged letters with the Samaritan Tobiah because of certain marriage relations? On the same principle with much that has since occurred. In chap. 3:5 we read certain 'nobles put not their necks to work of the Lord'. Such 'nobles' were of the kind to scheme against the man who did put his 'neck to work of the Lord'. Thus it was, thus it is, and thus it will be.

**Neh. 7** records account of what Nehemiah did when the wall of Jerusalem was finished and the gates, or doors set up; then is added account of those who came to Jerusalem when king Cyrus first gave Jews permission to return, as a record is given in Ezra 2.

**Neh. 8** informs of a Bible reading begun by request of Jewish people at Jerusalem and continued 7 days. Also of manner in which the reading was done and what the effect was on the minds of people when they understood what was read in their hearing.

What may we safely say of events recorded here? The best chapter in history of Jews as a nation. They desired to hear the law read, and wept when they understood part of it. Those who read in their hearing read 'distinctly and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading'. Such reading of God's law was in harmony with the command in Deut. 31:10-13, and would have tended to keep the Jewish nation in obedience to God, had it always been faithfully observed.

What may be said of reading the Bible before the public in this age? Catholic priests read but little of the Bible in public. Protestant preachers generally read considerable of the Bible in public, but seldom read distinctly or try to give the sense. Reading God's word they commonly do in public is mere performance often attended to with such indifference and irreverence that listeners feel relieved when it is ended and time comes for the sermon to begin. Same is true in many instances when professed disciples of Christ read before the public. They read so indistinctly, carelessly, or irreverently, that the Lord's word isn't magnified, nor is His will emphasized. Many read as if encomiums on God's word in Psa. 119 had never been written, and as if David had never said to the Lord, 'Thou hast magnified Thy word above all Thy name' (Psa. 138:2).



**Neh. 9** mentions more Bible reading, with confession and prayer; then a record of a prayer that was offered.

What may we learn by considering this prayer? It mentions goodness and mercy of God to Jews as a nation from their beginning, also perverseness and disobedience of Jews as a people when they were prosperous, and their humility when in distress. Like Ezra's prayer in his 9th chapter, and Daniel's prayer in his 9th chapter, it makes confession of sins of the Jewish nation.

What does this suggest? Propriety of God's people in the Gospel age doing the same in behalf of the entire church, even in behalf of the nation with which they are connected, and even for the entire world of mankind (see 1 Tim. 2:1-3).

**Neh. 10** records those who sealed the covenant mentioned in the previous chapter, also record of what the rest of the Jews did in regard to that covenant. Then mention of the people's purpose to keep the weekly sabbath, also to permit the land to have its sabbath or rest every 7th year, likewise to observe the Divine law in regard to making release of debts that year. Then account of purpose of Jews in regard to supporting the worship, and priests who ministered in the worship.

What does 'Tirshatha' mean? 'Governor', and was applied to those who occupied position of governors under Persian rule.

**Neh. 11** shows by casting lots there was selection of 1 of every 10 to dwell in Jerusalem; likewise some people offered themselves willingly to dwell there. Record then of chief men who dwelt in that city.

**Neh. 12** tells of priests (and Levites who had not been chosen to serve as priests) that went up to Jerusalem in the 1st company that returned. Then we read of dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, rejoicing the Jews did on the occasion, also of provision made for singers, and gatekeepers.

**Neh. 13** sets forth that reading the law enabled Jews to learn Ammonites and Moabites should never come into the congregation of the Lord, and why they should not come in; also result of learning the law on that Subject. Then we read of what the high priest had done for a Samaritan while Nehemiah was absent from Jerusalem, and what Nehemiah did in regard to that matter when he returned. Then of what Nehemiah did in regard to support of Levites and singers, also for observance Of the Sabbath; and what he did with reference to certain ones who formed improper marriage relations, making reference to influence of Solomon's heathen wives as a warning. Chapter ends with Nehemiah's prayer that the Lord would remember him for good.

What may we safely say of misconduct of the high priest in regard to making a place in the temple for the 'household stuff of Tobiah', a servant of the Samaritan governor? An outrage on the Jewish order of things, and suggests misconduct of those who in modern times prepare a platform in a meeting house for a piece of 'household' furniture called an 'organ', or some other kind of musical instrument.

What should have been done with all such instruments? Just what Nehemiah did with the 'household stuff' of Tobiah; and this is what would have been done in all such instances if elders of churches had only been possessed of Nehemiah's spirit.

What else does misconduct of that high priest, also neglect of the Levites, mentioned in v. 10, suggest? Common weakness of a majority of mankind. Soon as a regulator leaves them they go astray.

What is explanation of such weakness? Ignorance of God's word more than anything else. But many persons never develop into anything more than children as respects regulative ability, and always need someone to tell them what to do and what they should not do. Therefore those capable of being leaders should be careful to lead aright.

**Esther, chapter 1**, sets before us record of a king of Persia named Ahasuerus, who reigned between the periods of Cyrus and of Darius (see Ezra 4:6). Gives account of a long feast Ahasuerus made to nobles of his realm, also of a feast he made to all the people great and small in the palace. Next we read of a feast the queen made for women in the royal house. Then a record of the king, under influence of wine, commanding the queen to come before him with the royal crown, to show people and princes her beauty; also that she refused to obey his command, which resulted in making the king angry so he called a counsel in regard to her disobedience in which it was decided she should be rejected from being queen and her royal estate given to another. This decision was rendered because it was thought she had 'done wrong to the king', and because she had given occasion for other women to 'despise their husbands'. Chapter ends with statement that the king sent letters to all provinces ordering every man should bear rule in his own house.

What may we safely say in regard to conduct of the queen in disobeying her husband? She did wrong, judging by what the Bible says. But if there was no, law on statute books in Persia up to that date requiring a woman to obey her husband, then we may safely say her wrong in disobeying her husband should not have been charged against her.

But as her husband was king, ought she not to have obeyed him even if his command was unreasonable and was suggested because he was under influence of wine? She ought certainly to have obeyed him.

What should we say of preachers and others who praise Vashti for her disobedience? They show disregard for God's word and for human authority. Be' sides, they do much injury to those they would benefit. Woman has been injured much in modern times by public praise, even as she has suffered much for want of private praise. The Divine order is, 'Her children arise and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her' (Prov. 31:28). Woman's work is with the hearts of mankind in private, and in that domain is her power and success.

When, for whatever reason, she is taken out of that domain, or induced to leave it, she is out of her sphere and is more or less injured. Injury inflicted in many instances makes her unwomanly and proves her ruin. Husbands, fathers, brothers and other near relatives should generally praise women of their own families more than they do, in private, while all others, specially preachers, should, generally, praise her less, in public, than they are guilty of doing.

**Esther 2** informs in regard to a suggestion given to king Ahasuerus with reference to the manner in which a queen should be chosen, in the place of Vashti who, had been rejected, and how that suggestion was carried into effect, which resulted in choice of a Jewess named Esther, to succeed Vashti. In connection with the record of Esther a Jew named Mordecai, cousin to Esther, is mentioned, and the chapter ends with account of Mordecai exposing a conspiracy against the king's life, and that record of the exposure was made in the chronicles, or book of events, kept for the king.

**Esther 3** gives account of king Ahasuerus promoting a man named Haman, an enemy of the Jews; also that Mordecai did not bow to him, on account of which Haman plotted against all Jews and induced the king to give him authority to have them killed on a certain day.

**Esther 4** sets before us a record of what Mordecai did and said when he learned what was decreed against the Jews, and what all other Jews did throughout the realm. Next we read of Mordecai making known to Esther the king's decree, and that it was against her as well as against, other Jews. Chapter ends with mention of decision of Esther to go before the king even if she should perish.

**Esther 5** brings before us record of Esther going before the king, also that she obtained favor in his sight so that he offered her whatever she might ask, even to half his kingdom. Mention then of the request she, made for him and Haman to come to a feast she prepared, also that when this was granted, and she was again inquired of by the king, she requested he bid Haman would come to another feast she would prepare for the morrow. Then the record informs of Haman's joy over his exaltation and his grief by reason of Mordecai being at the king's gate. Chapter ends with statement, that, at suggestion of his wife, Haman caused a gallows to be built to hang Mordecai on.

**Esther 6** sets forth that the king could not sleep the night between the 2 feasts to which Esther had invited him and Haman, and that he called for records of the chronicles, which were read before him; also that when he heard the record concerning Mordecai's exposure of the plot against the king's life he inquired what had been done to Mordecai for that deed. When told nothing had been done he called for Haman and inquired of him what should be done to the man the king delighted to honor. Haman expressed himself freely and favorably. Then, the king told him to do thus to Mordecai. When it had all been done as the king ordered, Haman told his wife and friends what had befallen him, and his wife put her

interpretation thereon.

**Esther 7** sets forth account of the 2nd feast to which Haman was invited with the king and queen; also of the king inquiring of the queen for her request, and that she made a plea for her life and the life of her people; which resulted in Haman being pointed out by the queen as the adversary who plotted against Jews everywhere in the king's domain, and thus even against the queen, a Jewess. Chapter ends with account of death of Haman and the king's wrath pacified.

**Esther 8** brings before us that the house of Haman was given to the queen, and that Mordecai was exalted to the position Haman had occupied. Then we learn Esther pleaded before the king in behalf of her people, and that he granted her the request to the extent that he authorized Mordecai to send letters to all provinces instructing Jews to stand for their lives when the day would come that Haman had ordered them killed. Chapter ends with statement that many people became Jews because fear of the Jews had come on them.

Why did not the king reverse the command Haman had given against Jews by the king's authority, instead of commanding them to fight for their lives if molested? V. 8 informs. As the command given thru Haman had been in the king's name, no one might reverse it, not even the king himself.

**Esther 9** says when time drew near for the command to destroy Jews, to be executed, they gathered together in obedience to the command to stand for their lives and kill those who attempted to do them harm. This record also states that fear of the Jews fell on the people so that, many, even officials of the provinces, helped them, and, as a result, they were not destroyed, but killed thousands of these who tried to destroy them. Then we are informed when the time passed for the command against Jews to be executed it was ordained through Esther and Mordecai that, the Jews should commemorate the occasion, and those days were called 'Purim', because lots had been cast against them, and the word 'Purim' means 'lots'.

**Esther 10** gives statements concerning king Ahasuerus, and Mordecai the Jew who was next to the king, and was great among the Jews, accepted of the multitude of his brethren, seeking the wealth of his people, and speaking peace to all his seed.

What may we safely say of the book of Esther? It is dignified and instructive as well as entertaining even to excitement. It is illustration of the fact that God sometimes exalts his people even in midst of their enemies, and this suggests he will always exalt his people if they always do right.

**Job, chapter 1**, is account of a man named Job, who feared God and was very rich. It informs us also he worshipped God according to the order common in the first religious age of the world, generally called the 'Patriarchal age'. Next we learn of an interview between the Lord and Satan in regard to Job's righteousness, and that Satan challenged the Lord to put Job: to the test; also that the Lord gave all of Job's Wealth and children into Satan's hands; and that when Job learned of destruction of his wealth and children he did not complain against the Lord but said, 'The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord'.

What does the account, of Satan and his power bring before us? That Satan is supernatural being, thus superior to man in power.

Why then does not Satan always treat mankind as he treated Job? Simply because God holds him under restriction (see 2 Pet. 2:4). Because thus held he can't harm mankind except as the Lord lifts restrictions and suffers him to show special power.

Who were 'sons of God' in v. 6? Gen. 6:2-4 indicated they were men obedient to the Lord.

What evidence have we that Job was a real man, and not merely an imaginary character as some declared? We have the best evidence on the subject. The Savior endorsed the Old Testament prophets without a criticism and one of those prophets wrote of Job declaring he was a man possessed of a soul, and righteous (see Ezek. 14:14-20). Besides, the apostle James, an inspired writer, spoke of Job and his patience (see Jas. 5:11). Therefore we cannot doubt Job was a real man except by doubting Christ is really the Son of God in the Divine sense declared in the New Testament.

**Job 2** sets before us that sons of God on a certain day again presented themselves before the Lord, and that Satan presented himself with them. Next, an interview between the Lord and Satan in regard to Job's faithfulness in course of which interview Satan declared if Job's bone and flesh were touched he would curse God. Next we learn the Lord gave Job into Satan's hand to be afflicted, and only charged him to spare his life. Then we read Satan afflicted Job with boils; that his wife told him to curse God and die; that he refused to do so and rebuked her; that 3 of his friends came to mourn with and comfort him; also we read of what they did when they beheld his grief was very great.

What is meaning of the word 'potsherd' in v. 8? Means 'pot fragment', that is, a piece of broken pottery, or piece of a clay vessel when broken.

What may we say of Satan's doctrine, 'All that a man hath will he give, for his life', in v. 4? True of most men, but not of all.

What may we say of the common doctrine that 'every man has his price'? Most men have their price, but not all. That may be justly called the doctrine of Satan.

What may we learn by considering v. 7? Clearly declares Satan smote Job, and thereby indicates he is a supernatural being who has power to afflict mankind in special ways and

degrees, if the Lord suffers him to do so. But in 1 Cor. 10:13 Christians find consolation that God will not suffer them to be tempted in any special way or degree, but that their temptations will be only such as are 'common to man'.

If God should lift all restrictions from Satan, what would result? He would destroy all Christians and every copy of the Bible with all else that is good. But he and his angels are restricted as 2 Pet. 2:4 declares.

**Job 3** sets forth Job's 1st speech in hearing of his 8 friends who sat in silence with him 7 days, in which we find sentences he pronounced on the night of his conception and day of his birth, also his lamentation that he had not died in infancy; and that right is given to the afflicted who wish to die. Chapter ends with statements which indicate even in prosperity Job was not haughty and at ease, but, had fear and anxiety. Nevertheless 'trouble came', and he was perplexed to know the cause.

What is meaning of v. 12? Later translation of former part of that verse reads: 'Why did the knees receive me?' This is clear, and refers to an infant laid across the knees of the mother or the nurse. That this is the meaning is evident from reference to the mother's breasts (latter part of same verse).

What may we say of style of this speech of Job? Beautiful and touching, dignified and grand, penetrating and pathetic, poetical and rhetorical. The beginning of speeches which have perhaps never been excelled by uninspired men. Shows man in the Patriarchal age was equal to man in the modern age, and thus, by implication, conceit of the evolutionist is declared a lie.

**Job 4** gives first part of the first response made to Job by one of his friends called Eliphaz the Temanite. We read of Eliphaz in Gen. 36:10-12.

What is the burden and bearing of this speech? Its author addressed Job under pretense that he had regard for his feelings but that it was necessary for him to answer what he had just heard; then he mentioned Job's former record and declared he 'fainted' and was 'troubled' when required to endure what others had suffered. Next he intimated something must have been wrong in Job's life, thus that he was not 'innocent' nor 'righteous'. This is indicated by his questions, 'Who ever perished being innocent? or where were the righteous cut off.' It is indicated also by the statement, 'They that plow iniquity and sow wickedness reap the same', and by eloquent references to the 'blast of God', 'breath of his nostrils', 'roaring of the lion', 'voice of the fierce lion', 'teeth of the young lion', and what is said about 'the old lion' and the 'lion's whelps'. That something was wrong with Job was intimated by Eliphaz the Temanite in mention be made of a night vision and what it revealed to him.

What may be, justly said were points of controversy between Job and his pretended friends? Job confessed God had afflicted him but denied he deserved it, while his so-called 'friends' declared God is just and would not afflict an innocent man, and, therefore, Job must have been guilty.

**Job 5** is continuance of speech of Eliphaz the Temanite.

What is here said in regard to Job and his afflictions? Eliphaz intimated not one of the saints would answer him; then spoke of wrath and envy and their deadly effects on their victims, also on children of their victims. Then he philosophized about man being born unto trouble, and indirectly suggested Job ought to commit his cause to God; then stated what God would do, and what good results would be to Job if he would do according to the suggestion.

**Job 6** records first part of Job's speech in answer to Eliphaz the Temanite, in which Job expressed desire that his grief and calamity might be weighed; then referred to certain dumb animals and certain articles of food. He next expressed longing that the Almighty cut his life short, spoke of his strength so as to imply he was weak; then intimated he deserved pity of his friends, but declared his brethren dealt deceitfully with him, and compared them to a brook that would dry up and disappoint those who would hasten to it for water. He then reasoned with his friends, declared his righteousness and ability to discern perverse things.

What did Job seem to regard a capital defect in speech of Eliphaz the Temanite? That he made intimations and implications but had not specified. Eliphaz reached his conclusion by regressive inference that the Almighty would not have afflicted Job so seriously if he had not done wrong. Indicated by Job's response in vs. 24, 25—"Teach me, and I will hold my tongue: and cause me to understand wherein I have erred. How forcible are right words! But what doth your arguing reprove?" In other words, What have you specified? Eliphaz had dealt in what may be designated 'glittering generalities', or 'imaginary intimations'; but had not made specific charges.

Is the disposition manifested by Eliphaz common among mankind in the Gospel age? Yes, there, are multitudes whose disregard of truth and fact is such that they will not hesitate to speculate in order to find explanation of what they don't understand, or a foundation' for charges against one they don't like.

What did Job mean by saying, as indicated in v. 3, that his words were 'swallowed up'? Marginal reading explains, 'I want words to express my grief'. Means he lacked words to express his suffering.

What means reference to, certain dumb animals in v. 55? That those animals don't seem restless when well fed.

What mean references in v. 6? That salt is needed, as relief, for that which is unsavory, and for that which is tasteless. Vs. 5, 6 together imply as the wild ass and ox do not call for relief when they have food, and thus are comfortable, so would not Job call for relief if he were comfortable. Likewise, as the appetite calls for relief when that which is unsavory, or tasteless, is to be eaten, so did Job call for relief from his grief.

**Job 7** sets before us continuance of Job's speech in response to Eliphaz the Temanite, and that Job inquired if there was not an appointed time for man on earth, and if his days were not limited like those of a hireling; after which he spoke of a hireling that desired shadows of the evening and looked for his reward.-and thereby illustrated his own condition as he looked for relief. But he stated he found no relief, not even in lying down, but was full of tossings. Remainder of the chapter describes his condition.

**Job. 8** informs concerning Bildad the Shuhite, one of the 3 friends who came to Job in his afflictions 'to, mourn with and comfort him'.

Did Bildad say much to comfort Job? No. And what he did say for Job's comfort was spoiled before he said it. He began by speaking against what Job said, and after a few words in regard to God's justice he intimated Job's children were destroyed because they had done wrong; but that if Job were right him. self and would call on the Lord he would be heard and prospered. He then spoke of the rush not growing without water, and of it soon withering without water —and used the rush as illustration of the hypocrite, thereby implying Job was probably of that class. Then he spoke a few favorable words in regard to the Lord's treatment of a perfect man.

Was there much comfort for Job in the speech of Bildad? No. But as we shall learn, he stirred Job to answer him and, by that means, probably did the best that could have been done for the afflicted man. Prov. 38:14 declares 'the spirit of a man will sustain his infirmity', and, on that principle, it was well to stir Job's spirit.

**Job 9** shows what Job answered Bildad, in which we find a grand discourse concerning God's greatness and power.

What is meant by v. 9? Reference to certain groups of stars showing that even in days of Job some attention had been given to heavenly bodies.

What does last of v. 4 imply? That a person cannot prosper if he hardens himself against God.

And what may we say of Job's conclusion in v. 22? Sometimes seems true; but even in such instances servants of God have consolation that their untimely death will be to God's glory.

What is meant by 'post' in v. 25? Any unabridged dictionary of the English language will inform us; and all should know origin of the name post-office.

What did Job mean in vs. 34, 35? That while he was afflicted, and in terror by reason of his affliction, he was not disposed to speak to the Almighty. He was in confusion because he could not understand reason for his affliction.



**Job 10** sets forth latter part of Job's speech in response to Bildad.

What are the leading thoughts? Greatness and power of God are declared, also Job's affliction and his confusion by reason of it. V. 15 declares he was 'full of confusion'. Knew he was not wicked so as to deserve such affliction, and had not been informed concerning the interview between God and Satan with reference to him; therefore he could see no reason for his affliction.

**Job 11** gives speech of Zophar the Naamathite, and we may learn what he said in response to Job.

What was character of his speech? Consisted chiefly of accusations against Job.

What may be said of it in comparison with speeches by Eliphaz and Bildad? Plain and stronger in accusations. The 1st accuser intimated Job was not 'innocent'; the 2nd, that he was probably a 'hypocrite'; and here the 3rd accuser boldly charged Job with having told 'lies' and having been guilty of 'iniquity'.

**Job 12** sets before us 1st part of Job's answer to Zophar.

Was Job plain in response? Quite so, and somewhat disposed to ridicule, indicated in v. 2. In v. 6 he declared bad men prosper; then stated the beasts, the earth and fish of the sea could teach Zophar that God's supremacy should be considered. Then, after making mention of the ear trying words and the mouth tasting meat, also that wisdom is found in elderly ones, he devoted remainder of 1st part of this speech to declaring God's supremacy.

**Job 13** gives 2nd part of Job's response to Zophar.

What is character of this part? Plain and vigorous. Job declared he knew all his accusers had set forth, and that he was not inferior to them. Then he spoke of desire to reason with God; but charged his accusers with being 'forgers of lies' and 'physicians of no value', after which he expressed desire that they hold their peace, and stated their silence would be their wisdom. He then called on them to hear his 'reasoning' and 'hearken to pleadings' of his 'lips'. He then reasoned with them.

**Job 14** furnishes last part of Job's answer to Zophar,

What is set forth? Man as a frail being whose period on earth is short and who is too weak to enter into judgement with God. Man's death is considered and his resurrection intimated. That man after death does not know what goes on in this world.

What may we say of the question and answer in v. 4? Christ by his gospel may change an unclean person to one that is clean; but it is beyond human power to, turn a thing or an enterprise of unclean origin into something clean.

In what part of this chapter do we find intimation that man-kind will be raised from the dead? In vs. 11-13. The statement, 'til the heavens be no more they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep', clearly implies mankind shall be raised after the heavens be no more. 'Til' in v. 13 has same bearing; but this must not be used against Rev. 20:5, 6, yet considered in the light of Rev. 20:12, 13.

**Job 15** gives 2nd speech of Eliphaz the Temanite against Job.

How does this appear in comparison with his former speech? As a contrast rather than a comparison, for it is very different from what he formerly said. In his former speech Eliphaz simply intimated Job was prob' ably not 'innocent' and not 'righteous'; but in the speech now before us he appears bold in severe accusations and eloquent in grave charges.

**Job 16** gives 1st part of the speech Job made to the 2nd speech of Eliphaz.

What did Job say? That he had heard 'many such things' as Eliphaz said; then pronounced him and his associates 'miserable comforters'. Then intimated Eliphaz had been guilty of using 'vain words' and had, without cause, been 'emboldened' to answer. Job then philosophized concerning himself in relation to h's accusers and concerning his sufferings, declaring God had delivered him to the ungodly and turned him over into the hands of the wicked. But he declared he was not afflicted because of injustice in his hands.

**Job 17** gives latter part of Job's response to the 2nd speech of Eliphaz.

What is set forth? Continuance of Job's declarations concerning himself and his accusers. Inv. 10 he declared he could not find a wise man among them.

In what was their lack of wisdom manifest? They didn't know why Job was afflicted, but uncharitably supposed something was wrong. On basis of this supposition they accused him of wrong in general terms. But in opposition to all their accusations Job declared his integrity.

**Job 18** gives 2nd speech of Bildad the Shuhite.

What was its character? Intimated Job was making vain use of words; then inquired why he and his associates were accounted as beasts and reputed as vile in Job's sight? Having 'thus inquired he spoke with eloquence in regard to the wicked and evil which would befall him, thereby intimating Job was afflicted because he was wicked.

**Job 19** gives Job's response to the 2nd speech of Bildad.

And what was its character? Plain, pointed and pitiful. Began by asking how long they would vex his soul and break him in pieces with words; then charged them with having reproached him 10 times, also that they magnified themselves against him. Then declared God had overthrown him, compassed him with His net, fenced up his way, stripped him of his glory and destroyed him on every side. Therefore he pleaded, with his friends to have pity on him because the hand of God had troubled him.

What may we say of vs. 25-27? Indicate certainty of Job's faith in God, also his confidence there will be resurrection from the dead.

Are there other statements or intimations in the Old Testament concerning resurrection from the dead? Yes, and the plainest is in Dan. 12:2.

What may we safely say of those who say resurrection of the dead is not plainly taught in the Old Testament? Mat. 22:29 indicates what we should say to all such.

**Job 20** records 2nd speech of Zophar the Naamathite in response to Job.

What was its character? An eloquent and bitter speech against the wicked, and indirectly applied to Job.

**Job 21** records Job's answer to Zophar.

What was the burden of his speech? After a few preliminary sentences he declared wicked men often live long and are prospered, but God lays up their iniquity for their children because he has no pleasure in the house of the wicked after his life is ended. By referring to such facts he exposed injustice of Zophar's speech and said 'in your answers there remaineth falsehood'.

**Job 22** sets forth that Eliphaz the Temanite made a 3<sup>rd</sup> speech against Job.

What was bearing of his speech? After inquiring whether man could be profitable to God, and whether the Almighty received pleasure because Job was righteous or received gain because of Job's perfection, and whether God feared him, he charged that Job's wickedness was 'great' and his 'iniquities infinite'. After that general charge he made several serious and definite charges against Job, but offered no evidence to sustain them. He stated also that Job was afflicted on account of his wickedness.

What else did Eliphaz declare? The dignity of God, his severe judgments against the

wicked people who lived before the Flood, and then exhorted Job to acquaint himself with God, receive his law, return to him; and assured him he would be blest of Him and able to comfort others by reason of his own experience.

**Job 23** gives former part of Job's answer to the 3rd speech of Eliphaz the Temanite.

What did Job say? He began by saying his complaint was bitter and his stroke heavier than his groaning. Then expressed longing to know where he might find the Almighty in order that he might approach Him with arguments. Said God would not plead against him with His great power, but would put strength in him. Then Job said he could not 'perceive' God. Yet he believed God knew him in His 'way', and that when God had tried him he should come forth as gold.

**Job 24** gives latter part of Job's response to Eliphaz.

What are the leading thoughts? He spoke of God's knowledge, and reasoned in regard to those who know of His knowledge venturing to do wrong. Likened them to certain wild beasts because they refused to consider God knew all their ways. He described various classes of evil doers, then spoke of the fact that though they might be exalted a little while, yet they should be brought low. Ended his speech by indirectly challenging his 'miserable comforters' to show him a 'liar' and make his 'speech nothing worth'.

**Job 25** declares 3rd speech Bildad the Shuhite made against Job.

Of what did it consist? That 'dominion and fear' are with God and 'he maketh peace in his high places'. He asked concerning God's armies and His light, then inquired, 'How can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?' Then spoke of the moon shining not, and declared the stars are 'not pure' in God's sight. Finally he asked, 'How much less man that is a worm, and the son of man who is a worm?'

What does such reasoning on the part of Bildad indicate? That when he exhausted his false accusations and intimations against Job he tried to convict him of wrong by contrasting him with the Almighty!

Do false accusers reason thus in the Gospel age? Yes, and when they set themselves in direction of fastening a charge of wrong doing on an innocent person, they feel bound to accomplish their end regardless of fact or of truth.

**Job 26** sets forth 1st part of Job's answer to the 3rd speech of Bildad.

What did Job say to Bildad? He asked several questions that seem on the order of irony or ridicule, because he had pretended to come to 'mourn' with Job and 'comfort' him. But instead of so doing he became one of his false accusers. Then he spoke of the unseen world being naked before God, and that destruction, has no covering, that it 'stretches out the north over the empty space, and hangs the earth on nothing'. Thus he continued in regard to the Almighty to close of this chapter.

**Job 27** says Job uttered the 2nd part of his speech against the 3rd speech of Bildad.

Of what does this consist? Chiefly of statements concerning God, also in regard to his accuser, of himself, of his integrity, of his enemy, the hope of the hypocrite, and what God will and will not do with reference to the hypocrite. Then Job declared he would teach Bildad 'by the hand of God', and would 'not conceal' that which is 'with the Almighty'. Remainder of the chapter shows what Job tried to teach.

**Job 28** shows what Job said about wisdom.

Did he know what it is? He did not attempt, to define it, yet spoke of what it had enabled God to do, of its preciousness, and of what it would cause man to do. He said 'the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding'.

In what other book do we read much about wisdom? In Proverbs of Solomon, specially in chap. 8.

What, may be safely said of Job's speech concerning wisdom? Splendid illustration of ancient eloquence.

**Job 29** is continuance of Job's answer to Bildad.

What may we learn by it? Of Job's longing for his former peace and greatness, in connection with which we find a statement of his greatness among men.

In view of statements here of Job's benevolence, what may we say of the charge in chap. 22:9 that Job had sent widows away empty? It was false, as we may also learn by reading chap. 42:7.

Why would a pretended friend make a false charge against a suffering man? For the same reason pretended friends act on the same principle now. Many seem friendly toward a man while he is prosperous, but become his enemies when he meets with misfortune. Besides, there are those who envy every prosperous man and, indeed, every one greater than themselves. But because of his prosperity or greatness they seem afraid to make open attack on him. If, however, misfortune befalls him, then they seem to think their time has come to assail him. Thus it has been, thus it is, and thus it will be. Human nature is the same in all

ages.

**Job 30** is continuance of Job's reply to Bildad.

What does it set forth? Begins with the statement that those younger than Job held him in derision, that they were children of the lowest and basest of men. He said he had become their 'song' and 'by-word', and they 'spared not to spit' in his 'face' because God 'afflicted' him. Then mentioned disrespect with which he was treated and further described his sufferings. Then he had wept 'for him that was in trouble', and was 'grieved for the poor', yet 'evil' and 'darkness' came.

**Job 31** is last part of Job's response to Bildad.

What may be safely said of it? Conclusive as well as concluding. In a dozen or more arguments he justified himself by a method of reasoning which banishes doubt. After hearing these arguments not one of His accusers ventured to say more. Two spoke 3 times and the 3rd spoke twice against him, and to each he replied with dearness and pointedness, dignity and logic. Job showed himself a historian, rhetorician and philosopher. Likewise a man of excellent firmness, for neither affliction from God nor lack of sympathy from professed friends caused him to doubt his own integrity. But he was confused because he could not harmonize his affliction with his past life. He was compelled to admit what he suffered was more than ordinary affliction, yet he could not understand why the Lord brought it on him or suffered it to fall on him. Such was his condition of mind during his responses to his pretended friends.

**Job 32** records beginning of speech of a new speaker, Elihu.

What was its bearing? We are informed Elihu's wrath was kindled against Job because he justified himself rather than God; and against his 'three friends ... because they found no answer yet had condemned Job'. Elihu said he had refrained from speaking because he was younger than the others, but proposed to 'show' his 'opinion'. So doing he said 'great men are not always wise', then added that 'God thrusteth' Job. 'down, not man'. Showed good sense in thus speaking.

**Job 33** is 2nd part of Elihu's speech.

To whom was this addressed? To Job.

What is its bearing? He said of himself that he also, was 'formed out of the clay', and his 'terror' shouldn't: make Job 'afraid' neither should his hand be heavy on him. But he charged that Job, by declaring himself innocent, had been guilty of striving against God. In this

connection he declared God is 'greater than man' and 'giveth not account of any of his matters'. Then proceeded to declare what God had done for man in night visions in order to 'withdraw man from his purpose and hide pride from man'. Next declared God 'keepeth back' man's 'soul from the pit and his life from perishing with the sword', also that, even when man had been afflicted and was 'near the grave, and his life to the destroyer', yet he might be spared by mercy of the Almighty. He further stated God's willingness to save a sinful man from death when he would confess he had 'sinned'. In conclusion Elihu proposed to 'teach' Job 'wisdom'.

**Job 34** is 3rd part of the speech of Elihu the Buzite.

Against whom was it directed? Against Job's pretended friends chiefly, but in the last part he declared Job had 'spoken without knowledge and his words were without wisdom', also that he made 'answers for wicked men' and had added 'rebellion unto his sin'; finally, that he had 'multiplied his words against God'.

What do such charges against Job indicate in Elihu? That he was guilty of the same mistake found in speeches of Job's other pretended friends whom he censured.

What was that mistake? Because Job confessed God had afflicted him, but declared he did not deserve such treatment, they argued Job was wrong; for God is just and would not afflict the innocent. On the basis of God's justice they contended Job was guilty of something wrong. At first they made only general charges; but afterward they specified certain particulars. He answered and silenced his accusers. Elihu was stirred because they had not convicted Job. But he made the same mistake they did.

**Job 35** is continuance of speech of Elihu.

What was its bearing? Was directed against Job and declared his reasoning implied his righteousness was greater than God's; and that it was not profitable for a man to cleanse' himself from his sin. Then said he would 'answer' Job, also his 'companions' with him. Then reasoned in favor of the dignity, independence and righteousness of God from which he concluded Job had opened 'his mouth in vain' and 'multiplied words without knowledge'.

**Job 36** is continuance of Elihu's speech.

What was its purpose? He said he would 'speak on God's behalf' and 'ascribe righteousness' to his 'Maker' —then proceeded to declare God is 'mighty and despiseth not any'; that he 'preserveth not the life of the wicked, but giveth right to the poor'. On this principle he endeavored to 'speak on God's behalf' and by implication endeavored to condemn Job.

**Job 37** gives end of Elihu's speech.

For whom was it specially intended? V. 14 indicates it was intended for Job.

What argument did it present against him? Elihu reasoned God is possessed of 'excellency', and 'great things doeth he which we, cannot comprehend'. Then mentioned many of those 'great things' and finally said, 'He is excellent in power, in judgment, and in plenty of justice; he will not afflict. Men do therefore fear him; he respecteth not any that are wise of heart'.

What does such reasoning indicate in regard to Elihu? He censured those who preceded him in making charges against Job, but was guilty of adopting their method of reasoning:—1, God's justice will not suffer him to afflict the innocent; 2, But Job is afflicted of God; 3, Therefore Job is not innocent.

What was chief difference between Job's reasoning and that of his accusers whom he declared were 'miserable comforters' and 'physicians of no value'? Chief difference was he did not try to explain what he did not understand; but they tried then it.

Who acted the part of wisdom—Job or his accusers? This is easily answered. Job did not speculate in regard to. God's reason for afflicting him, but said of God, 'Behold he breaketh down and it cannot be built again; he shutteth up a man and there can be no opening' (chap. 12:14). His accusers, on the contrary, while professing great reverence for God, presumed to speak in His behalf and explain, by speculative reasoning, why He afflicted Job. By so doing they showed lack of true reverence and made manifest their folly.

Is it not always the part of wisdom in mankind to refrain from trying to explain what they do not understand? It is.

And is it not an indication of lack of wisdom in mankind to endeavor to explain what they don't understand? It is.

What may then be said of all religious speculators? It may be said as David declared of another class: 'This their way is their folly' (Psa. 49:13).

**Job 38** is 1st part of God's speech to Job.

What is set forth? God's attributes are indicated, specially his power, majesty, might, grandeur and glory as manifested in what God had done as Creator, Preserver and Regulator of the material world. Jehovah did this by asking Job whether he was author of the wonders He mentioned—and thereby implied He is, himself, their author.

What is indicated by v. 14? Index to the rotations or revolutions of the earth, for, speaking of the earth, God said 'it is turned', then by way of explanation, 'as clay to the seal'. That is to say, Jehovah declared the earth revolves, or rotates.

What may we say of revised versions of the Sacred Text which translate this verse, 'It is changed as clay to the seal'? Erroneous for these reasons:—



1. The Hebrew word in this instance means 'to turn, turn about or over', as to 'turn the hand' and 'turn the back to anyone', 'to turn one's self, to turn about'. The it also means 'to change', yet it cannot have that meaning in this passage because the remainder of the passage forbids. It says 'as clay to the seal'. And as clay, turned to the seal to receive the stamp of the man—or firm that manufactured it into a vessel, was not changed, so the word 'changed' is not the proper translation in this place, unless we think of change in turning.

2. When the Hebrew word here found was used in. the sense of 'changed', as in Exo. 7:15 and Lev. 13:15, 17, 25, then it meant 'changed' into something else, or from one condition to another; and not simply a change of position.

3. The present tense 'it is turned' means continued action, even as the declaration of the waters, 'they stand as a 'garment', means continued position.

In view of foregoing reasons all Bible readers should be satisfied that the common version of the Sacred Text in this instance is correct; therefore they should contend that in Job 38:14. Jehovah indicated revolutions of the earth even as in Isa. 40:22 he indicated spherical shape of the earth.

Have not declarations of the Sacred Text always been in advance of humanly arranged science when they touched subjects with which such science deals? Yes. This is evident from what Gen. 9:4 and other scriptures set forth in regard to blood being the life of the flesh, as well as by the verses just considered in chap. 38 of the book before us, and Isa. 40. Moreover, the telegraph and telephone together with all mind reading are anticipated or antedated by Isa. 65: 24. Concerning the millennial age Jehovah says in regard to his people—'and it shall come to pass that before they call I will answer; and while they yet speak I will hear'. The only reason why scientists ever become infidels in regard to the Bible is that they unscientifically reject the book of which they are grossly and shamefully ignorant.

**Job 39** is continuance of Jehovah's speech to Job.

What is found? Mention of wild goats, hinds, the wild ass, unicorn, peacock, ostrich, the horse, hawk and eagle. One or more prominent traits in the nature or disposition of each animal are mentioned, and Jehovah inquires of Job if he is author of those traits. By implication Jehovah declares he is, himself, their author.

**Job 40** informs Jehovah said to Job, 'Shall he, that contendeth with the Almighty instruct him? He that reproveth God, let him answer it'.

What effect did such speech, preceded by what is found in chaps. 38, 39, have on Job? Caused him to say, 'Behold, I am vile; what shall I answer Thee? I will lay my hand on my mouth. Once have I spoken, but I will not answer: yea, twice, but I will proceed no further'.

Why did Jehovah thus speak to Job? We are not informed except, perhaps, because of what Job said in chap. 23:2-7. In the mentioned passage Job spoke as if he would approach

the Almighty, order his cause before Him, would argue his case and even 'dispute with Him' if he only knew where to find Him. Perhaps, in view of such presumption on the part of Job, Jehovah addressed him in the lofty, precise, penetrating, inimitable, manner indicated in chaps. 38-41. But whatever may have been Jehovah's reasons for addressing Job, as these chapters indicate, they caused Job to feel he could not 'dispute' with his God.

What else is revealed in this chapter? A series of lofty questions, remarks and commands.

To whom addressed? To Job.

What was Jehovah's purpose in thus speaking? The answer is indicated by v. 8 and explained by that which Job stated in chap. 42:2-6. In Jehovah's judgment Job needed to be humbled more than had been accomplished by his afflictions.

**Job 41** reveals another series of lofty and penetrating questions, remarks and commands.

And in regard to what are these offered? In regard to a sea monster called 'leviathan' which, according to the description, is more terrible than any monster now known. Description of him ends with the declarations. 'on earth is not his like, who is made without fear: he beholdeth all high things: he is a king over all children of pride'.

**Job 42** gives first a statement of Job's humility before Jehovah. Next, that the Lord spoke to Eliphaz and his 2 friends, and what He said they should do by way of making an offering for themselves, and that Job. should pray for them.

What else do we learn? That Eliphaz and his friends did as commanded; also that the Lord accepted Job, which implies he accepted Job's prayer in their behalf.

What became of Job? The Lord turned again Job's captivity when he prayed for his friends, and gave him twice as much as he had before.

And what is next recorded? His relations and former acquaintances came to him, ate with and 'comforted him' in regard 'to the evil the Lord brought on him'. We are likewise informed every man 'gave him a piece of money and everyone an earring of gold'.

Was such conduct according to human nature? Yes. When Job was in distress his friends forsook him, and those who came to him falsely accused him. Even his wife told him to 'curse God and die'.

Chapter, ends with statements concerning Job's wealth, his family, how long he lived, what generations he beheld of his descendants, and that he died 'being old and full of days'.

What may we safely say of the book of Job from the viewpoint of literature? An illustration of Hebrew poetry; and in regard to dignity the speeches of Job and his accusers compare favorably with the most dignified of human productions in literature. Then the speech of Jehovah to Job is beyond comparison with any human production in literature of

ancient or modern times. If this statement be challenged then the challenger should show what he would offer for comparison with what Jehovah said to Job.

What should we say of those who pronounce the book of Job mythological? We should call their attention to Ezek. 14:14-20, and show Job is by the prophet Ezekiel, spoken of as a man, as having a soul, as having righteousness, and how he was placed in the same catalog with Noah and Daniel. And then we should show how Christ endorsed Ezekiel as a true prophet by His frequent endorsement of Old Testament prophets, generally, beginning with Mat. 5:12 and ending with Luke 24:25, to say nothing of endorsement of those prophets by the Savior through the apostles. By this method of referring to Scripture we would show that, as certain as that Christ is the Son of God, Ezekiel was a true prophet and Job a real man. All who deny reality of Job's existence therefore deny, by implication, divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and should be regarded as infidels.

Do all who question, or deny, that Job was a real person, know what Ezekiel said of Job, or that Christ, endorsed Ezekiel? No. Not one in a hundred, perhaps not one in a thousand of them, knows what Ezekiel said of Job, nor understands the bearing of what Christ said of Ezekiel.

Why then do so many speak of Job as a myth? On the principle mentioned in Mat. 22:29—'they do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'.

Are not some of them learned men? Yes, they are learned in those departments which beget conceit, and are ignorant in regard to those which beget wisdom and humility. Then they exemplify Rom. 1:22. As a result, the religious as well as the irreligious part of the world is, largely, perverted by infidel notions. From highest to lowest of those, in the ranks of infidelity, is shameful and shocking ignorance of the Bible. Many have studied much about the Bible, with reference to the Bible, and concerning the Bible; but they have not studied the Bible. As a result they 'err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'.

But what may be justly said of those pretensions to scholarship which permit the pretenders to reject and denounce a book they have not studied? All such pretensions are vain. Men making them are mere pretenders governed by conceit, prejudice, passion, or some other evil, which causes them to decide a case before hearing all evidence, or even the most important part of the evidence. This is unphilosophic, unscientific, unscholarly, ungentlemanly and unmanly. It is dishonest, dishonorable, condemnable and contemptible. For a man to denounce, ridicule, burlesque, insinuate against or, in any respect, disparage the Book to which he is indebted for the light which has saved him from worshipping dumb idols, is for him to show himself unfit for a servant, to say nothing of occupying the position of a teacher. Moreover, his pretensions to scholarship are empty and vain, because his learning hasn't made him humble and honest, but tended to make him conceited and dishonest.

Thus far, in its history, infidelity has never founded an institution of learning nor maintained one. It has never founded a charitable institution nor maintained one. But it has endeavored to deceive those who aren't on guard, and to betray the innocent, taking advantage of confidence gained by false pretensions, and, thereby, has endeavored to accomplish its degrading, destructive ends.

The remedy against infidelity is the study of the Bible from beginning to end. But a

single reading of. chaps. 38-41 of the book of Job should be sufficient to produce belief in existence of one only true God, and belief in the Book which declares Him in documentary form. The Bible proclaims its own origin to all who study it; with diligence from beginning to end.

**Psalm 1** reveals man's goodness and God's graciousness, likewise man's badness and God's severeness. Wisdom, goodness and constancy of God's works and words are set forth, also weakness and wickedness of mankind. Prayers as outgrowth of work, responsibility and afflictions, likewise praises, thanksgivings and adorations as result of deliverances from afflictions are recorded.

What does 'psalm' mean? In the Old Testament, defined by Gesenius in his Hebrew-English lexicon, it means song, music; for example, of the voice (Ps. 81:2; 98:5); of instruments (Amos 5:23; 2 Sam. 23:1). In the New Testament, defined by Robinson in his Greek-English lexicon, it means 'a song in praise to God'.

Of what does the 1st division of this book inform us? Concerning the godly and ungodly. What the godly man will not do, what he will do, what he is like, and what will be result of his good deeds. Then we are informed what the ungodly resemble, and what will come on them and on sinners.

What classes of wrongdoers are mentioned in v. 1? Respectable outsiders, open lawbreakers and those who sneer at religion.

Are not all 'ungodly' and 'scornful' persons really sinners? Up light of Jas. 4:17 they sin by omitting duty but measured by 1 John 3:4 they may not be regarded as sinners because they may be very respectable in behavior. Therefore, both Old Testament and New generally mention outbreking sinners and ungodly persons as belonging to separate classes. The apostle Jude however mentions 'ungodly sinners' in v. 15 of his letter, but even he uses that expression by reason of wrong words rather than because of wicked deeds.

Is it true in the Gospel age that the godly man's delight is in the Lord's law? It is, and this is a good standard by which professors of religion may measure themselves. Mankind are 'godly' just in proportion as they delight in the Lord's law and meditate therein day and night. Godliness and delighting in the Lord's law are inseparably connected. The loving heart does not more certainly turn toward the object of its love and linger there than does the godly mind turn with delight to God's Word and meditate therein.

What is meant by 'knoweth' in v. 6? Means what is expressed by the word approve; in the Hebrew text, 'to perceive, to understand'. Thus the Lord perceives and understands the righteous, so He will know how to reward them.

Is there reason evident to us why David mentioned 'counsel of the ungodly' and said nothing about counsel of sinners and scornful men,? Yes; the, ungodly man who is not an outbreking sinner is generally of such character that he is admired by many. In some instances he is spoken of as 'a model man'. Therefore he is of greater influence than the

positive sinner and disgusting scorner. As a result he is most dangerous of the 8 classes in regard to counsel or advice he may give. Besides he shows a man can be respectable among men while he is disobedient to God.

**Psalm 2** gives a series of prophecies concerning the Lord's 'anointed', thus concerning Christ, followed by record of an exhortation, warning and blessing.

What is best evidence this psalm referred to Christ? Acts 4:25-27 is all the evidence we need.

Why is God represented as laughing at those who oppose Him? Because their opposition to Him is in vain. They cannot overthrow His plans nor defeat His purposes. Psa. 76:10 sets forth truth on this subject; so does Isa. 44:24, 25.

What is meant by v. 8? Isa. 62:1, 2 indicates reference is here made to Gentile nations receiving the Gospel, and Eph. 2:19-22 indicates Gentiles who received the Gospel became inheritance of the Lord for they're declared his 'household' and 'habitation'. Then by reading v. 9 with Rev. 11:14-18 we learn overthrow of disobedient nations near close of the Savior's reign is here foretold.

What is meant by v. 12? Command or exhortation to embrace God's Son by obeying him, attended by a warning and promise.

**Psalm 3** mentions David's enemies had increased and concluded God would not help him, but that he had entire confidence in God's help while he was asleep as well as when awake. Then he declared he would not be afraid of 10,000 enemies. Next recorded a brief prayer, declared what God had done for him, then that salvation belongs to the Lord and His blessing is on His people.

Has such a psalm bearing on those who serve God in the Gospel age.? In spiritual sense it applies in every particular. David's fleshly enemies increased because God chose him to be king; and spiritual enemies of Christians increase just in proportion as the Lord uses them for honor and glory of His name. Then as the Lord defeated David's fleshly enemies and exalted him so He will overthrow spiritual enemies of Christians if they serve Him faithfully.

**Psalm 4** records several expressions of prayer, mention of rejoicing and confidence David had even when asleep. Then mentions his enemies, and teaching applicable in all ages.

What is meant by 'leaving' in v. 2? Lies.

What is meant by v. 4? Eph. 4:26 informs. These 2 verses are different expressions of the same command. David said 'be still', and Paul said 'let not the sun go down on your wrath' When mankind become angry they should not allow their anger to cause them to sin, and in

order to accomplish this end they should 'be still' and not cherish wrath, but, get rid of it soon as possible.

What is best plan to get rid of anger? By turning the thought Heavenward and praying to God in the name of Christ anger may be subdued, broken and overcome.

What should we say to those who declare every angry feeling is sinful? Refer them to Psm. 7:11, Mark 3:5, and thereby show 'anger' is attributed to God and Christ.

**Psalm 5** records prayer in which David called on the, Lord to hear his words, give ear to his meditation and harken to the voice of his cry. He then declared the Lord should hear his voice in the morning, that he'd direct his prayer to the Lord and look up to him because of what the Lord is and is not, also because of what the Lord would do. David then gave brief description of the wicked, prayed against them; also prayed for the righteous and declared what the Lord would do for them.

Should Christians pray against the wicked as David did? No. The Savior's prayer for his enemies in Luke 23:34, also Stephen's prayer in Acts 7:60, inform how Christians should pray for their enemies. If we pray for their overthrow it should always be in order that they may be led to repentance.

**Psalm 6** informs of a, prayer in connection with which David pleaded his cause, mention of what his condition in death, would be, also what he suffered. Then that the Lord heard him and on that account his enemies should depart from him.

What of v. 5? Explained by Psa. 30:9 also 88:11. These passages show David thought his usefulness in this world would end when death would come on him. Clearly set forth in Psa. 30:9, 'What profit, is there in my blood when I go down to the pit?' The entire verse shows David was sure the mortal part of man could only praise the Lord while living. He asks, 'Shall the dust praise Thee? Shall it declare Thy truth?' These queries imply negative answers and that in order for man to be of service in this world he must be numbered with the living.

**Psalm 7** sets forth David's prayer against his enemies in midst of which he mentioned his own conduct and asked to be judged according to his own righteousness and integrity. Then declared his defense was of God who saved the, upright, who also judged the righteous and was angry, with the wicked every day. He then mentioned what the Lord would do to the wicked if he would not turn from his iniquity, declaring evil doings of the wicked must should return on himself. In v. 7 David declared he would praise, the Lord and sing praise to His name.

What events in David's history are suggested by the statement in v. 4 that he had delivered him who was without cause his enemy? 1 Sam, 24:7 and 26:5-9 inform us. Saul was David's enemy without cause, but David would not suffer one of his men to do him

personal harm.

What events in Bible history are suggested by vs. 15, 16? Story of Haman and Mordecai in the book of Esther, also Dan. 6.

Does anything occur in the Gospel age which seems as if a man's evil intentions against others are brought on himself? Yes. In political, financial, social, domestic and religious departments of life evil designs and doings of many persons are turned on themselves. To what extent such result is accomplished by natural outworkings of right and wrong, and to what extent by special providence of Him who is 'governor among the nations' (Psa. 22:28) and notes even the sparrow's fall (Mat. 10:29), we may never know.

**Psalm 8** brings what may be justly called praise and adoration. David praised and adored the Lord because of His glory and that He had condescended to be mindful of man, also that He had placed man over Divine works here on earth.

What is meant by v. 20, Mat. 11:25, 26; 21:16 and 1 Cor. 1:25-27 inform us. The Lord knew if He should choose great, and learned men to advocate the Gospel then enemies of the Gospel would ascribe much, if not all, its success to the men who were its advocates. Therefore He decided to choose ignorant men to first proclaim His gospel. David's eye was unsealed so he could see this, and Acts 4:13 informs on this subject.

Was not Paul a learned man? Yes, but 1 Cor. 2:1-4 informs that as a preacher of the Gospel he did not use his human learning (v. 5 informs why).

What would have resulted if learned and unlearned men connected with the Church in all generations of the Gospel age had confined themselves to Divine testimony instead of venturing into domain of human speculation which has been misnamed 'interpretation'? The gospel of God's grace would never have been intermingled with human mess, nor would Christians' minds have been corrupted from simplicity that is in Christ, if Paul's example had been followed in regard to human learning.

**Psalm 9** gives an address to the Lord in which are incorporated exhortation to sing praises to the Lord and declare among the people His doings, also prayer for mercy, and for the Lord to arise against man in general and against heathen in particular.

What may be justly said of such a psalm? It is told to God in which David stated what he would do, what the Lord had done and would do, and what the psalmist desired Him to do. In that which the Lord says in this Word he talks to us, and in our prayers, thanksgivings, praises and adorations we talk to God.

What is meant by 'Higgaion' and 'Selah' at close or v. 16? Former means 'meditation' and the latter means simply a 'pause'. Such at least is indicated by use of 'Selah'.— Reading a psalm before the public we are not required to repeat 'Higgaion' and 'Selah', as they do not mean a thing to an audience.

**Psalm 10** gives a talk to, God in which the psalmist says much of the wicked, of their conduct toward God, also toward the poor and humble.

Is all David said of the wicked in his day true of them now? They still boast of their heart's desire and Fraise the covetous; they still are to proud to seek after God, their ways are still grievous, and they refuse to consider Divine judgments. Wicked men constantly plan against the, innocent, poor and humble. This is true of rich wicked men, of those who struggle to become rich, and of many who simply try to live and enjoy themselves by downfall of others. Desire for money is chief temptation in direction, of wickedness of nearly all kinds (see 1 Tim. 6:10).

How may desire for wealth be controlled? By daily studying the Bible. God's Word enables those who study it daily to understand true value of material wealth and value of all else in this world.

**Psalm 11** states the psalmist trusts in the Lord, and in v. 2 he turned attention to the wicked. In v. 3 he asked concerning the righteous. In remainder of this psalm David mentioned where the Lord is, that He beholds mankind and tries them, also of what He does to the righteous and wicked.

What is meaning of v. 3? Indicates the righteous can do nothing if the foundations be destroyed. Take all facts and truths from the righteous and they are helpless because they cannot resort to lies. The righteous cannot make even a show of success if their foundations be destroyed in any book, speech or argument. They cannot manufacture foundations, thus cannot call on their imagination for facts. They are bound up, in, down and under to truth and fact in every instance.

**Psalm 12** gives a prayer for the Lord's help because the godly cease to live and the faithful fail from among mankind. Then several verses are devoted to description of the wicked. Vs. 6, 7 set forth eulogies of the Lord's words.

What is meant by v. 6? Means that as silver is certainly separated from all dross when purified 7 times, so the Lord's words are certainly separated from everything not pure. As every wise man measures his words and endeavors to use them judiciously, so the Lord, infinite in wisdom, has measured His words in making verbal revelation to mankind.

What is meant by v. 7? The psalmist intended to teach the Lord will keep His words and preserve them forever.

What may we say to those who pretend the Bible is doubtful because it has passed through corrupt hands? God could make Satan a safe keeper of His Word. Three Hebrews were safe in a fiery furnace and another Hebrew was safe in a den of lions. Why then could not Divine words be safe in corrupt hands? God's care was over the mentioned Hebrews and



His care has ever been over His words. Who could, can or may do them harm? If we received evidence the entire Bible was for 1,000 years or more in Hell in custody of the devil, we should not on that account feel doubt concerning it. This v. 7 and Psa. 138:2 should banish all doubt concerning integrity of the Starred Text in minds of all who believe in God.

Are there any now who act according to v. 4? Yes. They seem to feel at liberty to use their tongues and lips in any manner they see fit. Some are by nature and education loose in speech and talk recklessly without intending to harm anyone; others with wicked designs force their tongues and lips to say what they think will accomplish their wicked ends.

What is, the remedy against such misuse of speech? The Bible in the mind and heart.

**Psalm 13** teaches David felt impatient by reason of God's delay in answering his prayers against his enemies. But the last verses show he had some assurance God would not always delay, but that, as he had trusted in the Lord, he would be enabled to rejoice in salvation the Lord would work for him. He seemed also to encourage himself to sing unto the Lord because of what He had previously done for him.

How long did king Saul persecute David? About 7 or 8 years.

Was not that a long time for a person to be constantly hunted by a king and his mightiest men? It was, and David seemed weary of it.

But did not the Lord overrule it all for good? He did. Besides, the persecution David suffered gave him experience that enabled him to write psalms in his maturer life which God intended for comfort and consolation of His people in all generations.

**Psalm 14** informs of what the fool said in his heart, and what was and is condition of 'children of men' in contradistinction from the Lord's 'people'. V. 7 is prophecy concerning return of Jews from captivity.

In view of this reference to the Jews' captivity what may we conclude in regard to those referred to as 'the children of men'? Reference seems to the heathen who oppressed Jews in captivity.

**Psalm 15** gives description of the man who shall abide in the Divine tabernacle and dwell in His holy hill; thus of the man whose conduct meets Divine approval.

Do we not find here description of a gentleman in highest sense of that word? In all human literature there is probably not a description of a gentleman nearly equal to what is here found. Another evidence the Bible is the best book in the world.

**Psalm 16** shows a prayer of David in midst of which is prophecy concerning evil which should befall those, who would go after another god. The psalm ends with prophecy concerning Christ.

What evidence have we that this referred to Christ? Acts 2:25-28 informs.

What is bearing of v. 4 on people of this generation? Sorrows of those are multiplied who adopt human devices in religion. By not studying the Bible so as to learn the Divine plan for saving sinners and sanctifying believers they remain ignorant of its adaptation to mankind in all life's conditions. Therefore they endeavor to improve the Divine arrangement by their own devices. Different men have adopted different devices and furnished occasion for disputes and strifes, sorrow and shame. In course of time all such devices have proved ineffective, and confusion of mind resulted.

**Psalm 17** sets forth prayer of David in which he mentioned what the Lord had done and would do for him, closing his 'speech' by declaring he would behold the Divine face in righteousness, and be satisfied when he awoke with the Divine likeness.

What may we safely say of v. 4? Sets forth the only plan by which Christians can keep themselves from paths of the destroyer. Multitudes obeyed the Gospel with full purpose to serve the Lord all the days of their life, but afterward turned aside to men's works, thus to paths of the destroyer, simply because they did not diligently study God's word. Thousands now are in the same condition. They have obeyed the Savior, been redeemed from false doctrines and practices, but will not become daily students of the Divine word, thus will not try to grow in grace and knowledge of the truth, so as to keep themselves from 'works of men' and thereby keep from 'paths of the destroyer'. As a result they will sooner or later be perverted by a false doctrine or practice, and be destroyed. 1 Cor. 11:19 indicates God suffers heresies to arise for this very purpose. Those who become good and wise enough, by studying the Divine word, to reject all heresies, are approved of God and will be saved. But all who don't study God's word so as to be wise and good enough to reject heresies, are not approved of God and will not be saved.

**Psalm 18** shows David declared love for the Lord, then what the Lord was to him, also what He had done for him, then wondrous manifestations of himself the Lord had made at different times. Again he mentioned what the Lord had done for him, then made a few statements of how he acted toward the Lord. How the Lord would show himself or appear to different characters is next stated, and what He would do to certain classes of mankind. God's perfection, what the Lord had done, and would do for him even to the end, are chief revelations in remainder of this psalm.

What may we learn by vs. 25, 26? That human nature is always the same. God seemed to mankind anciently according to their own characters. Same is true now. The merciful man is filled with admiration for God's mercy, while the cruel man regards God as cruel. Infidels often grow eloquent against God because of what seems to them 'shocking cruelty', while they would be cruel enough to take the Bible from mankind and give nothing in its place.

What of v. 30? Declares God's way 'perfect', his word is 'tried', and he is a 'buckler' to all who trust him.

What does 'buckler' mean? Name of a small round shield pertaining to, armor of an ancient soldier, and was intended to catch blows. This verse declares perfection of God's way, and that his word is tried, tested or proved; also that God is a shield for those who trust him. Thus it was, thus it is and will be 'til the end. Then God will be, the everlasting consolation and wonder of the redeemed. They will wonder that a Being so great and glorious ever condescended to create such a being as man, to care for him through life, redeem him from the grave, and exalt him to Heaven's honors and glories. Such wonder will cause everlasting gratitude in every redeemed spirit, and such gratitude will cause everlasting praise to God and Christ (see Rev. 4:11; 5:9-13).

**Psalm 19** consists of declarations of what the heavens declare, also of what God's written word is and does; and it ends with prayer.

Is external nature sufficient to convince the human mind there is a supreme being who deserves to be called God? David so, declares in beginning this psalm, and Paul in Rom. 1:18-20 so affirms. Besides, history of the Grecian Socrates informs he so reasoned concerning the mind or spirit of mankind that he concluded there exists one true God above all gods of the heathen.

But could anyone of ordinary brain in heathenism unaided by the Bible rise to the conclusion there is only one true God? Isa. 44:20 indicates he cannot; yet when the truth is offered to even the ordinary they could accept it if they would.

Do wonders of external nature indicate God is per-feet in all his ways? They do.

What then may we safely say to those who say and do what implies God has given a defective volume for men's spiritual guidance? They indirectly charge God with being less interested in man's spiritual than in his temporal welfare. They admit God stamped perfection on all that pertains to this world, but stamped imperfection on what pertains to the world to come! Such implication is in direct, opposition to v. 7, also to what the apostle Paul declares in 2 Tim. 3:16, 17.

What may we learn by v. 13? David regarded sins of presumption as very dangerous.

What does 'presumptuous' mean? Exo. 21:14, Num. 15:30 also Deut. 1:43 indicate 'presumptuous' in the Bible means 'perverse, self-willed'; thus 'presumptuous sins' were against light or knowledge.

What may we then say of those who sin through ignorance which is willful, because it is result of unwillingness to learn all within their reach? They are guilty of presumption because their ignorance is self-willed.

What is true, in regard to all sectarians with reference to learning? They adopted one or more erroneous ideas which tend to prevent them from learning any and all truth in

opposition to what they adopted.

**Psalm 20** records verses setting forth petitions any Jew might offer in behalf of another Jew. We then find expressions in regard to rejoicing, confidence and determination, appropriate for all Jews.

What of v. 7? In general bearing it is appropriate for Christians to use. They can say, Some trust in societies, festivals and musical instruments; but we will remember the name of the Lord. Again: Some trust in colleges and some in fine meetinghouses; but we'll remember the name of the Lord. And again: Some trust in secret grips and countersigns, in 3 links and the sign of a compass and square; but we will remember the name of the Lord our God.

**Psalm 21** sets forth an address to the Lord which David began and ended by mentioning strength of the Lord, and of his joy and praise by reason of that strength. This also mentions much the Lord had done for David, and much he would do against his enemies.

Will the Lord grant Christians desires of their hearts? 1 John 5:14 informs of the limit within which Christians' prayers will be answered. 2 Cor. 12:7-10 informs Paul prayed for what the Lord was not pleased to grant, but He gave him grace to bear his trial. In prayers concerning earthly affairs Christians should remember the Savior's words in Luke 22:42 and follow his example in saying 'nevertheless, not my will but Thine be done'. Then they will never be disappointed in results. It is a serious question whether any prayer in regard to earthly affairs is acceptable to God which is not offered in the spirit expressed in Luke 22:42. The Bible tells for what we may pray and what we may fully expect to receive in regard to spiritual things. Therefore we may pray in full assurance of faith for pardon of sins and strength to endure trial, when we comply with other Divinely appointed conditions of receiving pardon and strength. But in earthly affairs we do not always know what is best for us. Nevertheless the Lord knows what is best, and for this reason we, should always say 'not my will but thine be done' in one form or another, when we pray in regard to things pertaining chiefly to this world.

**Psalm 22** gives address to the Lord in which David summed up many of his afflictions, personal and official, and in connection are found 4 sentences which, in the New Testament, are used by the Savior, or with reference to him. (see v. 1 and Mat. 27:46; v. 8 and Mat. 27:43; v. 18 and Luke 23:34; v. 22 and Heb. 2:12.

On what principle are certain declarations in the Old Testament applied to person and events in both Old and New Testaments? On the principle of 'double reference.' When a prophet's personal experience, or vision of his people's experience, reached its height or depth, then his prophetic eye was unsealed to behold certain events Divinely ordained to be

fulfilled in the Gospel age. Thus with David, Isaiah and other prophets. This fact must be kept in mind while prophetic books are read, in order to understand certain declarations there.

**Psalm 23** informs David mentioned the Lord as his shepherd, then the confidence he had by reason thereof, also what the Lord was doing and would do for him

Should mankind fear a shadow? No, and for this reason should not, fear death when they have prepared for it by obeying the Gospel. Death is only a shadow, and only those fear it who live not in, harmony with the Divine will.

**Psalm 24** declares the earth and all else pertaining to this world belong to God, then the foundation of the earth is declared. Next we find description of the character acceptable to God. Then an address to gates and everlasting doors, and mentions the King of glory entering through them.

To what does the last part of this psalm refer? V. 3 indicates it refers to one who should stand in the Lord's 'holy place'.

Who was on earth who has gone to God's holy place in Heaven? The Lord Jesus Christ.

Would not such address of David have been appropriate in regard to Christ's ascension into Heaven? Very appropriate. Besides, here is another instance of a prophet's eye being uncovered or unsealed so he could behold future glories. David inquired who should ascend into the hill of the Lord and who should dwell in His holy place. That inquiry was in behalf of mankind generally, then he was enabled to foresee Christ 'the King of glory' entering the 'holy place' in Heaven.

**Psalm 25** gives David's prayer in connection with words of praise to the Lord and instruction to mankind.

What is bearing of v. 14 on those who fear God in the Gospel age? That the Lord will show his covenant to those who fear him because those who really fear him will study his Word so as to learn what the Divine covenant is. The secret of the Lord is with all such because they learn what the Divine will is.

**Psalm 26** sets forth David's prayer requesting the Lord to judge and examine him in view of his uprightness; in which he also mentioned what he had and had not done.

What of v. 12? David mentioned he was in good position and not liable to slip.

What is bearing of that expression on us? Christians stand in 'an even' place while they remain strictly with the Gospel.

**Psalm 27** sets forth David's great confidence in the Lord, and words of prayer to the Lord and instruction for mankind.

What of v. 8? Indicates David's disposition by reason of which he was in early life called a man after God's own heart. That is to say, he was not stubborn. Always willing to be convinced, always ready to acknowledge wrong when convinced thereof.

How should mankind act in regard to being convinced and confessing wrongs? They should imitate David. When God calls they should answer, and when he commands they should obey. When truth addresses them they should listen, and when what they think is error addresses them they should investigate if they have not already done so. Prejudice or pre-judgment should not control any human mind, and stubbornness should be regarded as beneath dignity of every human being.

**Psalm 28** records David's prayer in strong terms against the wicked, that justice be inflicted on them, making no mention of mercy. David blest the Lord because he had been heard, and declared the Lord was his strength and shield, also the shield of His anointed. The prayer ends with petition for all God's inheritance.

**Psalm 29** is address to the mighty, calling them to give the Lord glory and strength, the glory due His name, and to worship the Lord in beauty of holiness. David then declared what the Lord's voice, had done and was still doing, also, gave other reasons why the mighty should give the Lord his due.

How should we be impressed by this psalm? That God is much greater than earth's greatest; that we should always be filled with adoration for Him and give glory due His name.

But are there not people so constituted they are not disposed to praise and adore the God of heaven and earth? Yes, a majority are so constituted, and so much occupied with life's affairs that they forget God. But if they read some part of the Bible with ease each day they would learn to praise and magnify the Lord.

**Psalm 30** says David declared he would extol or praise the Lord because of what He had done, for him; we learn also that he enjoined on saints to sing to the Lord, and why. The psalmist then wrote concerning himself and what the Lord had done for him, and that he would praise the Lord forever.

What benefit should Christians receive from such a psalm? They should feel encouraged to continue faithful. If the Lord did not suffer David's foes to rejoice over him, He certainly will not suffer enemies of His faithful ones in the Gospel age to rejoice over them except it

be for some good which could not otherwise be accomplished. This thought should never be forgotten. Still we should pray, 'Nevertheless, not my will, but Thine be done' (Luke 22 :42). Such should be our prayer in connection with all petitions to be delivered from what we fear or dread.

**Psalm 31** gives declaration of David concerning his trust in the Lord, then a prayer with statements concerning whom David had hated, what he would rejoice in, what the Lord had done for him, and what he had suffered by reason of his enemies. The prayer ends with exhortation to all saints.

What may saints who now live learn by this psalm? That David's prayers, praises, thanksgivings and adorations were outgrowth of his trials and deliverances.

Is not the same true of Christians? It is. Trials seem necessary to cause mankind of every age to feel need of help, thus importance of calling on God in prayer. Then after being brought low by trials they are filled with thanksgiving by reason of their deliverances. In midst of peace and plenty mankind are liable to forget God, but in distress they feel constrained to call on Him. Psa. 107 sets this forth repeatedly.

**Psalm 32** finds blest condition of those whose transgression was forgiven. Then David mentioned how he felt when he kept silence. Next declared he acknowledged his sin and the Lord forgave him. The psalm ends with exhortation to the righteous and the upright in heart.

What does this psalm teach on forgiveness or pardon? That God forgave, and under the Jewish law.

Is this the only scripture in the Old Testament setting forth that? In Num. 14:19, 20 we find the same.

What may we safely say of those who deny sins were really pardoned before Christ's death for sins of the world. They deny part of the Bible, even that the Savior told the truth in Luke 7:47.

Is Heb. 10:4 in opposition to these scriptures? Tho Bible does not contradict itself. God had right to forgive sins in view of Christ's death, and Christ could forgive sins in view of his own death even before he really died.

**Psalm 33** sets forth that David told the righteous what to do and why. Next he told all the earth, referring to people, what to do and why. Next he stated what nation is blest, whence the Lord looks on inhabitants of the earth, what He has done for them, also what is not good confidence. Then he stated on whom rests the eye of the Lord and why. The psalm ends with expression of confidence in the Lord and prayer for mercy.

What of David's command to use man-made musical instruments in praising the Lord? Was appropriate in an age of sensuous worship, but is not for Christians. Man-made musical instruments used in the Jewish age had somewhat same relation to song service of the church of Christ as the man-made Jewish altar had to the Gospel, in obedience to which mankind present themselves as living sacrifices to God. Those who wish to introduce David's musical instruments into worship of God through Christ should be consistent and contend for the literal dance, the literal 2-edged sword and literal slaying of heathen, for those items of Jewish practice are all recorded in Psa. 149.

Why then do persons professing to be intelligent disciples contend for use of musical instruments in worship of God through Christ? They do 'err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God' (Mat. 22:29). In many instances they have spent more time with song books than in studying the Bible. As result they are unacquainted with God's Word.

Is this the only reason why they desire to use such instruments? No. In many instances the chief reason, religious persons have for wishing to use such instruments is because they are pleasing and popular. If non-professors, who stand outside all churches, would turn against musical instruments in religious worship the churches would likely abandon their use. Churches use such instruments, generally if not universally, as a bid for popularity.

**Psalm 34** begins by David declaring what he would do at all times, and in whom his soul should boast. Then called on others to magnify the Lord with him, and stated what, he, had done and with what results. Then stated what others had done and with what results. The Lord's care for those that fear Him is next mentioned, followed by exhortations in connection with which is mentioned what befalls young lions and wicked persons, while the Lord will care for the righteous.

**Psalm 35** sets forth David's prayer against his enemies in connection with which are statements concerning manner in which he behaved when his enemies were sick. The psalm ends with prayer for his friends and statement concerning his purpose to praise the Lord if his prayer would be granted.

**Psalm 36** informs of the impression transgression of the wicked made in David's heart, also what the wicked did. Then he mentioned mercy of the Lord, also the Lord's faithfulness, righteousness, judgments and loving kindness, as reasons why the children of men should confide in Him. He then stated with what man kind should be satisfied and why. Then prayer for the good and against the evil, and statements in regard to the wicked.

If professed Christians studied v. 8 'til they would feel satisfied with fatness and fullness of the Divine provision for and in the church, what would result? All human devices in religion would be discarded, and all professed Christians would become real Christians. As a result, they would be united, and there would be but one religious body professing to be of Christ, and all members of that body would endeavor to keep unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.



**Psalm 37** consists of good advice and reasons for it. Is this advice applicable to God's people in all ages? It is, excepting that in the Gospel age Divine assurances are with reference to spiritual rather than temporal affairs. Christians may rest confident that if they serve the Lord faithfully he will bring them safely through their trials, either by causing their trials to end or by giving them strength to endure.

**Psalm 38** records David's prayer in regard to a disease that afflicted him, in connection with which he mentioned how his lovers, friends and enemies treated him.

Did David have enemies because he did what was right? So indicates in v. 20. Besides, history of king Saul's enmity toward him, in last part, of 1st Samuel, shows jealousy was the secret of that enmity.

Are Christians ever hated because they do right? Yes That is the only reason why genuine Christians can be hated, for they confine themselves to doing right. If they make mistakes they hold themselves ready to be convinced of their wrongs and, when convinced, they endeavor to right the, wrongs. Nevertheless certain professed Christians suffer themselves to cherish jealousy in their hearts so that they hate certain others who are better than themselves.

**Psalm 39** reveals David's statements regarding himself then a prayer.

What of v. 4? A good prayer for Christians. We all need to consider the end of this life, and how frail we are, in order that we may feel need of Divine help. In other words, the better we know our own weaknesses the more we shall know our need of God and of Christ.

**Psalm 40** states David waited patiently for the Lord, then stated what the Lord did for him. Next mentioned the blessed man then David magnified the Lord for His wonderful works and thoughts. Then statements to the Lord which seemed not in harmony with the connection, following which is prayer continued to end of the psalm.

What information does the New Testament give in regard to vs. 6-8? In Heb. 10:59 we learn those are prophecy concerning Christ.

Why was prophecy regarding Christ introduced in midst of this psalm? V. 5 mentions God's wonderful works and thoughts toward mankind, and it was appropriate for the Lord at that juncture of thought to unscale the psalmist's eye and enable him to behold the most wonderful of all God has thought and done for mankind.

**Psalm 41** gives David's sentence of blessing on the one who considers the poor, followed by

statements of what the Lord would do for him. Next we read David's prayer in connection with which he mentioned how the enemy treated him. The psalm ends with expression of everlasting blessing of the Lord.

What may we learn in bearing of v. 9? Considering John 13:18 we learn David, describing his enemy, stated what was to be fulfilled in an enemy of the Savior.

Did David ever have an enemy of that kind? Yes. His son Absalom was guilty of treason.

Do Christians suffer from such enemies? Some do. Not unfrequently a person in whom a Christian has confidence becomes his worst enemy. In many instances the seducer eats bread at the table of the home he disgraces.

In such instances can Christians find consolation in the Bible? Yes. They can console themselves by considering what Christ suffered when Judas betrayed Him.

**Psalm 42** presents David's statements regarding his longing for God, then in regard to his distress. Followed by declarations in regard to what he would do and what the Lord would do.

What is meant by 'my tears have been my meat' in v. 3? 'Meat' means 'food', and the idea is that he has shed tears instead of eating his food.

**Psalm 43** records David's prayer against an ungodly nation, also against the deceitful, unjust man. He inquired also why the Lord cast him off, and why he mourned because of the enemy. Then declared what he would do, and what he felt confident he would do by way of rejoicing in the Lord.

When did David have such experience mentioned in this psalm? When persecuted by king Saul, and when he fled from Jerusalem for fear of Absalom.

**Psalm 44** shows David first wrote concerning what he heard of God's dealings with Israelites when He brot them out of Egypt and established them in the promised land. Then he requested the Lord to command deliverances for Israelites as descendants of Jacob, after which he declared what he and his people would do through the Lord's power, and what the Lord had done for them, also confidence he had in the Lord. Then we find prophecy unfavorable, and David seemed confused with reference thereto, as Israel had not at that time turned from the Lord. But, the Lord enabled him to foresee what Israel would do and the results. Thus in this psalm David wrote, concerning past, present and future of Israel's history. By considering these several bearings and other of David's writings we become prepared to understand the 'Prophetic Books'.

**Psalm 45** is a song with reference to a Divine king, then with reference to his daughter.

What was such song intended to mean? Heb. 1 informs that what is here stated concerning 'the king' referred to Christ in his spiritual glory and, by implication, what is said about 'the king's daughter' refers to the Lord's people in spiritual beauty and glory. Here again we find by studying the book of Psalms we become prepared to understand Prophetic writings. In this book we find History, Law and Prophecy mingled. Prophecy here found, in some instances, referred simply to Jews, as such, or to heathen, as such, or to Christ and His Church.

**Psalm 46** sets before us that God is the refuge, strength and present help of his people, and for that reason they should not fear in any circumstances. Mention is made also of spiritual glories of the Church of God as consummated in the New Jerusalem, described in Rev. 22. This psalm likewise sets forth God's final supremacy over the earth, thus over heathen nations.

**Psalm 47** sets before us a command, or exhortation, of David addressed to all people,—to clap their hands, shout and sing praises because God is King over the earth, reigns over the heathen, and sits on the throne of His holiness; also because shields of the earth belong to Him and He is greatly exalted.

What is meant by 'the shields of the earth belong to God? That He controls all weapons of war, thus that He can control wars to His honor and glory.

**Psalm 48** tells of Mount Zion, highest mount of Jerusalem, and in this instance is mentioned for the entire city of Jerusalem. Originally the fortress of Jerusalem (2 Sam. 5:6-9).

What of David's description of Jerusalem under the name 'Mount Zion'? Dignified and grand. Applicable to the 'church of God' in first part of the Gospel age. Will apply also to the church in the last part of the Gospel age if Christ's disciples do their duty.

**Psalm 49** sets forth David's exhortation to inhabitants of the world with promise that he would speak to them words of wisdom; then remainder of the psalm consists of fulfillment of the promise.

What classes of persons specially mentioned? The rich and the weakness of their riches, then exposes folly in trusting in their riches.

Do persons now 'call their lands after their own names'? They do.

And is it true that men praise those who do well to themselves? It is. Whoever treats himself well and makes success in affairs of this world will secure for himself many

compliments.

What does David mean by 'wisdom' and 'understanding'? Psa. 111:10 informs.

What effect would this psalm have on the rich if they read it carefully every day? Most, if not all, would break down in earthward confidence and humble themselves before God.

Why is it mankind generally live, in disobedience to God? Because they don't read the Bible.

**Psalm 50** shows David declared God had spoken, then what God said.

Does this psalm indicate anything in regard to the wicked advocating God's cause? Yes. Beginning with v. 16 the Lord expressed disapproval of the wicked declaring the Divine law or even taking the Divine name in their mouth.

What is Divine teaching in the Gospel age on this subject? Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus indicate, preachers of Christ should keep themselves pure.

**Psalm 51** records David's prayer with confession of sin and explanation of his weaknesses; also promises of what he would do after the Lord answered His prayer.

What of v. 5? Explanation of David regarding why he singed.

Does the explanation indicate the doctrine of original sin or guilt transmitted from parent to child? No. Ezek. 18 shows God did not intend guilt transmitted from parent to child.

What then does v. 5 set forth? That David, explaining his weaknesses, followed Adam's example and intimated a woman was responsible for them. There is reason to believe he told the truth even as Adam did in regard to woman's responsibility; but Adam wasn't justified because a woman 'beguiled' him, nor was David justified because in sin his mother 'conceived' him. From mistakes of Adam and David we should take warning. We shall not be justified in Heaven's sight because we inherit certain weaknesses nor because someone tries to beguile us. Self-control by reason of right convictions constitutes grandeur and glory of manhood and womanhood. The Divine promise of salvation is to those who 'overcome' weaknesses; not to those who yield to them (Rev. 2, 3).

**Psalm 52** gives David's address to the 'mighty' man who 'trusted in abundance of his riches', also David's statements concerning himself.

What effect should such words have on minds on those who trust in riches? Should humble their proud minds and hearts, and cause them to consider their confidence in riches is vain, and that they ought to obey the, gospel of God's grace so they could trust in Divine

promises.

**Psalm 53** is same in nearly every particular as Psa. 14.

What is specially set forth? Foolishness of infidelity, damage infidels do to God's people, and fear which will come on infidels because God has despised and scattered them.

What may we learn by v. 6? That David as a prophet foresaw captivity of Israel, return of many from captivity and consequent rejoicing.

**Psalm 54** records David's prayer and reason for it, and statement of what the Lord was to him and what the Lord would do to his friends and his enemies. Then David stated what he would do to the Lord because of what the Lord did in his behalf.

What does this psalm indicate? That David's prayers were outgrowth of his trials, also his devotions resulted from God's goodness to him in time of trials.

**Psalm 55** informs of a prayer of David and his reasons, for praying as he did.

What circumstances in David's life seem indicated in this prayer and its explanations? 2 Sam. 15 is indicated, specially when vs. 12, 31 are read in connection with vs. 12-14 of this chapter. David probably walked many times to the Lord's house in company with Ahithophel his counsellor, yet Ahithophel went over to Absalom and against David.

**Psalm 56** gives David's prayer for mercy, with description, of his enemies, also statement of what he'd do toward the Lord and what the Lord did for him.

What is implied by this prayer? That David's prayers were outgrowth of trials and difficulties that came on him through evil purposes of his enemies.

Is same true of Christians? It is. Our trials and difficulties, persecutions and afflictions, determine what our prayers should be and how often we should pray. Then our praises, thanksgivings and adorations are outgrowth of deliverances from things and circumstances which distress us. Very few persons would learn to pray aright if they should be always exempt from every form of trial.

**Psalm 57** is another prayer of David in connection with which he made explanatory statements.

What of v. 8? Mentions certain musical instruments he was disposed to use in praising the Lord.

What bearing on us has the fact that David used such instruments in praise of God?

None, except as indicated by Rom. 15:4. It is Christians' business to learn all that is recorded in the Bible, so as to overcome evil.

**Psalm 58** sets forth brief description of the wicked, then prayer against the wicked, and blessed assurances in which the righteous can rejoice.

What of v. 3? Simply refers, to early date in life of children of the wicked when they go astray. Born of wicked parents they are from the first surrounded by wicked examples and go astray soon as they can know or do anything.

**Psalm 59** is David's prayer against his enemies, then description of his enemies; another prayer to the Lord against the wicked, and what he would do toward the Lord.

What of vs. 5, 11? Indicate David prayed as a Jew, and in this respect Christians cannot imitate him. The Gospel requires Christians shall pray for their enemies, and that God may have mercy on them (Mat. 5: 44; Acts 7:60).

**Psalm 60** indicates captivity of Jews and their return from captivity, then mention of Moabites, Edomites and Philistines.

What is meant by 'wine of astonishment' in v. 2? Figurative form of speech setting forth that Jews would be greatly astonished at Divine judgments.

What is meant by v. 8? See 2 Sam. 8:1,2, 14.

**Psalm 61** is David's prayer with statement in regard to whence and in what circumstances and for what reasons he would call on the Lord.

What effect should reading David's prayers have on Christians? Should make them more humble, devoted, prayerful and happy.

What is meant by 'Thou hast given me the heritage of those that fear Thy name' in v. 5? Means David's heritage among men consisted of rulership over God's people.

What should this suggest to the Gospel preacher?

The hold he may by doing right secure for himself on hearts of Christians whose best interests he may serve.

Is such hold on Christians' hearts of importance? It is the preacher's rich reward on earth and closely related to joy of having a good conscience.

How may preachers gain such reward? By daily studying the Bible for their own spiritual good and living in close communion with God and Christ. Then by being devoted to their

work as preachers, avoiding all talk about themselves as far as possible, avoiding unnecessary criticism on others, and minding their own business, they may gain good spiritual heritage. That is to say, all preachers who have not missed their calling may secure strong hold on hearts of their brothers and sisters in Christ by acting according to directions Paul gave Timothy and Titus. By so doing they will gain good heritage.

**Psalm 62** says David wrote of his soul waiting on God, that from God came his salvation, also that God was his rock and defense, by reason of which fact he would not be greatly moved. We then read what David wrote concerning his enemies, and further statements in regard to waiting on God and confidence God as a 'rock' and 'defense' gave David. Next is in regard to men of low degree, also in regard to men of high degree; then, exhortation concerning what should be done with reference to 'oppression', 'robbery' and 'riches' when they 'increase'. The psalm ends with statements concerning God's power and mercy.

What is meant by v. 9? Just what it says. In Psa. 39:6 we read, 'Surely every man walketh in a vain show', and in connection with that statement mention is made of shortness and vanity of man's life. Therefore 'men of low degree are vanity' and 'men of high degree are a lie'. There is more reality about men of the middle classes than about others.

**Psalm 63** is the psalmist writing of his longings and yearnings for God, in connection with which he expressed confidence in God, and what results would be to his enemies and those who spoke lies.

What should this psalm suggest to Christians? Desire to live in close communion with God and Christ. If David, a pious Jew, could yearn for God and His ways, Christians should do the same, only more abundantly.

**Psalm 64** is David's prayer that he might be preserved from his enemy, from secret counsel of the wicked; then varied description of the wicked. Next we read of God's affliction of the wicked, and results to those who would behold those afflictions.

Will the Lord save his people in the Gospel age from their enemies? In 2 Thess. 3:2 Paul indicated He will.

But was Paul always saved from his enemies? Yes, except that he was suffered to be afflicted by his enemies in order to fulfill the Divine purpose indicated in Acts 9:16.

Why are Christians often required to suffer annoyances and distresses inflicted by evil disposition of their enemies? Heb. 2:10 and 5:8,9 indicate the answer. Christ was perfected for his position as High Priest by things he suffered. This shows we are to be perfected by suffering affliction for Christ's sake, and to prepare us for position of the redeemed in Heaven.

**Psalm 65** informs of God in regard to praise and prayer; what He would do with iniquities of His people; then of blessedness of whom the Lord would choose, then of goodness of

God's house. Next we are informed what God would do in answer to prayer; of God's strength and power, and what He has done and is still doing in blessing, the earth.

Ought not Christians be 'satisfied with goodness' of the Lord's house? They ought and must be if they'd certainly meet Divine favor. In Psa. 18:30 we learn God's 'way is perfect', and in 12:6 we learn 'words of the Lord are pure'. Such teaching should cause us to be satisfied with God's way and words found in his church, 'the house of God, the church of the living God' (1 Tim. 3:15).

In light of such teaching what may we safely say of professed Christians whose conduct implies the church as a Divine arrangement is not perfect? We may safely apply the Savior's words in Mat. 22:29, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'. Moral sentiments of those who think the church as a Divine institution is defective must be very low. Either by nature or education, or in both, they must be morally dwarfed. God's perfect work is seen through the domain of nature; and to suppose His work in establishing the church is imperfect indicates moral imbecility or religious infidelity.

**Psalm 66** teaches God is worthy to be praised by people of all lands, and that people of all the earth shall worship Him. We next read of what God did to his people in suffering them to be afflicted, then delivering them. Then David declares what he would do in paying his vows. The psalm ends with exhortation and remarks concerning what God would do and had done.

What of v. 4? History in and outside the Bible informs some persons, of all great divisions of the earth, have already worshipped God, and indications are that in course of the Millennial age the Lord will be more generally worshipped than He has been at any time since corruption of nations that descended from Noah.

What of v. 18? What it declares is as applicable now as when David wrote it.

What effect should this declaration have on those who live in the Gospel age? Should banish hypocrisy from every mind and heart. Shows all pretense in God's sight is vain. Psalm 139 dearly indicates God knows mankind perfectly, and v. 18 of this psalm informs the Lord knows every secret of human hearts. This suggests Heb. 4:13 and should cause all who consider it to feel assured they cannot deceive God.

**Psalm 67** consists of prayer for God's mercy and blessings, also prayer that the nations might praise the Lord so the earth might yield its increase and all people might fear the Lord.

Did not such prayer embrace even enemies of David? It did.

What is in the New Testament on this subject? Mat. 5:44 informs Christ commanded his disciples to pray for their enemies.

Is such prayer contrary to human nature? It is; but love for God is unselfish, and those who have it always desire their enemies as well as their friends may possess it and rejoice in



its blessings. Moreover if Christians pray for their enemies they will be able to bear reproaches and other afflictions they may suffer with patience and benefit.

**Psalm 68** is David's prayer against his enemies followed by what he thought should befall the wicked; prayer for the righteous, and statements of what God had done and would do for them.

What of those who affirm v. 9 refers to Israelites' baptism at the Red Sea and was accomplished by rain, thus by sprinkling? We should refer them to connection in which that verse is found, which indicates rain fell in the wilderness, thus long after Israelites left the Red Sea.

What of V. 18? A true statement concerning Jehovah, and in the New Testament is declared to have applied to Christ (Eph. 4:8).

What of David's prayer in v. 30, 'Scatter Thou the people that delight in war'? Appropriate prayer for Christians.

What of those who delight in such things as introduce strife and contention into the church? They delight in the most mischievous kind of war—that, always disgraces Christ's name and damages the name of religion in general (Rom. 16:17, 18).

**Psalm 69** records David's prayer in deepest distress, and in connection are forms of expression the New Testament declares applicable to David's royal Son, the Lord Jesus Christ (see vs. 9, 21; John 2:17; Mat. 27:34, 48; Mark 15:23; John 19:28-30).

May Christians pray against their enemies as David prayed against his? Yes, if final salvation of their enemies be the end in view. Christians may pray for God to bring on their enemies and even on their disobedient friends evils which will tend to bring them to repentance. Many persons will never repent 'til humbled by affliction. All success, they endeavor to think, is a mark of Divine approval of their conduct and condition. Therefore, praying for them, we may ask the Lord to send, or suffer, such evils as necessary to lead them to repentance.

**Psalm 70** is David's prayer for the Lord to hasten to help him. In connection is a prayer that his enemies be ashamed and confounded, turned backward and put to confusion; likewise that those who sought the Lord might rejoice and be glad.

What is meant by 'Aha' in v. 3? Natural expression of satisfaction implying an afflicted one is receiving punishment deserved.

**Psalm 71** is David's prayer that he might never be put to confusion but that in Divine righteousness he might escape and be saved. In connection he spoke of God as the one in

whom he trusted, and prayed he might not be cast off in old age when his strength would fail.

Did God ever forsake His people in old age or any other period of their life? No. In all ages God has been constant in care for His faithful servants. Though He sometimes suffered them to be severely afflicted, He overruled their afflictions for their good and His glory.

What of v. 16? Sentiments which should be always remembered and adopted by Christians.

**Psalm 72** is David's prayer for himself as king, and for his son, followed by description of the model king and results of his reign 'til close of time. The psalm ends with sentences of blessing David pronounced on the Lord, and declaration that his own prayers were ended.

What does such statement of David concerning end of his prayers indicate? That this psalm should have been placed at the end, by those who compiled the book or placed David's writings in the order of a volume.

What effect should study of this psalm have on mankind? Should cause all who read it, specially civil rulers, to be impressed with importance of doing righteously at all times.

**Psalm 73** declares God's goodness to Israel, to such as were of a clean heart. Then sets forth that David reproached himself because of his mistake in envying the foolish when he saw their prosperity. Next we find description of the wicked in their prosperity, and of the conclusion David adopted when he went into the Lord's sanctuary. Divine purpose in prospering the wicked is next set forth, and David's grief when he considered his folly in envying them. The psalm ends with statements concerning his relations to God.

What value of this psalm to us? Should enable us to understand and appreciate the 37th division of the book, thus should prevent our envying the rich and fretting against God. Should teach us to be satisfied that the Lord knows what is best for us at all times.

**Psalm 74** indicates David foresaw overthrow of the Jewish nation, fulfilled about 400 years later by reason of wickedness of which that nation would be guilty, specially in days of a certain king. This psalm also mentions what God formerly did for His people, and records prayer for Jews, specially for the poor, and prayer against their enemies.

**Psalm 75** begins with David's declaration in regard to giving thanks to God. Next, of what David said was declared by God's wondrous works, and what David stated he would do when he should receive the congregation to judge it, and what he thought his responsibility was.

What of v. 3? Indicates David foresaw final destruction of the earth and its inhabitants, also that he as king occupied position of great responsibility regard-ins the entire earth.

In what respect was this true? It was of him as an earthly father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

What of vs. 6-8? Suggests 22:28 also Dan. 4:25. The God of Heaven rules in kingdoms of men, and in order to execute His purposes as ruler among men He exalts one man and deposes another, and, on the same principle, exalts one nation, and humbles another.

**Psalm 76** tells God was known in Judah and His name was great in Israel. Mention of God's tabernacle in Salem and His dwelling place in Zion. Next, that God broke implements of war. Glory of God's dwelling place on earth, then spoiling of the stouthearted, then overthrow and fear produced by the Lord's rebuke and anger. God's judgment next mentioned and that His praise is accomplished by man's wrath. The psalm ends with exhortation and warning.

What of v. 10? Mentions God's overruling power and providence by which He is able to turn to good account even the worst of man's dispositions and deeds.

What effect should confidence in such power and providence produce in mankind? Should cause them to be patient in tribulation at all times.

**Psalm 77** sets forth statements in regard to what David did and said when afflicted and discouraged, likewise statements of thoughts by which he endeavored to encourage himself.

What may Christians learn by this psalm? They should learn that a discouraged condition of mind and heart is sometimes result of physical infirmities; also, that the best way to banish such conditions and be encouraged is to follow David's example. He decided to remember the Lord's works and wonders of old, also to meditate on all God's works and talk of His doings.

What is chief cause of discouragement in minds and hearts of Christians? Weakness of faith.

And what is chief cause of weakness of faith? Ignorance of the Bible.

What is chief reason for ignorance of the Bible? Religious sectarianism.

**Psalm 78** sets forth David's exhortation to give ear to his words; then brief statement of God's dealings from time of Israel's deliverance from Egypt 'til when he was chosen king, and even 'til when he became established in his kingdom as judge over Israel.

What of v. 10? We should learn it was offense to God for His ancient people when armed to turn back in the day of battle.

What bearing should that have on Christians? Should cause them to consider importance of putting on the whole armor of God, then standing against the enemy as indicated by Eph.

6:11-19.

What of v. 38? Sets forth that God forgave sins in the Jewish age.

What of those who deny sins were forgiven before Christ died on the cross? Mat. 22:29 indicates the answer. Testimony is clear that God pardoned sins, and that Christ pardoned sins before he died for sin of the world. But all such pardon was extended in view of the death God ordained he should die in behalf of mankind.

What of v. 60? 1 Sam. 4 informs in regard to time and circumstances of God's forsaking Shiloh, where he had established his dwelling place in Israel. Jer. 7: 12-14 gives additional information.

Will Christ forsake a church because of wrong doing? Rev. 2:5 gives clear testimony on this.

Is character in God's sight determined by any and all wrong doing? No, except in cases of committing crime..

What then determines character before God? Determined by persisting in wrong after being reproved for it (Mat. 18:15-17; Rev. 2:1-5).

**Psalm 79** shows David sets before us a vision God gave in regard to destruction of Jerusalem and Jews' captivity; of his prayer in behalf of Jews and against their enemies.

What does such prophecy indicate? That God foreknew what Jewish people would do in regard to practicing idolatry, and what it would be necessary for Him to do in order to destroy idolatry from among them.

**Psalm 80** gives prayer to God as the Shepherd of Israel and in his prayer mention of the Jewish nation under figure of a vine brought out of Egypt, planted in Canaan, or Palestine, after heathen had been driven out. Flourishing of that vine is mentioned and, last of all, its damaged condition, and prayer in its behalf.

What do statements concerning damaged condition of the vine indicate? Refer to damage Jews would suffer from their enemies by reason of their wrong doing.

What of v. 17; David desired God would specially strengthen the man he would choose to work deliverances for his people.

What bearing on those now God's people? Indicates kind of prayer they should offer for those who seem specially raised up to do Divine work.

**Psalm 81** is exhortation of David in regard to singing, bringing certain instruments, and blowing of trumpets; then certain explanations he made in view of Israelites' history in their deliverance from Egypt. Then further exhortation with additional statements regarding Israel's history. The psalm ends with statements concerning what the Lord would have accomplished through Israelites and would have done for them if they had only obeyed Him.

What of v. 13? Sets forth God's longing for obedience of His people.

What should we say to those who inquire why the Lord did not make His people of such disposition they would have always obeyed Him? Should refer them to 1 John 4:19, and on basis of that scripture inform them the Divine Father desires mankind to love Him because convinced of His love for them,—not because they were incapable of loving another being.

**Psalm 82** begins and ends with declarations in regard to God as Judge. Between these extremes is address to the unjust who oppress the poor.

What of v. 6? Exo. 7:1 states Jehovah made Moses 'a god' to Pharaoh, and connection indicates the meaning is that Jehovah gave Moses His words against Pharaoh and in behalf of Israelites. In that sense inspired Jews have been made 'gods' to mankind generally because through them the Lord made known His word. To this the Savior referred in John 10:34.

But, what of v. 7? Means that though Jehovah declared Jews to be 'gods' and 'children of the Most High', yet they should give their bodies back to the dust, and thus die as men. Same is still true of all mankind, and will continue 'til Christ comes to gather the redeemed to himself.

**Psalm 83** is David's prayer that the Lord would not keep silent nor hold His peace. Reason for that prayer was that the Lord's enemies took 'crafty counsel' against His people. Then mention of nations that took counsel against the Jews. Next, David's prayer against those nations and reasons for thus praying.

What were David's reasons for praying as he did? Set forth in these words—'that they may seek Thy name, O Lord'; also—'that men may know that Thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth'.

May Christians pray for overthrow of their enemies with sincere desire for their conversion to God and Christ? Yes; and overthrow of the Lord's enemies is implied in all prayers for their spiritual good, since very few will think of repenting while prosperity attends them.

**Psalm 84** is expression of praise for Divine tabernacles, then longing for the Divine courts. The fact that the sparrow and swallow found place in God's altar, and blessedness of those who dwell in the Lord's house. Blessedness of the man whose strength was in the Lord,

followed by a prayer. The psalm ends with statements in regard 'to what the Lord had been and would do for the upright, and blessedness of the man who'd trust in the Lord.

What of v. 10? Sets forth what has been true in all ages of the world's history, and will be true through the future, even in eternity. The Bible indicates God's chief purpose in creating mankind was that they might live forever, serve Him and rejoice in His service forever. The Bible and nature unite in teaching God intended mankind to be happy. But the Bible and human experience indicate human happiness is found in living according to Divine arrangements.

**Psalm 85** gives statements concerning what the Lord did for the land and people of Israel. Then a prayer is recorded, also statements concerning David's purpose to hear the Lord, what the Lord would say to His people, and that they should be careful not to turn again to folly. The psalm ends with statements in regard to salvation, mercy, truth, righteousness and peace, as coming from the Lord and bestowed on His people.

Does this psalm refer to Israelites' history in David's day, or to them prophetically? In view of what Israelites suffered from their enemies in days of the Judges, this psalm seems appropriate reference to the time that had passed when David wrote. But, like Psa. 137, it might have been chiefly reference to future of that people, specially to when they should return from captivity beyond the river Euphrates.

**Psalm 86** records David's prayer on basis of the fact that he was poor and needy, also that he was holy, prayed daily and lifted up his soul to the Lord. Then mentioned the Lord's goodness and readiness to forgive; and again prayed. In midst of his prayer he declared all nations the Lord had made should worship before Him and glorify His name. He also prayed the Lord would teach him and, finally, that the Lord would show him a token for good in order that his enemies might be ashamed.

**Psalm 87** gives David's declarations of the dignity, grandeur, glory and permanency of Jerusalem as the city of God.

In view of such declarations why was Jerusalem ever suffered to be destroyed? It was first destroyed because Zedekiah would not do what he was told to do (Jer. 38:17). Mat. 23:37, 38 informs it was destroyed the 2nd time on account of its inhabitants rejecting the Savior. This indicates the permanence of Jerusalem as all actual city was intended to be conditional.

Is there other explanation of the fact that God suffered Jerusalem as a city to be destroyed? There is. The earthly city Jerusalem was typical of the church of Christ, otherwise named 'Jerusalem which is above' (Gal. 4:21-26). Typical character of earthly Jerusalem in foreshadowing the church is like the typical character of David's earthly throne in foreshadowing Christ's throne in Heaven (compare Psa. 89 with Acts 2:30-33). On the same

principle, dignity and glory of the Jewish high priest foreshadowed dignity and glory of Christ as great high priest of true believers in the Gospel age (Heb. 9).

What is meant by v. 2? That the Lord loved the city of Zion, where the ark of testimony was (2 Chron. 5:2). more than He did all private dwellings of His people. His name was recorded in the ark of the testimony, and from between the cherubim He promised to commune with Israelites through the high priest (Exo. 25: 21, 22). Therefore 'gates of Zion' were more closely related to God's throne than were all homes of the Israelites.

What should this suggest to Christians? Near and dear relationship of public worship of the church to Him who died for the church.

**Psalm 88** gives address to the Lord in which David stated he cried day and night to Him; then prayed for the Lord to hear him. Next he wrote about troubles and distresses in connection with which he implied he was sick nigh unto death, and that even his near friends forsook him.

What does all this indicate? That though David was chosen of God and highly favored yet he was permitted to suffer much.

Does the New Testament set forth anything on suffering? Heb. 2:10-17 informs Christ was made perfect by things he suffered, and that sufferings were necessary in order to perfect him for the priesthood, by giving him experience of a man in the flesh.

And what more does the New Testament teach on this? In Rom. 5-3 and Jas. 1:2-4 we learn of advantage trials and temptations will be to Christians if they meet them in the spirit of the Savior indicated by his history, and mentioned in 1 Pet. 2:19-23.

**Psalm 89** sets before us David's rejoicing because God promised to establish his throne forever, and prophecy concerning subjugation of the Jewish nation to its enemies, followed by lamentation over unhappy condition of that nation and God's seeming indifference to its welfare. Thus David was permitted to foresee and foretell permanency of his throne, also an interval in which it would be set aside. That interval is indicated first by vs. 30-32, then by vs. 38-51.

In whom has David's throne been vested since overthrow and scattering of the Jewish nation? Acts 2:29-36 and 15:15-17 indicate it has been vested in Christ and that God's promise, in this psalm, concerning permanency of David's throne, referred first to his own descendants on the literal throne of fleshly Israel, and then to Christ as one of his descendants on the spiritual throne of spiritual Israel.

If this scriptural conclusion is rejected, what follows in regard to promise of permanency of David's throne set forth in this psalm? It follows that the mentioned promise has failed and Divine prophecy is unreliable.

But what shall we say to those who intimate perhaps David's throne has been perpetuated in the Anglo-Saxon race, supposed by some to consist of a residue of the 'lost 10 tribes'? The Bible, does not intimate 10 tribes were lost. But even if they were declared lost, that would not relieve the difficulty, for the tribe of Judah, to which David belonged, was not of those 10 tribes.

**Psalm 90** reveals God is from everlasting to everlasting, while man's existence on earth is very short; then prayer for Divine instruction, mercy and blessing.

What may we learn by v. 10? That duration of life on earth is determined by strength, between 70 and 80 years; and this implies continuance of life during all other periods is determined by strength. All mankind live while they have strength to live, and all die when too weak to live.

What mysteries are, explained by this conclusion? Death of infants and all others is explained. Every individual who has become a victim of death has died for want of strength, thus by reason of weakness.

What doctrine is by this conclusion proved untrue? That the death of every human being has been determined by special Divine decree, Heb. 9:27 sets forth God's general decree on the subject; but death in every individual instance has been and will be result of weakness,—not by special decree except in case of special judgments.

**Psalm 91** shows God's care for those who trust Him.

Was the Divine care as indicated in this psalm manifested toward the Jewish nation as such and toward individual Jews when they were obedient, to God's commands? Yes, 2 King's 19 indicates God's care for the Jewish nation when it, was obedient to Him, and David's history indicates God's care over the individual Jew who obeyed the Divine will.

What bearing have such facts on Christians? Indicated in 1 Cor. 10:13 and 2 Tim. 4:17,18. The Lord will not suffer evil to befall His faithful ones except as will be for their good and His glory. Thus it has been, thus it is and thus it will be.

What application, in the New Testament was made of vs. 11, 12 while Christ, was on earth in the flesh? It informs that Satan quoted and applied them to Christ.

Was that application correct? No evidence to the contrary. Christ was chief among those who did the Father's will and trusted in him. Besides, he did not intimate Satan misapplied these verses, but indicated in his response to Satan that to have put God to the test, presumptuously, would have been wrong. Thus it has been in all ages; thus it will be 'til close of time. Therefore the Savior would not gratify presumption of Pharisees and Sadducees when they asked for a sign (Mat. 16:1-4).



**Psalm 92** teaches of what David said about giving thanks and offering praise to the Lord for his loving kindness and faithfulness. We may learn also something of what David wrote regarding use of musical instruments, likewise in regard to his gladness and how it had been produced. Next in regard to the wicked and what the psalmist thought he would see concerning them, and finally blessings the righteous should enjoy.

What may we learn by considering what David set forth in regard to musical instruments? We should learn use of musical instruments was appropriate in worship ordained for the Jewish age, which worship was shadowy and by images, sights and sounds prefigured, in some measure, what should be spiritual worship during the Gospel age (Col. 2:16, 17; Heb. 10:1).

What did use of musical instruments in the Jewish age prefigure? Eph. 5:19 with Col. 8:1:6 dearly show.

What should we say to those who contend that use of literal musical instruments in the Jewish age justifies use of literal musical instruments in the Gospel age? 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'; for thus contending they show they don't understand difference between a material type and its spiritual anti-type. They thereby show they regard a type and its antitype as the same, and that the musical instrument foreshadowed itself! An absurdity. Besides. on that principle of reasoning the Jewish brazen altar, altar of incense Jewish table of show-bread and golden candlesticks with all else pertaining to Jewish worship could be literally transferred to the Gospel age. Such reasoning ignores Heb. 9, 10 with all else that sets forth difference between law given thru Moses and the gospel given through Christ. Yet such reasoning in principle is adopted by all who advocate instrumental music in the Gospel age because it was practiced in the Jewish age.

**Psalm 93** shows David mentions God's reign, majesty strength; also constancy of the world, of God's throne and his existence. Then mentioned floods of waters and God's exaltation above them. Psalm ends with declaration that Divine testimonies are sure and holiness becomes the Lord's house forever.

**Psalm 94** informs David addressed the Lord as the one to whom belongs vengeance, and called on Him, as Judge of the earth, to lift up Himself and reward the proud. Then we are informed concerning the wicked who damaged the Lord's people; that the Lord is the one who can hear, see, correct and teach. Blessedness of the man the Lord chastens and teaches in next mentioned, and David's declarations concerning the Lord as his help, defense and rock of refuge, also what He would do to workers of iniquity.

What may Christians learn here? First they should learn reverence, then humility resulting from it. They should learn also to be patient when the workers of iniquity triumph, because God's longsuffering and forbearance are much greater than man's, thus He will delay His vengeance on the wicked much longer than human impatience suggests.

**Psalm 95** exhorts to sing and make joyful noise to the Lord; also exhortation to approach the Lord with thanksgiving, and statement of reasons for so doing as found in God's greatness and goodness. Warning against following example of Israelites in the wilderness.

Is this psalm applicable to us? Quotes from it in Heb. 3, 4 indicate it is indeed applicable to Christians, specially to those disposed to turn from the Savior in any degree.

What do those references to this psalm indicate? Use inspired men of the New Testament age made of the Old Testament. Shows they referred to it as Divine history showing God's dealings with people of former ages, thus that it is in the Gospel age dangerous to trifle with God's law.

**Psalm 96** sets forth David's exhortation for all mankind to sing unto the Lord, bless his name, and show forth his salvation every day,—even declare his glory and wonders among all people. Then the psalmist sets forth reasons for his exhortation, all again exhorted and declared reason for exhorting. The last reason mentions final judgment of the world of mankind.

**Psalm 97** declares the Lord reigns, and all nature should be glad; also that He reigns in dignity and majesty. Mention of idolatry also and sentence on idolaters. Effect of Divine judgments on the Lord's people. likewise high and exalted character of the Lord. Psalm ends with statements regarding the righteous, followed by exhortations for them to rejoice in the Lord and give thanks at remembrance of his holiness.

**Psalm 98** is exhortation to sing, make joyful and even loud noise unto the Lord; certain inanimate objects—not having life—are called to rejoice. The reason is that the Lord will judge the world of mankind in righteousness.

**Psalm 99** declares the Lord reigns, that he sat between the cherubim; with certain exhortations to the people. The fact that God loves judgment (justice) is followed by mention of Moses, Aaron and Samuel, and what the Lord did by way of speaking to Israelites in the wilderness, in the cloudy pillar, also that He sometimes 'forgave' them when they sinned, though He took vengeance on their inventions.

**Psalm 100** exhorts to make joyful noise unto the Lord, serve him with gladness, and come before him with singing. Mentions the Lord as Creator, and implies He is our shepherd. Psalm ends with exhortation to enter the Lord's gates with thanksgiving and his courts with praise, and to bless His name because he is good and His mercy everlasting, and because his truth endures to all generations.

**Psalm 101** states what David intended to do in regard to singing and behaving himself; then statements in regard to what he would not do, what he hated, what should not cleave to him, what he would cause to depart from him; whom he would not know, also whom he would cut off, and whom he would not suffer, Next, on whom his eyes should be and who should serve him; likewise who should not dwell in his house nor tarry in his sight, and whom he would destroy.

Are Christians permitted to destroy evil doers? No, but they are required to separate themselves from such and if they will not repent Christians should permit them to destroy themselves. After taking from this psalm what is set forth about destroying the wicked, what may we say of the remainder? Christians may adopt it, and same is true of many other psalms. The book of Psalms seems intended to instruct Jews and Christians in prayer, praise, thanksgiving and adoration.

**Psalm 102** sets forth prayer and supplication with statements of his condition; then mentions the Lord's everlasting character and what He would do for Zion, with reasons and results of what he would do. Next,, that the Lord looked down from Heaven to benefit certain needy ones. Then David as a prophet seemed to behold the Lord Jesus Christ and His eternal character and power, as we may judge by reading Heb. 1.

**Psalm 103** informs of David's address to his own soul, in which he called on it to bless the Lord and not forget His benefits: then of what the Lord was doing for him. Next, of what the Lord was doing, had done, would and would not do for others besides David. Near the close frailty and brevity of human life are mentioned, and in contrast are mentioned the Lord's mercy and righteousness. The psalm ends with exhortation for all the Lord's works to bless His name.

**Psalm 104** exhorts to bless the Lord because of His greatness, honor and majesty. Mentions what God does in regard to himself in the heavens, what he has made his angels to be, also what he does in preserving and regulating affairs of this world through nature's laws; mentioning inanimate things, lower orders of the animal kingdom, and finally man. The Lord is then magnified because of his manifold works, then other manifestations of Divine goodness and power are mentioned. The psalm ends with exhortation to praise the Lord.

**Psalm 105** exhorts to give thanks to the Lord, call on his name, declare his deeds among people, sing unto him, talk of his wondrous works, glory in his name, seek him evermore and remember his marvelous works. Then descendants of Abraham and Jacob are addressed with reference to the Lord. Declarations concerning what the Lord did in remembering his covenant forever which he made with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Then statements of Israelites' history in going down into Egypt, their deliverance from bondage in Egypt, time in the wilderness and entrance into the land of Canaan.

What of V. 37? A fact which can only be accounted for on principle of God's special providence in behalf of Israelites. When they went from Egypt they probably numbered 3 millions or more, but no 'feeble person' among them. Wonderful for us to consider!

**Psalm 106** exhorts to praise the Lord, give thanks to him because he is good and his mercy endureth forever. Then questions concerning his mighty acts and his praise, and statement concerning who is blessed. Next, David's prayer, then confession in regard to wrong doing of Israelites in the wilderness, and in the days of judges mentioned in the book of Judges. The psalm ends with prayer, expression of adoration and sentence of praise.

What of vs. 32, 33? They are, taken together, the best commentary on the sin Moses committed at the rock, mentioned in Num. 20. Show his sin consisted in what he said rather than what he did.

**Psalm 107** exhorts to thank the Lord because he is good and his mercy endures forever. Exhorts the redeemed to follow his example in thus speaking of the Lord, then mentions facts in history of Israelites who had been redeemed from the hand of their enemies; and these facts are reasons why they should praise the Lord for his goodness and mercy.

Reading history of wrong doings of Israelites in this psalm and others, should we conclude Israelites were worse in their generations than other nations have been? No. When the time that passed between numerous reformations and backslidings, mentioned in these psalms, is considered, it becomes evident that after a reformation a period of obedience continued through one or two generations before another backsliding. Thus it has been with professed Christians in the Protestant world, and seldom has it been much better with them than with the Jews.

**Psalm 108** declares David's heart fixed, then statements of what he would do because of God's mercy and truth. Next, a prayer for God to exalt himself in order to deliver David. Then names of cities and tribes, and what the Lord said with reference to them. The psalm ends with prayer, then declaration of what David would do through the Lord because He would tread down enemies of His people.

**Psalm 109** reveals a prayer that the Lord would not hold his peace, then mentions the wicked and deceitful who had spoken against David with lying tongue, words of hatred, and fought him without cause. Then said they were his enemies because of his love. Next, very severe prayer against the wicked. Then prayer for the Lord's blessings, and statements of what he'd do in praising the Lord.

May Christians pray against their enemies as severely as David prayed against his? No. All Christians prayers against their enemies should imitate the Savior and the martyr Stephen. If we pray for our enemies to be overthrown we should do so, with hope their overthrow

leads them to repentance. Therefore we should always pray for their eternal welfare.

**Psalm 110** is prophecy in regard to Christ, his kingdom, also his final judgments.

What of v. 29? Means God's people in the Gospel age shall be a willing people.

Can one become a Christian unwillingly? No. Impossible to become a Christian, live a Christian or die a Christian unwillingly. There is no conscript soldier in the Lord's army, but all his soldiers are volunteers. He does not accept service except willingly rendered.

**Psalm 111** exhorts to praise the Lord, then David's expression of determination to praise the Lord with his whole heart. Next, about the Lord's works being great, honorable and wonderful, also that the Lord is gracious and full of compassion. Then, David's statements which seem intended to show in what respects God's works are great, honorable and wonderful. The psalm ends with declaration that God's praise endures for' ever.

What of v. 9? We should learn what use ought to be made of the word "reverend". It is found but once in the Bible, and in this instance applied to God's name.

What of those who apply this word to men's names? They make unlawful and presumptuous use of a word that is made specially sacred by its application in the Bible to God's name only.

But suppose we are told when applied to the name of a man it only means he is a preacher? Our answer should be that a preacher worthy of the name, if one could be found, does not need nor desire to be called Reverend.

**Psalm 112** exhorts to praise the Lord, then blessedness of the man that feareth the Lord and delighteth greatly in His commands. Next, evidences of blessedness of such a man. Then the upright, man is described and favors the Lord will show him. The psalm ends with statements concerning the wicked.

What bearing should this psalm have on Christians' minds and hearts? Should cause them to rejoice; for though the Lord may not do for the faithful in the Gospel age as He did for faithful Jews, yet he has said he will never leave nor forsake Christians (Heb. 18:5). Besides, 1 Cor. 10:13 assures the Lord will not suffer us to be tempted above that we are able to bear, also that He will with the temptation make a way to escape that we may be able to bear it. This should console as in every trial and temptation.

**Psalm 113** begins and ends with exhortation to praise the Lord. Between such beginning and ending the psalm chiefly consists of praise and exaltation of the Lord. In connection is stated that the Lord humbles himself to behold things in the heavens, yet raises the poor out of the dust, and lifts the needy from lowest humility and makes them sit with princes. Mentions that He causes th barren to be fruitful and the desolate woman to be a joyful mother of children.

**Psalm 114** states prominent events in history of Israelites from the time they left Egypt 'til they entered the land of Canaan. Among these are the dividing of the Red Sea and Jordan, also shaking the mountain when God descended on Sinai to give his law to Moses, and the fact that waters were brought from flinty rock.

What ought to have been effect of David's psalms on Jewish People? Should have caused them to always remember what the Lord (did for their fathers, thus should have kept them always in humble obedience to, Divine will.

Why did it not have that effect? They were kept in ignorance of it. Leaders of the people who had privilege of reading sacred writings, of the nation weren't disposed to read them. As a result they remained ignorant and kept the masses of the people in ignorance. Indicated by 2 Kings 22. Josiah had been king 10 yrs. before he saw a copy of the Word of the Lord!

**Psalm 115** states glory should not be given to any of mankind, trot to the Lord because of his mercy and truth. Then mentions heathen inquiring where is the God of Israel, and the answer. Next indicates folly of idolatry because all idols are lifeless and powerless. Then exhorts Israel to trust the Lord also records blessings of the Lord on them that fear him, and David's determination to bless the Lord evermore.

What of v. 17? It considered in light of Eccl. 9. We've learn David and Solomon wrote of what mankind can do while on earth 'under the sun'. Frequency of the expression 'under the sun' in Eccl. 9 shows the statement in v. 17 of this psalm refers to this world. Note Eccl. 9:6 and let all references in favor of materialism based on v. 17 be banished.

**Psalm 116** informs of David's love for the Lord and the reason. Then he declares the Lord is gracious, righteous and merciful. Next, various statements of David concerning himself among which we find his hasty speech that 'all men are liars'. Then his question in regard to rendering to the Lord for benefits received, with statements of his purposes, in connection with which is the statement. 'Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints'.

**Psalm 117** is the shortest division of David's writings, begins and ends with praise. It states also why mankind should praise the Lord. Reasons mentioned still exist and should be considered by all Christians. It is true, God's merciful kindness is great toward us and his truth endures forever.

**Psalm 118** again exhorts to give thanks to the Lord, and David's reason. Then we learn of his reason for confidence in the Lord. The psalm ends with repetition of the exhortation in beginning.

What of v. 8? Said to be the middle verse of the Bible. But whether this statement be true, it, is of utmost importance for all mankind to consider the doctrine set forth.

**Psalm 119** is longest division of David's writings. Arranged in sections of 8 verses each, and each section is under name of a letter of the Hebrew alphabet. Seems written with special purpose of praising Word of the Lord, as it sets forth only a few verses in which that Word is not in some respect favorably mentioned. In vs. 50, 93 David declares the Lord 'quicken'd' or made him alive by His Word.

What effect should vs. 50, 93 have on minds of mankind when they read them? They should be impressed with power of God's Word as the Divinely appointed means the Lord uses to affect minds and hearts of all to whom it is addressed.

What should we say to those who speak of the written word of God as the 'mere word', the 'bare word' and the 'dead letter of the word'? We should say, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God', then endeavor to show why they should not disparage the Divine word. In so doing we should not forget Psa. 138:2.

**Psalm 120** records David had been in distress, had called on the Lord and He heard him. Next, he prayed to be delivered from lying lips and a deceitful tongue. Then David inquired and stated, what should be done to the false tongue; also mentioned bad company with which he had long dwelt.

**Psalm 121** gives David's information regarding the place and to whom he would look for help. Then mentioned confidence in the Lord and what He would do for those who obey Him.

Does the Lord now watch over and preserve His people? He does, but always in view of their spiritual welfare. He suffers trials and afflictions to come on his faithful ones in order to test them, develop their faith, and prepare them for the final rest prepared for the faithful.

**Psalm 122** declares the psalmist was glad when invited up to the Lord's house; then mentions Jerusalem as a city compactly built, whither the tribes went to the testimony of the Lord and to give thanks to Him; also that Jerusalem was the place for judgment. David then exhorted to prayer for Jerusalem's peace, and promised prosperity to those who loved that city. Next he pronounced peace on Jerusalem and declared he'd seek its good, and gave his reason.

What blessing should this psalm have on Christians? All should read it in light of I Tim. 3:15 and understand 'the church of God' is to Christians 'the house of God'. Therefore all Christians should be glad when time comes for them to go to the assembly of saints, and they should pray for the church's peace, also seek its good at all times. 'In seeking its good they should always consider its unity and peace in the truth, as of first importance (John 17:20-

23).

**Psalm 123** declares David would lift up his eyes to Him that dwelleth in the heavens. States that as the eyes of the servants look to the hands of their masters so his eyes should wait on the Lord for His mercy, Next, his prayer for God's mercy, and that reasons for such a prayer were the scorning of those at ease and contempt of the proud.

**Psalm 124** shows David's confidence in the Lord, also that he blest the Lord for deliverance from his enemies, thus that he was not ungrateful for favors he received.

What impression should this make on the minds of Christians? We should learn it becomes us to be grateful and express gratitude for favors received.

Are we in danger of forgetting to be grateful and when gratitude exists, forgetting to mention its. Yes, that is common weakness.

**Psalm 125** slates steadfastness of Mount Zion as illustration of stability of those who trust in the Lord. Then mentions constancy of mountains around Jerusalem as illustration of constancy of the Lord's care over His people. The wicked are next mentioned and that they shall not rule over the righteous. Then David's prayer for the Lord to do good to those who are good and upright, also sentence of judgment against workers of iniquity. The psalm ends with sentence of peace on Israel.

**Psalm 126** declares David's prophecy in regard to return of people of Israel from captivity, then declares those who sow in tears shall reap in joy; to which he adds precious encouragement for all who sow truth as seed in mankind's minds and hearts.

Why did David foretell return, from captivity which did not occur for over 400 yrs. later? God foresaw Jewish people would become idolaters and what would be necessary to purge idolatry from their minds and hearts.

**Psalm 127** records importance of God's blessing resting on all man does, declaring even in building a house or watching a city Divine blessing is needed. David declares it vain to rise up early, sit up late, or to eat the bread of sorrows,—for without the Lord's blessing mankind cannot succeed. He then commends rearing a family, and speaks of advantages of having children born to parents in their early life.



**Psalm 128** sets forth sentence, of blessing on every man that fears the Lord and walks in His ways, then mentions particulars in which such man shall be blessed, namely, in eating result of labor of his own hands, also in his family relations, then in his church relations, and that he should even behold children's children, and see the peace of Israel's God. Thus it was with the Jew that feared God and walked in His ways; thus it will be with the Christian.

**Psalm 129** shows David wrote of afflictions which came on Israelites at different times in their history, also of judgments the Lord inflicted and would inflict on their enemies. Then, of David's prayer against Israel's enemies.

What do vs. 6, 7 mean? Refer to grass that grew on sod-covered houses. It generally withered before time for cutting grass because it had not much depth of soil, therefore lacked moisture.

**Psalm 130** declares 'out of the depths' David cried to the Lord, then prayed the Lord would hear him. Next implied if the Lord should mark iniquity not one would be able to stand; then explicitly declared there is forgiveness with the Lord, also that he waited and hoped for the Lord even more than they that watched for the morning. He then proposed Israel should hope in the Lord with whom is mercy and plenteous redemption, and declared the Lord would redeem Israel from all iniquities.

**Psalm 131** gives statements of David concerning his humility, and then his proposition for Israel to hope in the Lord forever.

What may we learn by David's statements in regard to his humility? We may learn a lesson of humility which will prevent our trying to do things or handle subjects too great for us. What David said of himself in this respect should serve as wholesome suggestion against all outworkings of conceit.

**Psalm 132** informs of David's prayer that the Lord would remember him because of his oath and vow to the Lord, and in regard to finding a place for the Lord. Next, concerning the Lord's house, his priests, of the Lord's oath to David in regard to his offspring on Israel's throne; finally, what the Lord declared concerning Zion.

To what did David refer in regard to finding a place for the Lord? 2 Sam. 6, 7. David made a tent or tabernacle for the ark of God and sent to a place called Kirjath-jearim (1 Chron. 13:6), where the ark had been placed when sent out of land of the Philistines (1 Sam. 6, 7). David's zeal for the Lord shown by making a tent for the ark, then by bringing the ark of God to Jerusalem, and finally desiring to build a house for the Lord,—was well pleasing in Divine sight.

What does this indicate to us? That the Lord will be well pleased if we endeavor,

according to His will, to build the church of God near where we live.

**Psalm 133** mentions it is good and pleasant for brethren to dwell together in unity; then such dwelling together is declared like precious ointment God commanded made for official anointing (Exo. 30:20-33). Such unity is also declared to be as dew that descended on certain mountains.

Is there New Testament teaching on this subject? Yes, the entire Gospel is in behalf of one people being gathered together and dwelling in unity.

**Psalm 134** shows David called on all the Lord's servants to bless Him. The Lord's servants are called to lift up their hands to bless Him that made heaven and earth.

Is the Lord benefitted by praise and prayer, thanksgiving and adoration, and by such blessing as His people offers to Him? Last verse of Psa. 50 answers: 'Whoso offereth praise glorifieth Me'.

**Psalm 135** begins and ends with exhortation to praise the Lord. Then David stated the Lord should be praised because of what He had done for Israel, also because He is great above all gods, and because He has a name which will endure forever, and will judge His people. Description then of heathen idols. The psalm ends with exhortations to bless the Lord and praise Him.

**Psalm 136** begins with exhortation to thank the Lord because his mercy endures forever, and with that exhortation it ends. Intervening verses mention God's exalted character and deeds, and each ends with the declaration 'his mercy endureth forever'.

What impressions should such a psalm make on minds of all who read? That the psalmist desired Israelites remember God's mercy, and the impression should be that we never forget His mercy.

**Psalm 137** consist chiefly of prophecy concerning Jews in captivity. The psalmist's eye was unscaled to look forward 400 years or more, and behold condition of captive Jews when they first reached Babylon. He beheld also their disposition in regard to Jerusalem, then pronounced prophecy against Babylonians who'd become their captors.

What may we learn by considering disposition toward Jerusalem? David foresaw captive Jews would possess? That human nature in all ages is the same. Jews for some time before the captivity quite generally despised Jerusalem's welfare. But after they had been taken

captive and separated from it for a time, they looked back toward it with longing eyes and yearning hearts.

What does this suggest in history of mankind generally? Disposition of a majority of persons. They seem to despise health, time and friends 'til deprived of them, then look back and long for them. Same is true in regard to time, place and opportunity to become Christians. Multitudes seem to despise them all until deprived of them forever; then they long for them.

**Psalm 138** shows David's determination to praise the Lord with his whole heart, then in last of v. 2 we find highest praise for God's word. Next, David states he cried and the Lord answered, also that kings of the earth shall praise and sing in the Lord's ways. Then mention of God showing respect to the lowly though He is high above all other beings. The psalm ends with prayer that the Lord would not forsake work of His own hands.

What of last part of v. 2? Declaration that God has 'magnified' his word 'above all' his name. This should close lips of all disposed to speak against God's written word. The name Jehovah is certainly above all other names, yet the verse before us declares God esteems his Word above his Name. This declaration should cause all readers to fear and tremble at thought of speaking lightly of God's Word.

**Psalm 139** declares God is infinite, thus unlimited, in wisdom, knowledge and vision, indicated by what He has done and said, also by what He continues to do and say. That God will slay the wicked; that David desired bloody and deceitful men to depart from him; that he hated the Lord's enemies. The psalm ends with David's prayer for God to search and try him, and lead him in the Way Everlasting.

What may we learn by this psalm? That to hide from God is impossible. He is acquainted with our public walks and private ways, even knows secrets of our minds and hearts.

What would result if mankind generally considered each day that God sees and knows them at all times and circumstances? They would generally keep themselves from crime and all other kinds and degrees of wrong doing. To consider at all times, 'Thou God seest me', will prove the best moral safeguard of mankind.

**Psalm 140** is David's prayer against the evil man, hands of the wicked, and the violent man, in connection with which he described those against whom he prayed. In conclusion are expressions of assurance in behalf of the righteous and upright.

Is this psalm applicable to Christians? In some respects, for its expressions are mostly in harmony with the Gospel. Christians may offer this psalm, in Christ's name, except its severest words against the wicked.

**Psalm 141** informs of David's prayer in which he called on the Lord to haste to him and hear his voice; likewise that his prayer might be set before the Lord as 'incense', and lifting up his hands as 'offering the evening sacrifice'. He also prayed his mouth, lips and heart might be kept from evil. The psalm ends—'Let the wicked fall into their own nets whilst that I withal escape.'

**Psalm 142** is David's account of what he had, on a former occasion, said to the Lord; also of assurance that 'the righteous' should surround, him because the Lord would 'deal bountifully' with him.

What may the righteous in the Gospel age learn by this psalm: To consider Heb. 12, specially v. 6: 'For whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth'.

**Psalm 143** consists of prayer to God, statements concerning David's enemies together with declarations that his spirit was 'overwhelmed' within him and his heart 'desolate'. Next, he remembered the past and meditated on his works, likewise that he stretched forth his hands to God. The psalm ends with this petition: 'And of Thy mercy cut off mine enemies and destroy all them that afflict my soul: for I am Thy servant'.

May Christians pray against their enemies as David did against his? No. The Savior teaches we should pray for our enemies. This does not mean we should pray for their destruction nor for their earthly prosperity: but, for their spiritual good. The example of the Savior in Luke 23:34 also that of Stephen in Acts 7:60 should serve as index to our prayers in regard to our enemies, and we should be willing for the Lord to deal with them as He sees best. 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do', was our Savior's petition when in agonies of death. If we are Christians our enemies don't know what they do when they persecute us.

**Psalm 144** expresses blessing and adoration, then unworthiness of man, followed by prayer against evil doers spoken of as 'strange children'. Then, after declaring he would 'sing a new song' to the Lord, and in connection with it would use certain instruments of music, he spoke of the Lord as the one who delivered him from 'the hurtful sword'. The psalm ends with mention of happy condition of God's people.

What is application on us of David's use of musical instruments? Same that use of animal sacrifices, literal incense and many other things of the Jewish age now have. They were all typical and shadowy, and not intended to be adopted literally by those who worship God through Christ.

**Psalm 115** shows David declared he would 'extol' the Lord 'bless' Him every day and 'praise' His name forever. Also mentioned Jehovah's 'greatness', His mighty acts, 'glorious honor of His majesty', and of His 'wondrous works'. He then mentioned evidence of praise in the

Divine works, and stated the Divine kingdom is 'everlasting'. God's goodness to all that 'fall' and are 'bowed down' was next spoken of, likewise that from Him comes food of all. The psalm ends with expression of David's purpose to 'speak the praise of the Lord,' and exhortation to all mankind 'to bless His holy name forever'.

Is it still true the 'eyes of all' wait on the Lord, and that He opens His hand and satisfies desire of 'every living thing'? Yes, even eyes of the infidel wait on the Lord. In a dry season he watches for clouds to, bring rain, and in a wet season he watches for sunshine, even as the Christian does. By reason of God's mercies, expressed in Gen. 8:22, earth's inhabitants do not perish.

**Psalm 146** begins and ends with exhortation to praise the Lord. Also David's declaration that he would praise the Lord while life continued, and exhortation not to trust in man, not even in princes,—and the reason why. Next, David's statement that he is happy who has the God of Jacob for his help,—and reasons for that statement.

Is this psalm appropriate for Christians? Yes, we may read and endorse it unreservedly. It is edifying and consoling.

**Psalm 147** is another which begins and ends with exhortation to praise the Lord. Then, statement that it's good, pleasant and comely to sing praises to the Lord. Next, what the Lord does, by reason of which He should be praised. Next, exhortation to sing to the Lord with thanksgiving. Then, what He does, by reason of which He should be thus adored.

What should we say to those, who refer to David's mention of the harp, as something on which to 'sing praise' to the Lord, as argument in favor of Christians using musical instruments in worship? They can as reasonably use Psa. 51:19 in favor of Christians offering animal sacrifices to the Lord. David's writings may be adopted by Christians where they harmonize with the gospel revealed in the New Testament, but not further. The New Covenant scriptures are the standard by which Christians should measure everything in religion. They constitute the Book of Divine Authority for Christians, while the Old Covenant scriptures are Divine History.

**Psalm 148** begins, continues and ends with exhortation to praise the Lord. David called on all intelligent beings and even on lower orders of creation to praise the Lord. Even called on lifeless things to praise Him.

What should we say to those who use the fact that David called on dumb brutes, on inanimate nature, to praise the Lord, as argument against the idea that man is the only worshipping animal, Refer them to v. 7 in which it is declared the 'stormy wind' praises the Lord by 'fulfilling His word'. Then remind them that a machine reflects praise on its inventor and maker when it does work it was intended to do,—and that thus it is with lower orders of creation and inanimate nature. Next tell them, as the Savior said to certain Sadducees, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God' (Mat. 22:29). Finally, remind them

of the ancients who, 'professing themselves to be wise became fools', and adopted idolatry as their religion (Rom. 1:22, 23).

**Psalm 149** sets forth exhortation to praise, the Lord, rejoice in His name and destroy His enemies.

What should we say to those who use what David said in this psalm, about praising the Lord with certain musical instruments, as evidence Christians should use such instruments in worship? Refer them to the 'dance' in v. 3, also to the literal 'two-edged sword' in v. 6, and show the reasoning which will, on basis of this psalm, justify use of musical instruments in worship will also justify the 'dance' in worship and use of the literal sword against the Lord's enemies.

**Psalm 150**, the last division of David's writings, is a series of exhortations to praise the Lord. V. 1 exhorts to His praise in 3 sentences, and every other verse thus exhorts in 2 sentences each. Thirteen times in the brief compass of this psalm we find the word 'praise'. This psalm therefore is a becoming conclusion to a book seemingly written for special purpose of causing those who read it to be filled with the spirit of prayer and praise, thanksgiving, and adoration.

Can anyone who studies the Psalms with care feel need of a 'prayer book', written by someone not Divinely inspired, in order to learn language of prayer, praise, thanksgiving and adoration? No. Every 'prayer book' written to assist in worship of God through Christ has been outgrowth of ignorance of the value of David's writings. Those who know value of this book cannot conceive need of a humanly arranged 'book of prayer' (or praise). All human productions in regard to prayer, praise, thanksgiving and adoration are in contrast with David's writings, even as light of a common lantern in contrast with brightness of the noon-day sun in a cloudless sky.

**Proverbs, chapter 1**, records proverbs of king Solomon who seems to have been Israel's wisest king, judged by his writings.

Whence did he receive his great wisdom? 1 Kings 3 informs God gave him privilege of asking what he desired, and he was wise enough to ask for 'a wise and understanding heart'. When God gave him such a heart he had wisdom above other men.

What does 'proverb' mean? In this book it means 'a sentence briefly expressing a truth'. Means also 'an old and common saying'.

What are chief subjects in 1st part of the chapter? Wisdom, instruction, words of understanding, justice, judgment, equity, subtlety or prudence, discretion and fear are mentioned.

What difference between wisdom and knowledge? 'Knowledge' means information, and 'wisdom' in its widest sense refers to right appreciation and use of information. A person may have much information without wisdom to know its value. But see Job 28:28 Psa. 111:10.

What characters in this chapter? The young man, wise man, fool, father, mother, sinners, robbers, murderers, simple ones and scorners.

Chapter ends with statement of the cry or loud call, and a warning, of wisdom. Beginning with v. 20 wisdom is represented speaking with a voice 'in the streets', 'in chief places of concourse' or gatherings of people, also 'in openings of the gates' and 'in the city'.

Will wisdom always appeal to mankind? Last part of this chapter answers in the negative. Wisdom will not always call but, after being long rejected by careless ones, will refuse to hear their cry of distress when their fear comes.

In what sense does wisdom call to mankind in places and on subjects Solomon mentioned? In the sense that everything good around and about mankind manifests wisdom. If sun, moon or stars be considered, or if the earth, animal, vegetable or mineral kingdom be considered, wisdom's voice is, in a certain sense, heard, because all external nature reflects God's wisdom. See chap. 8:22-81. Moreover, every house, gate, street, alley, highway and by-way, every wagon, carriage, and other kind of vehicle, every department of business, every orderly arrangement and every arrangement to accomplish order, every useful article of clothing and article of household furniture,—indicate wisdom to all who pause and reflect concerning them. Besides, every precaution concerning dangers on life's highways and every danger signal on life's crossways together indicate wisdom. Every book and paper, every song and picture unite in declaring wisdom to those who think. Thus all nature and art, truth and error, life and death arc, in some sense, the cry of wisdom's voice. By each of our 5 senses and by all we contact through our senses wisdom speaks to all who pause and reflect. Every outworking of truth and error, every instance of reaping according to seed sown, whether in nature, in religion, in politics or natural science, in mental or moral science, in medicine for the mind or for the body,—all such outworking manifests Divine wisdom in ordaining relation between cause and effect. Rain and snow, dew and frost, ice and vapor, seasons of the year, stormy winds and rolling waves, light and darkness, morning, dawn and evening twilight,—by all these, together with everything else that is good, the voice of wisdom, by implication, calls and says, 'How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity, and scorners delight in their scorning, and fools hate wisdom?'

There is a sense in which worldly shrewdness is called wisdom, indicated in Luke 16:8. But all shrewdness which does not regard truth and righteousness is folly when measured by the Gospel, because it brings all under condemnation who manifest it. But wisdom in highest sense is defined by Job: 'Behold, fear of the Lord, that is wisdom'; and by David: 'Fear of the Lord is beginning of wisdom'; and Solomon represents wisdom as saying: 'For whoso findeth me findeth life and shall obtain favor of the Lord. But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul; all that hate me love death' (see Job 28:28; Psa. 111:10; Prov. 8:35, 36).

**Prov. 2** is Solomon's address to his son, and to every Bible reader as his son, in regard to receiving his 'words', retaining his 'commandments', so as to incline the ear to 'wisdom', and apply the heart to 'understanding'.

What did he say would result? Those who cry after 'knowledge' and lift up their voice for 'understanding', who seek for understanding as for silver and search for it as for hid treasure, shall understand fear of the Lord and find knowledge of God. He also stated the Lord is author of wisdom and knowledge; then stated what the Lord does for the 'righteous' and what He is for those who 'walk uprightly'; also what He keeps for His 'saints', and what would result to those who sought knowledge and understanding. Next, the result when wisdom entered a man's heart and knowledge became pleasant to his eyes. A special result would be to 'deliver' from the 'evil man' he described, and from the 'strange woman' he described.

What means the 'strange woman' here? Connection shows an adulterous woman.

Why is such called 'strange'? The Hebrew word here translated 'strange' means 'foreigner', thus refers to one of a different nation. Such is its general meaning and was applied to a woman who did not belong to a man as his wife.

Is such woman dangerous? Solomon indicates, in vs. 18, 19, she is very dangerous: 'For her house inclineth unto death, and her paths unto the dead. None that go unto her return again, neither take they hold of the paths of life'.

Is that true in the Gospel age? Yes, in many instances. But by reading 1 Cor. 6:9-11 we learn Christ's gospel had sufficient of God's power in it to save 'fornicators' and 'adulterers' at Corinth. Rom. 1:16 indicates it is God's power to save all true believers. Nevertheless an adulterous woman was justly regarded, by Solomon, as a dangerous character. Thus she is now and will be 'til close of time.

**Prov. 3** is a chapter of commands and assurances to all obedient believers who would read or hear what he said.

What are the special commands and assurances? His command to obey His commands, and results of obedience to them; the command to trust the Lord wholeheartedly, and result of so doing; the command not to be conceited, and results of observing that command; the command to honor the Lord with earthly possessions, and results of obeying it; the command not to despise the Lord's chastening, and why,—all these are here set forth.

What else? The man who finds 'wisdom' and gets 'understanding' is pronounced 'happy', and the reason is in statements concerning value of 'wisdom' to man and to God. Remainder of the chapter is devoted to wholesome commands, or exhortations, followed by statements of good results of observing them.

**Prov. 4** records more commands, or exhortations, followed by declarations and assurances of good results of doing right.

What are some special items of teaching here? Wisdom, understanding and importance of wisdom, are here mentioned; also how to avoid the path of the wicked. Contrast between the just and the wicked is presented, followed by exhortation to attend to Solo-men's words and incline to his sayings because of good that will result. To keep the heart with all



diligence, and why; followed by command in regard to a 'froward mouth and perverse lips'; in regard to right use of eyes and eyelids; choice of a path and ways, followed by commands, 'Turn not to the right hand nor to the left: remove thy foot from evil'.

What of Solomon's command or exhortation to avoid the path of the wicked? Sets forth the only safe plan. Same is true in regard to what he says about keeping the heart.

Why do so many sons and daughters of mankind go in the pathway of evil? They venture to tamper with evil. If they would keep away from all evil they'd not be successfully tempted to do evil.

But is it not time, if mankind keep away from places of evil, yet cherish evil in their minds and hearts, they will finally yield to evil? Yes, and on that account Solomon said, 'Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life'. In Philip. 4:8 we find New Testament doctrine on this subject.

Thinking controls the emotions, and emotions generally control the will, then the will controls speech and conduct. Therefore all who would control words and acts must control their wills, and in order to control their wills they must control their feelings or emotions. But in order to accomplish this end they must control their thoughts. The thoughts that are cherished will stir emotions, and mankind's emotions seem very close to the will. Therefore all who would control themselves must obey Philip. 4:8, which directs that only good thoughts be cherished. If other thoughts obtrude, they should be banished.

**Prov. 5** is Solomon's address to his son and, by implication, to all other men, to attend unto his wisdom and bow to his understanding, in order to regard discretion and keep knowledge. Then the 'strange woman' as a character is mentioned, described and warned against. Evil results of a man becoming connected with her are strikingly portrayed.

What difference between 'wisdom' and 'understanding'? Different words for the same idea, indicated by Job 28:28 and Psa. 111:10. Former passage declares 'fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding'. The latter passage declares 'fear of the Lord is beginning of wisdom: good understanding have all they that do his commandments'. Then in Gen. 22:12 we learn that to fear God is to obey Him. Therefore we conclude 'wisdom' and 'understanding' are different words for the same idea.

**Prov. 6** advised Solomon's son what to do if he became surety for a friend's debts, and implied against going security for debts. Then he advised the sluggard, or lazy person. Next, described a naughty person, or wicked man, and stated his end. Farther on he stated what the Lord hates and how many things are abomination to Him. Remainder of chapter advises obedience to fathers and mothers, and warns against a whorish woman.

This chapter consists of teaching which is still true and of universal application. Going security for others' debts has ruined millions in business life, laziness has ruined millions, wickedness has ruined many millions; the Lord still abominates characters Solomon here

declared were abominable; and it still ruins every man who goes with whorish women.

What does the New Testament declare concerning those who sow discord among brethren? Rom. 16:17, 18 informs. Divisions and offenses according to Christ's doctrine are justified. Luke 12:51-53 indicates divisions the Savior knew would result when his Gospel would be preached, because some would accept while others would reject it, and these two classes would oppose each other. But those who cause divisions and offenses contrary to Christ's doctrine, by introducing into the worship and work one or more human devices—all those are under Divine condemnation.

**Prov. 7** records another address of Solomon to his son and, by implication, to every son who reads his words. The strange woman, or harlot, is mentioned, described and warned against.

What is meant by 'correction of the stocks' in v. 22? 'Stocks' were an arrangement in which prisoners' feet were made fast (see Acts 16:24). Solomon's mention of 'the stocks' indicates they were anciently used for punishment of wrong doers.

What effect should this chapter have on the mind of every young man, and every older one, who reads? Should cause fear, dread and horror with reference to the strange woman, otherwise the licentious woman. She is more dreadful than death's worst form. Destroys honor, wealth and, in many instances, health and life of men under her control. Solomon was not too severe when he said 'her house is the way to Hell, going down to the chambers of Death'.

**Prov. 8** records from Israel's wisest monarch that wisdom' and 'understanding' are represented as calling to men. Spoken of as 2 separate excellencies but spoken of as being one. Implies that 'wisdom' and 'understanding' are one, and only 2 names for one excellence.

What is the leading thought here? Personification of wisdom, or representing wisdom as speaking like a person, declaring what wisdom does, also, where wisdom was, and what it did, in the beginning.

What may we learn by this chapter? So much of dignity and excellence of wisdom that we should be so anxious for greatest possible amount of it that we might be spoken of as watching at wisdom's 'gates', waiting at 'the posts' of its 'doors'. We should, as result of reading this chapter, strive to learn wisdom's words and walk in wisdom's ways, so as to gain wisdom's rewards for this world and the world to come.

**Prov. 9** finds wisdom represented as having built a house, prepared a feast and sent forth young women to invite guests. Then, what wisdom says to those who attend her feast.

Are sayings here evidently sayings of wisdom? Yes, each shows wonderful penetration and grasp of that.

What familiar theme is again introduced? Warning against a lewd woman.

**Prov. 10** reads of a wise son and a foolish one, of treasures of wickedness, of righteousness, of the Lord's care for the righteous, of His disregard for the wicked, of the hand that maketh poor and the hand that maketh rich, of evidence of a wise son and of the son that causeth shame. Then we read of the just and of the wicked, of the wise in heart and of a prating fool, of him that walketh uprightly and of him that perverteth his ways, also of him that winketh with the eye, and of a prating fool.

**Prov. 11** is the Lord's estimate of a false balance and of a just weight, also result of pride and result of being lowly. Then we read of integrity, of uprightness, of riches, and righteousness, of the perfect and of the wicked, also of the upright and the transgressors. These sayings indicate great wisdom, largeness and clearness of thought. The tendency in minds of all who study it will be to impart wisdom.

**Prov. 12** sets forth the one who loves instruction, then of him that hates reproof. We next read of the good man and of the wicked man, also of that which shall not be accomplished by wickedness and what shall be to the righteous. Then we read of a virtuous woman and of the woman that makes one ashamed. Thus Solomon continued to indicate unusual penetration and comprehension of thought.

What of v. 10? Should be impressed on minds of all mankind, specially on those who handle dumb animals.

Are not some persons who profess to be Christians cruel to dumb beasts? Yes, and all such professed Christians are seriously doubted by many who know of their disposition toward dumb animals.

Are statements in v. 24 still true among mankind? It is still true that the diligent in business rise in this world, while the slothful go down.

What of v. 27? States what a lazy man will or will not do, also, results of diligence.

**Prov. 13** sets forth a wise son and a scorner, and they are contrasted. Then mentions the man who shall eat good, and of transgressors, and next we read of importance of mankind keeping their mouth or maintaining silence much of the time, and result of being openmouthed. The sluggard and the diligent are contrasted, also the righteous and the wicked, then results of righteousness and wickedness.

What of v. 11? It is still true,—wealth gotten by vanity shall diminish, he that gathereth by labor shall increase. Simply because when wealth is gathered by vanity, or other dishonorable way, it will not be well cared for; but when a man gathers by labor he generally knows how to take care of it.

What of v. 23? While some persons gather much, yet they don't know how to take care of it. They lack economy.

What of v. 24? Still applicable. Besides, children generally hate those who have right to correct them but don't do it. On the other hand, they love those who rightfully correct them.

**Prov. 14** sets forth the wise woman and the foolish one, the upright man and the perverse one, the mouth of the foolish and the lips of the wise. Then lack of oxen and possession of oxen, a faithful witness and a false witness, a scorner and one that understands. What important truth in v. 12? Possibility of mankind being so deceived the wrong way will seem right.

Does the New Testament teach this? See Mat. 7:2123.

Is it important for Christians to keep this in mind? It is, and same is true in regard to all others of mankind. We are born into this world ignorant of everything; and as there is much error in the world we are all liable to be imposed on and receive error in what we learn. Therefore we should always be willing to hear criticism because it may open the way for us to be convinced of error and learn truth. It is saddening to think we are so constituted that a fatal error may be accepted by us as truth. Therefore we should be always ready to learn.

Remainder of this chapter offers rich rewards to all who study it with care. It will benefit the poet, orator, statesman, ruler, father and mother, husband and wife, son and daughter. Consider vs. 31,34. What changes they would make among mankind if they should be always observed? This book of Proverbs sets forth sufficient practical wisdom to benefit mankind more than do all books in the world of human origin.

**Prov. 15** reads of deep and excellent wisdom. V. 1 sets forth best defense for mankind in ordinary depart-merits of life. V. 2 makes 2 declarations which are constantly verified. V. 3 should be sufficient to keep all intelligent beings who read it, even once, always on guard. V. 10 is constantly verified. Those innocently led astray will generally rejoice when shown they are wrong, so that they may learn the right way. But those who reason themselves into the wrong way, and thus forsake the right way by determination, are aggrieved when corrected. Some of that number will show their aggrieved condition by manifestations of anger; others will pretend to be amused. But in both cases is cherishing of dislike, if not positive hatred, for the person or persons who offered the correction. All such illustrate, that 'correction is grievous to him that forsaketh the way', and they should remember 'he that hateth reproof shall die'.

In remainder of this chapter each declaration glitters with truth and will make every one who studies what it declares wiser and better for all departments of life. For instance, 'Better is a dinner of herbs where love is than a stalled ox and hatred therewith'. Who will deny this? Certainly not those who have experienced eating a meal with one or more loved ones. As for those who have experienced eating in midst of hatred,—they have learned by bitter experience that 'better is a dinner of herbs where love is than a stalled ox and hatred therewith'.

**Prov. 16** states 'preparations of the heart in man and the answer of the tongue are from the Lord'.

What does this mean? That as God is author of all things, even 'every good and perfect gift', He is certainly author of man's natural gifts and of surroundings by which he is led to think, feel and speak.

What is meant by v. 4, specially the latter part? Must mean what is in Job 21:30, that 'the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction; they shall be brot forth to the day of wrath'.

What of v. 18? Universally true, though the threatened 'destruction' and 'fall' do not always come at an early date. But, it is always true God hates a 'proud look' (Prov. 6:17), for He knows mankind are too small and dependent to be proud, even if pride wasn't in itself wrong.

What should we say to persons who are 'proud' of their home, children, or anything else? Remind them that 'pride' and 'proud' are used in unfavorable sense throughout the Bible. Also remind them that Solomon said the Lord hates, even abominates, 'a proud look'. Mankind should be thankful for all good, but never be proud of anything. Pride is of the devil (1 Tim. 3:6), and those who become proud fall under same kind of condemnation which fell on the devil: condemned because he lifted himself up with pride.

The last verse refers to the ancient custom of casting lots to determine difficult questions. Generally regarded as appeal to the Lord, and it seems the Lord regarded the appeal (see Jonah 1). This is what is meant by 'the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord'.

How were lots cast in ancient times? The method seems not recorded.

When did God's people cease to cast lots? When the Holy Spirit descended on the day of Pentecost mentioned in Acts 2.

**Prov. 17** gives additional statements of wisdom. A deep and strong statement concerning advantage of quietness at a meal even in midst of poverty.

What of v. 5? We may and ought to learn to treat the poor considerately.

In light of this verse what may be said of so-called 'poverty socials'? They mock the poor by making fun of poverty, thus are reproach unto God. If there were nothing else, to prevent mankind from engaging in such socials, certainly the fact that the Savior was born into this world, was reared to manhood, and then lived 'til his death, in poverty, also that his body was buried in a borrowed grave,—these facts should prevent all who live in Bible lands from taking part in a so-called 'poverty social'.

What else may we learn by v. 5? Importance of not rejoicing when evil befalls another even if the one overtaken by evil is our enemy.

What of v. 14? May be spoken of as a peace precaution, for it warns against meddling with what doesn't pertain to our affairs.

The last verse is directed against loose talking of all kinds, and is intended to encourage those who read it to measure their words. Eccl. 5:2 bears emphatically in this direction. The rule is that the more a man really knows the less he is disposed to talk. The wise man is always impressed, and even oppressed, with his ignorance, for he knows enough to know wherein he lacks knowledge.

**Prov. 18** begins with statement concerning one who desires wisdom, then mentions the fool, then the wicked.

What of v. 13? We should learn to be deliberate, and be sure we understand a question before we begin to answer.

What of v. 14? A truth is set forth which explains all the good there is in 'Christian Science', likewise all the good in the modern 'Faith Cure' advocated by those who will not be Christians according to the New Testament. When man's spirit is stirred with hope, or with confidence which is the foundation of hope, he is thereby enabled to overcome, in some measure, most of his infirmities. When strongly stirred he may sometimes overcome entirely a certain class of infirmities, whether he is stirred by truth or by falsehood. This explains all the good in the doctrines now considered: Serious ailments more real than imaginary are beyond reach of so-called 'Christian Science' and so-called 'Faith Cure'. Mary Baker Eddy, author of 'Christian Science' speculation, on p. 400 of her book 'Science and Health', says, 'Until the advancing age admits efficacy and supremacy of mind, it, is better to leave adjustment of broken bones and dislocations to fingers of a surgeon'. This means when an ailment is so real and serious that deception cannot be imposed in regard to it, then a real physician should be employed!

What does the New Testament teach on this? Christ said 'they that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick' (Mat. 9:12)—to illustrate that sinners needed Him. Again, Paul advised Timothy to use a certain remedy, internally, and did not intimate he could cure himself by praying, nor by thinking nothing ailed him. The apostle Paul knew much more than Mary Baker Eddy knew about 'supremacy of mind', but he did not teach her kind of doctrine.

**Prov. 19** is a chapter of rich and rare learning. The poor who walks in his integrity is first commended in contrast with perverseness of a fool. Then words of wisdom in regard to many subjects.

What of v. 11? Importance of being deliberate and merciful ... V. 17 should encourage all who read it to be compassionate toward the poor ... In v. 18 parents should learn importance of correcting children, even severely, while they are young and have not formed their habits. Early life is the period of hope. When they become older and their habits formed they will not likely receive correction. Therefore parents should begin very early to correct

their children. They generally despise parents who do not correct them, but they respect and even love parents who administer proper correction.

**Prov. 20** begins with words of wisdom in regard to wine and other strong drink, and v. 2 mentions danger of stirring a king's anger ... V. 3 should always be remembered ... V. 4 presents in few words history of the lazy man, and v. 13 is more on the same subject ... V. 14 tells of a common trait of shrewd business men who do not regard truth in business affairs.

**Prov. 21** confronts us with statements in regard to the Lord controlling hearts of kings, then mentions a man's own estimate of his work while the Lord considers his heart ... V. 6 declares a truth of universal application. Same is true of vs. 9, 10 ... V. 31 reveals the wisest monarch of Israel understood the Lord's protection is worth more than all else combined.

**Prov. 22** shows advantage of a good name and of loving favor.

V. 6 is another statement in regard to training children.

Is this statement true in modern times? It is.

Why then do so many children go astray? They've not been rightly trained. Even children of religious parents generally get more training at school or under other influences than they do at home, specially in towns and cities. In v. 15 Solomon said more on the same subject.

Vs. 22, 23 indicate God's care for the poor and the afflicted, Vs. 26, 27 warn against becoming surety for debts. V. 28 forbids moving ancient landmarks. The

chapter closes with a question and a statement which have been fulfilled in many instances. Diligence is the condition always essential to elevation. This does not mean every diligent man will stand before kings, but in proportion as he, is known he will be honored, specially if his diligence is not inspired by ambition for riches.

**Prov. 23** advises in regard to behavior when eating at a 'ruler's table'; later we find advice against eating the bread of him that has 'an evil eye'. Vs. 13, 14 advise in regard to correcting children. Solomon's wisdom enabled him to understand children generally need correction, and when they need it they should receive it, even to severity of punishment.

Vs. 20, 21 advise against drunkenness and gluttony. Followed by strong and severe descriptions of evils of whoredom and strong drink (v. 26 to close of chapter).

What do such warnings against bad women and strong drink indicate? That Solomon's wisdom enabled him to understand the most terrible dangers to men. If boys and young men

would only read and study this, the effect would be to forewarn, and many would be saved from whoredom and drunkenness. Therefore parents should make free use of Solomon's writings in training their children.

**Prov. 24** advises against being envious, and in v. 6 we learn in the multitude of counselors is safety. Because among them all there is wisdom, and what one does not know another does. Therefore by hearing from many counselors a man of good mind may adopt a wise conclusion.

What is meant in v. 7 that a fool 'openeth not his mouth in the gate'? In ancient times cities were walled and entrances to such cities were only through the gates. In and about those gates prominent men often assembled and talked (see Gen. 19:1; Esth. 5:13; Psa. 127:5). An ignorant man was not chosen to sit nor speak in the gate where men of prominence gathered and where important business was often transacted.

What of vs. 11, 12? We cannot deceive God. And in VS. 17, 18 danger of rejoicing even when calamities befall our enemies is set forth. The Lord does not propose to punish enemies of His people if the punishment He inflicts will harm His people. Therefore Christians should be very careful not to rejoice over anyone's downfall, but should always be humble, and pray for all mankind, including their enemies.

V. 27 would have saved millions from failing in business if it had been always carefully observed. The advice is to defer building the house 'til the field is in good condition; and the reason is evident. A field in good state of cultivation will produce wealth which enables a man to build his house. But if he first puts his capital in a house, then he will lack means to put his field in a good state of cultivation, or lack means to buy implements to cultivate it.

The chapter ends with description of the field and disposition of the slothful or lazy man, and evil results of indulging laziness.

**Prov. 25** shows God has, in the mental and material world, placed much beneath the surface, and that it is to the honor of kings to discover what has been thus placed and concealed.

But is it not to others' honor to search out what God has hidden? It is. Jehovah intended mankind should live a life of activity and development in this world, and He has so arranged this world's things that many needs to work to secure them.

Vs. 21, 22 come very near Christ's doctrine requiring Christians to love their enemies and pray for them. These verses are quoted by Paul in Rom. 12.

V. 24 suggests Solomon seemed to know something of a quarrelsome woman. And his statements in regard to contentious and quarrelsome women if they would read them, would make them more angry than common and cause them to say hateful things about Solomon.

Is a quarrelsome disposition in a woman incurable? No. The Bible would cure her if she



would use it; and a man strong enough might cure her if the law of the land only permitted him to use the right, remedy. The courts should provide a remedy for her ease, also for a quarrelsome man.

V. 28 expresses truth of universal application. The illustration is apt. A man who had no rule over his own spirit was like a defenseless city liable to be entered and plundered at any time. Same is true now.

**Prov. 26** begins with 2 illustrations of the statement that 'honor is not seemly (or becoming) for a fool'. Then v. 2 presents 2 illustrations of the truth that the 'causeless curse shall not come'. Vs. 4, 5 advise in opposite directions. Easy to understand as man is judged by the company he keeps so he might be judged by the kind of man with whom he converses. On the other hand, if a man tries to support a doctrine by foolish, suppositions, the best plan on which to answer him is to introduce more suppositions more foolish, if possible, than those he used. By so doing his conceit may be lowered.

Vs. 11, 12 indicate a fool will not learn by experience, and condition of a conceited man is more hopeless than that of a fool.

Any exception to this rule? There is not except when a conceited man has, by studying the Bible and studying himself, learned sufficient to know himself. Such a man may do well in life and be very useful.

What next in this chapter? Description of the slothful man, the meddlesome man, the mad man, the deceiver, the tale-bearer, the contentious man, the tale bearer again, burning lips, a wicked heart, then the hypocrite. Next we read of the man who digs a pit for others to fall into, and what shall befall a man who rolls a stone. The chapter ends by declaring 'a lying tongue hateth those afflicted by it; and a flattering mouth worketh ruin'.

**Prov. 27** gives command not to boast of tomorrow, as We know not what a day may bring forth.

What does the New Testament teach on this? Jas. 4: 13-15 informs.

What next? Advice against self-praise. Then the weight of a fool's wrath and meanness of envy. Vs. 15, 16 inform what a 'contentious woman' is like. Will what he said about her do her any good? Not likely.

What special use may the husband of such a woman make of her? She will by her contentions, give him many occasions for practicing patience and self-control. She may even help him become a philosopher.

What is meant by the statement that he who hides a contentious woman hides the wind? Means what it says, and in any sense. If a man succeeds in hiding her he will hide that much wind and, in many instances, a man could as easily hide the wind as to hide her.

**Prov. 28** begins and ends with statements concerning 'the wicked'. Between such beginning and ending are 26 proverbs as rare gems. For instance, v. 4, 'they that forsake the law praise the wicked :but such as keep the law contend with them'. A truth of universal application in regard to civil law and the Bible. Take also v. 9, 'he that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination'. True even in the Gospel age. Those who turn from Christ's law may pray, but their prayers will be in vain.

V. 26 is likewise a truth of universal application, specially in regard to religion. Jer. 17:9 sets forth that 'the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked'. This being true, it is certainly foolish for anyone to trust the heart. The Bible, and thus God and Christ as revealed in the Bible, should be man's confidence. Moses was instructed to say to ancient Israel 'the eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms' (Deut. 33:27).

But some may ask whether the heart may not be trusted as a witness in regard to evidence of pardon? The apostle Paul says to Christians—'ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine delivered you: being then made free from sin ye became servants of righteousness' (Rom. 6:17, 18). Here is Paul's statement of evidence of pardon. When obedient believers obey from the heart the form of doctrine delivered to them in the Gospel, then the Holy Spirit declares they are made free from sin and become servants of righteousness. Sufficient evidence of pardon.

**Prov. 29** begins with warning against hardening one's self against Divine reproofs. V. 3 warns against keeping company with harlots. Vs. 15, 17 instruct in regard to correcting children. V. 20, by comparison, describes the man 'hasty in his words'.

What of v. 25? Still true that 'the fear of a man bringeth a snare', likewise that safety is found by trusting the Lord.

V. 18 shows God in the Jewish age, as in the age preceding, spoke to His people in visions, and by that means directed them in regard to certain things they should do. But when the Lord, on account of sins of the nation, or of some ruler, or because of sins of both ruler and people, refused to direct them,—then they were in danger of perishing at the hand of their enemies, because they were not informed what to do.

**Prov. 30** records a speech attributed to a man named Agur, which name means 'gatherer of wisdom'. He seemed to have low estimate of himself, nevertheless he spoke, wisdom. For instance, in vs. 5, 6 he declared, 'Every word of God is pure: he is a shield to them that trust Him. Add thou not to His words lest he reprove thee and thou be found a liar'. Then we learn Agur requested to be moved far from vanity and lies, also that he should be given neither poverty nor riches.

Then he commented on several generations, also on the horseleech, after which he declared there are 4 things which never say they have enough. Next he wrote against the one

who mocketh his father and despiseth the voice of his mother. After that he declared 4 things he knew not. After naming them he stated there are 4 things on account of which the earth is disquieted and which it could not bear. After naming them he mentioned 4 little things that are wise, then named 4 things which are comely, or graceful, in going.

**Prov. 31** reveals words of a king named Lemuel, which name means 'dedicated'.

What do these words set forth? Advice Lemuel's mother gave him in regard to women and wine, then told him wine was for those ready to perish. She also advised in regard to exercising judgment in the case of the dumb and such as were appointed to death, also in the case of the poor and needy. Lemuel's mother also made to him an excellent speech in regard to a virtuous woman, and declared her price to be 'far above rubies'. She meant, one who is not only chaste in life but who is also a good housekeeper, good manager and good mother, and of whom her husband will not feel ashamed.

Having read the book of Proverbs and considered many of its wise sayings in some of their bearings and relations, what should we conclude in regard to its value? We may safely regard it as superior in practical wisdom to all humanly arranged works on wisdom ancient and modern. For, judging all those works by those we have seen, they are, without exception, above understanding of the masses of mankind. But Solomon's proverbs are so brief, simple and plain, that all persons, who have sufficient common sense to be, responsible before the civil law, may understand many of them. A majority of mankind may understand most, of Solomon's sayings and thereby be made wise in proportion as they commit them to memory and put them into practice. Therefore by reason of its simplicity, as well as by excellency of its wisdom, the book of Proverbs may be regarded as superior to all uninspired books combined. The poet and orator, the philosopher and statesman, the ruler and the ruled, will all be wiser and better by study of this book. Even the skeptic, who may doubt existence of the God of heaven and earth who is acknowledged in this book, will be made wiser and better by studying it with care.

Those who study the book of Proverbs, believing the Bible to be God's written revelation to man, will generally be impelled to think God intended it for practical wisdom in ordinary affairs of life. They will also be impelled to think God intended his revelation should not lack in such wisdom, but should be perfect as a guide in regard to, common affairs of life as well as in religion. 'As for God, his way is perfect: the word of the Lord is tried: he is a buckler to all those that trust him! (Psa. 18:30).

If we consider perfection of God's way, as seem in wonders of the material world, the conclusion is unavoidable that the Bible is the perfect guide for man, kind in regard to this' life as well as with reference to the life beyond.

**Ecclesiastes 1**—What does 'Ecclesiastes' mean? Preacher', as vs. 1, 2 indicate.

What is the leading thought in this book? Confession of vanities in life's affairs which, naturally and generally, occupy mankind's attention.

The last part of v. 4 should be considered in view of its connection. As compared with all changes on the face of the earth, it is evident the earth, by contrast with those changes, 'abideth forever'. But 'abideth forever' should be considered relatively, and not absolutely in relation to changing things, and not by itself considered. Same is true of 'continually' in v. 6, also of 'no remembrance' and 'any remembrance' in v. 11 Though man has no remembrance of certain things yet that does not mean God will forget them. Therefore the mentioned expressions in v. 11 are used relatively, not absolutely,—used in relation to man in this life, not in relation to God.

Solomon specially commented on certain works of God in nature, then on man's works. Concerning nature,—'all things are full of labor; man cannot utter it: the eye is not satisfied with seeing nor the ear filled with hearing'. Then of man.'s works—'this sore travail hath God given the sons of man to be exercised therewith'.

Why 'in much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow' as stated in v. 8? The more we know the more we are acquainted with evils and distresses among mankind.

**Eccl. 2** informs in regard to Solomon's experiments and his conclusions. Latter part of v. 3 says he wished 'to see what was that good for the sons of men, which they should do under the heaven all the, days of their life'. He wished to learn what would be best for man, so as to record it for him to consider. (Solomon omitted reference to his numerous marriages.)

He said he had musical instruments 'of all sorts'. Did they make him better than he otherwise would have been? The record does not inform they did.

What of the modern idea that instrumental music is very elevating and refining? Certain nationalities of people are very musical also very cold-blooded and murderous. Musical talent, like every other special gift, requires a great deal of common sense and Bible to balance it. In absence of such balance musical talent is very liable to prove a curse rather than a blessing.

What of Solomon's conclusion in v. 24? He meant, for man to eat and drink what is wholesome for him, and take time to enjoy it, will be better for him and give him more pleasure, than all else which pertains simply to this life, specially as it is from God's hand. Besides, eating and drinking what is wholesome will have good results. The body is thereby strengthened and prepared for life's work. Therefore eating and drinking accomplish an important end. But this is not true of listening to musical instruments, laughing, nor of any other mere entertainment.

**Eccl. 3** first sets forth that there is a season and a time, to every purpose under heaven, then mentions purposes or ends to which reference was made. Then Solomon inquired about profit man has in his labor, after which he made statements regarding his own observation and experience,—that good will result from a man enjoying good in his labor. Near the chapter's end Solomon compared man with beasts of the earth, then contradistinguished man from the

beast.

In v. 11 we may learn God did not intend man should find out his work 'from beginning to end'.

What effect should this have on speculators? Should cause them to quit speculating. God has decided mankind should not find out His work fully, and it is useless for them to try in that direction.

What may we learn by considering what Solomon said of man in relation to the beast? That man's spirit and the beast's spirit are so different that at death one goes 'upward' and the other goes 'downward'. We may learn also to be cautious about trying to define man's spirit, as materialists attempt to do, designating it as 'common air' or 'electricity'. Israel's wisest, monarch did not attempt to define man's spirit, and 'common mortals' should certainly refrain from every attempt in that direction. We should always be careful to avoid being more definite, or more explicit than is Divine wisdom in regard to all Bible themes. In vs. 18-20 Solomon compares men and beasts, resemblances, but v. 21 contrasts them, mentioning a great difference. With this information all Bible readers should be satisfied, and never try to be wise above what is Divinely recorded.

**Eccl. 4** records that Solomon wrote of 'oppressions' he had seen 'under the sun', and of unhappiness of both oppressors and oppressed; also that, as a result, he praised 'the dead' more than 'the living'. The remain-tier of the chapter states what Solomon regarded as 'vanity and vexation of spirit' in connection with certain advantages 2 persons have over one.

Do these advantages always result from 2 persons being together? Yes, if they are friends; but it is better to be alone than with an enemy.

What of v. 13? As true now as when Solomon wrote. Besides, a person 'who will no more be admonished', whether that one is 'an old and foolish king' or any one else that is 'foolish', whether old or young, is a very objectionable character. Those of mankind who are not able to teach and are not willing to learn must often be endured, but they cannot be enjoyed. But those who constitute that class are numerous, and because of them there is much vexation of spirit among those who must bear with them, unless those required to bear with them resolve to be patient.

**Eccl. 5** informs how we should behave in God's house.

What is 'sacrifice of fools'? They make an offering of what they say and do, and this is called their 'sacrifice'.

One cause of dreams is mentioned, also how a fool's voice is known. Next we read in regard to vows and, importance of keeping them, and of other important matters among which Solomon mentions several 'sore evils'—things that distress and are grievous.

**Eccl. 6** mentions evil which consists of a man having plenty but lacking power to eat thereof. This, the wise monarch declares, is 'a vanity and an evil disease'. In modern times such ailment is declared 'dyspepsia'.

Then Solomon presented condition of a man who has a large family and lives a long time, but has not his soul 'filled with good', and finally receives 'no burial'. Ends with remarks indicating unsatisfied condition of mind.

**Eccl. 7**, first part consists of excellent proverbs. Vs. 16, 17 warn against extremes. But v. 16 has special bearing on many who are disposed to be upright, only they are inclined to be extremists; and all such are in constant danger of destroying their usefulness. They should study this verse with care.

In v. 26 Solomon gives terrible warning against bad women. And v. 28 indicates it is difficult to find out a man, but more difficult to find out a woman, Meaning of 'found' is 'found out', as rendered in 3:11 also 8: 17, where we have 'find out the work'. The Hebrew word here translated 'found' literally means 'to reach to' or arrive at', 'to be at hand', 'to come to'; thus means 'to find out'. Translators have generally rendered the passage as if they were in confusion concerning its meaning. But both the original term and the connection show what the translation should be.

What of Solomon's statement that he had 'found out' one man in a thousand, but in all these he had not 'found out' one woman? Indicates he regarded woman more difficult to understand than man.

What has been other men's experience on that subject? Same, as that of Solomon. Woman is generally better or worse, more intelligent or more ignorant, more stable or more variable, more exalted or more degraded, than man has supposed her to be. In many cases a man has thought he understood a woman; but he didn't!

**Eccl. 8** is extended proverbs.

Does a man's wisdom still make 'his face shine'? Active thinking of any kind causes change in a person's countenance. Much and protracted thinking causes change to become permanent. Therefore such education as does not damage physical health will improve the countenance of everyone who secures it.

V. 11 is still true. Mankind are generally disposed to think whatever is long delayed will never come to pass. The wicked are disposed to think thus concerning punishment. 2 Pet. 3:3,4 mentions that disposition.

V. 15 gives the doctrine that a man should eat, drink and enjoy good in his labor.

Did Solomon think enjoyment of eating and drinking is of human or Divine origin? Chap. 2:24 declares it is from God. Same is indicated in 5:18, 19.

Did Solomon think even a 'wise man' could possess universal knowledge? V. 17 answers.

**Eccl. 9** laments that death will come to all mankind: to the good and wise, as well as to the evil and foolish. Solomon then spoke of life being better than death because the dead don't know what is going on in this world.

What should we say to those who, because Solomon said 'the dead know not anything', affirm the dead are 'utterly unconscious'? We should first try to show difference between the absolute and the relative meaning of words; then try to show that words, phrases, clauses and sentences are known by connection in which they are found and, for that reason, the expression 'the dead know not anything', should be taken in relative meaning and, thus, that Solomon taught: 'The dead know not anything' going on 'under the sun'. Finally we should refer them to 2 Sam. 15:11, which declares of certain living men that 'they knew not anything', but that declaration should be taken relatively or in modified sense.

V. 11 states that circumstances sometimes control a man or prevent, his receiving what his abilities or excellencies deserve.

The ending of this chapter reveals 'wisdom is better than strength, nevertheless the poor man's wisdom is despised and his words not heard'. Again, 'wisdom is better than weapons of war: but one sinner destroyeth much good'. These are wise observations 'like apples of gold in pictures of silver'.

**Eccl. 10** is a chapter of proverbs lengthened and explained.

Why is 'a little folly' in a man who has reputation for wisdom and honor as serious as Solomon indicates in v. 1? Because it is in contrast with such a man's general behavior. It has been said 'one hour's eclipse of the sun will attract more attention than his bright shining for a year'.

V. 3 means one who lacks common sense will show it in walking along a highway or on a sidewalk. Common sense and dignity belong together, but dignity does not mean pomposity of conceit. It means correct bearing; thus the kind of behavior which does not distract attention of those who behold it. Culture will in many instances accomplish much in preventing natural defects from becoming apparent on ordinary occasions. But the gift of common sense is basis of wisdom, and in every instance where such gift is lacking will be more or less folly manifest on special occasions.

Solomon's remarks in regard to mistake of a ruler in exalting unworthy persons and holding worthy ones in low places are directed against favoritism and partiality manifest in many governments, and serious weakness in all governments where they exist.

Vs. 16, 17 mean when 'a king is a child' he is liable to be victim of his surroundings; and when 'princes eat in the morning' they eat out of 'due season', thus eat not 'for strength' but 'for drunkenness'.

**Eccl. 11** is a volume of sound wisdom. Vs. 1, 2,6 teach importance of doing good always regardless of earthward appearances or indignations. Vs. 4,5 bear in the same direction.

Have these teachings been often verified? Yes. Favor has sometimes been shown to an obscure child which has been returned in after years with benefit worth a thousand-fold more than the favor shown. Therefore if we bestow favors on 7 or more we shall, in some evil time, be that much more likely to receive much advantage in return.

V. 3 mentions 2 natural consequences and indicates by them that the good which will return to mankind for doing good is natural consequence, in all ages remains some gratitude in majority of mankind, and those who possess gratitude will remember kindness shown them.

Vs. 7, 8 teach precaution against forgetting days of darkness when we enjoy light.

Conclusion of the chapter exhorts the young man to rejoice, but not to forget in rejoicing that he will finally be brought to judgment. Then, after another exhortation of the same bearing, the wise man declared 'childhood and youth are vanity'. Certainly mature persons will admit their 'childhood and youth' were 'vanity' when they consider 'vanity' they were guilty of thinking and doing in their childhood and youthful days.

**Eccl. 12** exhorts the young to remember their Creator while they are yet young, thus before days and years of their life come, when they have no pleasure in those periods of existence.

Last part of v. 5 indicates vs. 2-5 were written to indicate darkness and sorrow accompanying old age and death. V. 6 refers to suddenness with which death sometimes comes, indicated by 'loosed' and 'broken'.

V. 11 indicates what is in 3:21 regarding man's spirit. It 'goeth upward' and 'shall return to God who gave it'. In connection with this Zech. 12:1 should be considered, for it declares God 'formeth the spirit of man within him'. These several scriptures teach God 'forms the spirit of man within him', and when the dust or body of earth returns to the dust whence it came, then the spirit 'goes upward' and 'returns to God who gave it.'. This should teach Bible readers that the spirit of man is an entity or being that dwells in his body while his body retains animal life, but when the animal life leaves the body entirely then the spirit is not blotted out, nor does it, become unconscious, but simply returns to. God. Other scriptures show when man's spirit returns to God He assigns it to the place its character has fitted it to occupy.

Vs. 9, 10 teach Solomon was not directly inspired by the Holy Spirit as were the prophets. They did not need to search for words to express what God gave them, but 'holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit' (2 Pet. 1:21). But Solomon 'sought to find out acceptable words' by means of which to set forth wise conclusions to which his wisdom impelled him. This shows he didn't have those words given him.



V. 11 means as 'goads' were, used to urge forward a lazy animal so 'words of the wise' urge indifferent specimens of humanity to duty. Again, as 'nails fastened' have in them what is reliable so are 'words of the wise', or as a revised version declares 'words of masters of assemblies' 'are as nails well fastened'. 'Masters of assemblies' and the 'one shepherd' here spoken of may be found in 'rulers of the people' and in the: 'one shepherd' spoken of in the Divine record (see Ezek. 34). The, 'one shepherd' in Ezek. 34:23 referred to a descendant of David who should be the 'prince' that should rule over jews after their return from Babylon. But the expression 'one shepherd' where ever found conveys the idea of oneness of rulership, thus strength of rulership, in contradistinction from weakness resulting from division among rulers.

Concluding words of this book indicate Israel's wisest monarch understood fearing God and keeping His commands constitute man's 'whole duty', and that man should do his 'whole duty' in view of final judgment.

Does not Gen. 22:12 imply to fear God is to obey His commands? It does. But, there is theoretical fear which must be felt before practical obedience to Divine commands will be manifest. Thus Solomon's exhortation referred to internal fear and external manifestation thereof. His exhortation therefore means: Fear God, then show it.

Is that the 'whole, duty' of man in the Gospel age? It is. Those who teach we should serve God 'through love' but 'not through fear' should be referred to 1 Pet. 2:17, where Christians are commanded to 'fear God'. Then we should inform them that those who love God fear to offend Him by disobedience. Christ said 'he that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me' (John 14:21). And the inspired John wrote 'this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments' (1 John 5:3). Thus it is evident fearing and loving God are shown by keeping Divine commands, doing what the Lord required. Therefore to 'fear God and keep His commandments' is 'the whole duty of man'.

**Song of Solomon, chap. 1**, begins a love song by his black wife, an Egyptian. 1 Kings 3:1 mentions he married a daughter of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and 2 Chron. 8:11 shows he did not regard it appropriate for her to live in Zion, city of David, because the ark was or had been there. But he thought so much of her he recorded a song of her love for him and his love for her.

What of the idea that this song was intended to set forth relationship between Christ and the church? Purely fanciful. The New Testament mentions relationship of husband and wife to illustrate relationship between Christ and the church (see Eph. 5:22-31). But Solomon's song is simply a love song or song of fleshly love, such deep and intense love as God intended should exist between husband and wife in Divinely appointed relationship.

We know not why such a song was here recorded except that God intended His Book to be perfect, and therefore did not intend it should be defective in expressions of fleshly love. The Bible is superior to all other books in its record of everything therein set forth. In Gen. 29:18-20 we find the greatest love story ever recorded; Num. 11 records the greatest quail story; in Judges 15 is the greatest fox story; 2 Chron. 13:13-17 records the greatest battle; Psalms is the greatest book of religious songs; Proverbs and Ecclesiastes are the greatest

books of wisdom, and the 'Song of Solomon' the greatest love song.

**Chap. 2** continues the love song of Solomon's Egypt-ion wife.

**Chap. 3** ends the 1st song of Solomon's black wife.

**Chap. 4** begins Solomon's response to the song of his black wife.

**Chap. 5:**1-3 continues Solomon's response to his wife, then from 4-8 the wife sang again. He sang in v. 9, then she sang to close of chapter.

**Chap. 6:**1 is Solomon's 2, 3 are recorded as from his wife. Then he is represented as singing remainder of the chapter.

**Chap. 7**—First, Solomon sings to his wife down to end of v. 9, and then his wife's song ends the chapter.

**Chap. 8**— In vs. 1-4 Solomon's Egyptian wife sang, then we read Solomon's response down to close of v. 7, then the Egyptian wife sang to end the chapter.

What place in literature should this song fill? The place occupied by all gushy novels is hereby more than filled. We find here in concentrated form all the most intense expressions of fleshly love between man and woman, in their Divinely appointed relation as husband and wife, and there is not the slightest need to read novels in order to find such expressions. They are here, in the midst of the book God has given for guidance of mankind.

What may be said in general of poetic books we've considered? The 1st largely records afflictions; 2nd is chiefly prayer and praise, thanksgiving and adoration; the 3rd and 4th are books of wisdom, and the, last consists of love songs between a man and his wife.

As books of poetry they are superior to all others in dignity and precision of style and loftiness of themes.

## CONCERNING the PROPHETIC BOOKS

Before beginning to consider Questions, Answers and Remarks concerning 17 distinct documents known as 'The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament' a few remarks may be considered with advantage.

1. Divine prophecy has been justly regarded as 'history written beforehand'. And the Lord's purpose in thus writing history seems to have been to prove His divinity by declaring beforehand many details of events that could not possibly have been known by any one except the God of heaven and earth. One illustration will suffice, Isa. 13:19, 20 'And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall shepherds

make, their folds there'.

Here is a challenge infidels have never accepted, and which they seem never to have thought of accepting.

Why have they not gathered their forces anti gone to where ancient Babylon was built on the banks of the Euphrates, and have made a show of rebuilding that city? By so doing they might have done more to overthrow the Bible than by all talking and writing they have done. Why have they not even attempted rebuilding that city?

These questions should cause skeptics concerning the Bible to bow themselves in shame.

We are sometimes told that 2 men named Isaiah wrote the book bearing that name. But that does not affect the question before us; for if a dozen men by that name helped write that book, surely the prophecy we are considering remains the same. That prophecy declares Babylon should never be rebuilt—never be inhabited again,—not even by an Arabian pitching his tent there, nor by shepherds gathering their flocks there; and that declaration remains true regardless of a village certain ones say has been built some distance from ancient Babylon ruins.

2. Prophecies concerning ancient Babylon indicate other prophecies concerning near or about all other ancient nations except such as favored the Jews or would favor them. All ancient nations grievously sinned against God and deserved overthrow. Yet God favored Egypt somewhat because he used Egypt as a protectorate over children of Israel while they increased from about 75 persons to a nation of about 3 million men, women and children. For instance, Deut. 23:7, 'Thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian because thou wast a stranger in his land'. As result we find Egypt still on the map as a nation. And same is true of ancient Persia as a nation: still on the map. But with these and certain other exceptions God caused near or about all other nations to be utterly overthrown, and certain of them seem blotted out entirely. And predictions concerning all this make up the burden of many prophetic books.

3. But God's judgments against Jews, his warnings and pleadings with reference to them, make up much of the prophetic writings. Several prophets foretold their overthrow as a nation and their captivity—10 tribes in Assyria for about 200 years, and 2 tribes in Babylon about 70 years,—also their return to their own land after captivity. And here is mentioned the exception God made in their favor: 'For I am with thee, saith the Lord, to save thee: though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee: but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished' (Jer. 30:11).

4. Jews as a nation had God's promise to Abraham (Gen. 12) about Abraham blessing all nations. And in order for that promise to be fulfilled the Lord needed to take care of Israelites (later known as Jews) even to the uttermost. And that promise was the reason the Lord caused several of his prophets to write cheering assurances to Jews, even when He foretold their captivity as a nation. Jews mentioned in prohetic books are referred to as a fleshly nation in which was a promise concerning Christ and the Gospel age and, in certain instances, the prophetic vision seemed to reach even to the Millennial age, and into Heaven itself.

5. The method of expression in the prophecies is largely poetic., figurative, concrete.

And on that account many persons, find them obscure. And in many writings we find references to time past, time present, as well as to time then future. Take for illustration Is. 1:2, 3—'I have nourished and brought up children, and they rebelled against me. The ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider'. Here is mentioned past history and condition then existing among Jews. See also Isa. 1:16-20. But this is explained in Questions, Answers and Remarks to which attention is next invited. If readers will do their best they will be able to understand the prophecies.

**Isaiah 1**—Here the prophet presented time of his vision, an address to the heavens and the earth, reference to the family also to certain dumb brutes, for illustration. Next, lamenting description of Jewish people as a sinful and corrupt nation then spoke of their perverseness (referring to a diseased, wounded and corrupt human body, to illustrate their condition). Then, of condition of their country and cities, and desolation of the land generally, which was such as to make Jerusalem isolated, and like Sodom and Gomorrah except by reason of the remnant or residue the Lord had in his purpose reserved. The prophet then addressed Jews as if they were people of Sodom and Gomorrah, reproved them for attempting to worship God while their hands were 'full of blood'. Next, exhorted them to turn from their evil ways and do right, stating that the Lord desired to reason with them, also what would result if they would, and then if they would not, turn from their evil. The prophet then lamentingly described Jerusalem and stated what the Lord would do by way of punishing the people, correcting and restoring them, and stating what wrong-doers should suffer and be like in punishment they should receive.

In order to understand this vision of prophecy it is necessary to consider times of the vision and Jews' condition during those times. King Uzziah did well 'til he 'was strong', then he did evil. His son Jotham did better than his father, but the people did 'corruptly' (2 Chron. 26, 27). Jotham's son Ahaz was next king and did evil during his entire reign (2 Chron. 28). He was succeeded by his son Hezekiah, who did well during his reign except in a single instance (2 Chron. 29-32).

Isaiah's address to the heavens and the earth means what he was about to write was from the Lord's mouth, therefore worthy of being heard by heavenly hosts as well as by inhabitants of earth. Therefore by a figure of speech called 'apostrophe', in modern rhetoric, he began to tell his vision.

What is meant by his reference to the family in V. 2? That as rebellions children would treat one who nourished and brought them up, so the Jews treated God. He exercised fatherly care over them, yet they rebelled against Him.

What is meant by reference to certain dumb brutes in v. 3? That those dumb animals are more grateful to, their masters than Jews were to God.

Why were they so ungrateful? The prophet declared they did not 'know'. But why did they not know? They did not 'consider'.

Is that true of religious people in the Gospel age? It is, and true of all other people. The reason mankind, generally are ignorant of God's will is that they don't 'consider'.

But why don't they. 'consider'? They generally fail to do what they admit in all Bible lands to be their duty, namely, to read the Bible.

What may be safely said of Isaiah's description of Jews as a sinful, corrupt and perverse people? It is concise, dignified, rhetorical. Same is true of the, prophet's description of the country, of the cities generally, and Jerusalem in particular.

What is meant by v. 87 That as a cottage in a vineyard for the vine-dresser to live in, and as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers in which the gardener might live, and as a besieged city, are all isolated, so was Jerusalem isolated to destruction in the Divine purpose.

Why did the prophet address Jews as 'rulers of Sod' ore' and 'people of Gomorrah'? Because in character they were like people of those cities.

Why did the Lord refuse to accept their offerings, even hated them, when they were doing what he commanded in regard to, offerings and other acts of worship? Last of v. 15 informs they had been guilty of murder.

What may we learn by this record of Divine decision? That acceptable worship, in the Jewish age required the right act by the right character.

Is not the, same true in the Gospel age? It is. Compare Psa. 66:18 with 1 Cor. 13:3.

What of the lamenting description of Jerusalem in vs. 21-23? Concise, forceful, rhetoric?

What is meant by vs. 24-27? They set forth God's decision to take vengeance on the Jewish nation by punishing it in hands of its enemies, thereby purging away its iniquity; and set forth condition of that nation afterwards.

What is meant by 'the oaks' in v. 29? Chap. 57:5 indicates Jews worshipped idols under trees, thus oak trees are referred to as trees they 'desired'. Reference to 'gardens' they had 'chosen' has same bearing. See ch. 65:3; 66:17. In going after idols Jews worshipped under oak and other kinds of trees, also, in gardens. The Lord said they should be 'ashamed' of those 'oaks' and 'confounded' on account of those 'gardens', Then while 'oaks' and 'gardens' were before the prophet's mind he was instructed to write that Jews should be as an oak whose leaf fadeth, for they should be stripped of their glory even as an oak tree is stripped of its leaves. He was also instructed to write, they should be as a garden without water because they would fade and wither as a nation when their enemies would be permitted to come on them. Reference to, 'tow', or the coarse part of flax, and to a spark, then fire, has same bearing.

**Isa. 2** — The first 5 verses mention that 'the mountain of the Lord's house' shall be established 'in the top of the mountains and exalted above the hills'. Then the disposition all nations shall manifest toward it and beneficial results on those nations, also what the house

of Jacob should do in view of such vision. Next the prophet was turned back to the Divine decision to forsake the Jews, reasons why, and results. Chapter ends with exhortation to cease following after man whose breath is in his nostrils.

What is meant by 'the mountain of the Lord's house' being 'established in the top of the, mountains' in v. 2? The last of v. 3 in connection with Luke 24:47 indicates the prophet foresaw the church of God as 'the Lord's house' or 'house of God' (1 Tim. 3:15), would be established at Jerusalem, and the Gospel would be sent forth from the church there. As the gospel church of God at Jerusalem should be established on the highest and best development of the Jewish church of God, namely, the Lord Jesus Christ, it was very appropriate for Isaiah to be inspired to write that 'in the last days the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains and exalted above the hills'. Showing the Divine intention was that the church should be above every other institution. Then the prophecies that 'all nations shall flow into it' and that 'many nations shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord', indicated many nations would turn their minds toward Jerusalem and receive the Gospel sent from that city. Moreover, that the Gospel's effect would be to prevent nations from learning war is foretold in v. 4

Has that effect been accomplished? Not fully. But in proportion as nations under Gospel influence have been lifted from barbarism, they have ceased to make war their chief business. Moreover, disposition among nations to settle national disputes by arbitration is an index in direction of this prophecy being fulfilled, the ambitious men are often anxious for war.

After the prophet's eye had been unsealed to behold the Gospel church in its exaltation and exalted effects, what did he behold? His prophetic eye was turned to behold captivity of Jewish people.

What is meant by 'replenished from the east' in v. 6? Means filled with customs of Eastern nations.

What of 'the mean man' in v. 9? Refers to the 'ordinary man' as opposed to the 'great man' mentioned in same verse. Thus 'mean' in such connection refers to position in life, not to character nor disposition. The ordinary man and the great man both bowed down to idols, and for that reason Isaiah prayed 'forgive them not'.

What is meant by the exhortation beginning with v. 10? Means when Jehovah's judgments would come on Jews he would be the only exalted one, for all 'lofty looks' and 'haughtiness' of men should be 'humbled' and 'bowed down'.

What of reference to 'cedars', 'oaks', 'high mountains', 'hills lifted up', other high things, and certain 'pleasant' things? The prophet foresaw complete humbling of the Jewish nation so impressively that he: spoke of every high thing in nature being bowed down at the same time. He made grand display of rhetoric, summed up in v. 17, and is repetition of v. 11.

Was the prophecy against idols in vs. 18, 20 fulfilled in regard to the Jewish nation? It was. Captivity of the kingdom of Israel by Assyrians and captivity of Judah by Babylonians abolished idolatry from the Jewish mind and heart, so the nation as such never afterward bowed down to idols. Rebuke inflicted by captivity was terrible but successful. Even to this day Jews are disposed to keep themselves from worship of idols.

**Isa. 3** tells of the Lord's purpose to take from Jews their necessary food and leading men, also of His purpose to place incompetent persons over them as result of their leading men going into captivity. Then we read of distress of people being so great even chief men would declare they lacked bread and clothing; also that in such distress men would shrink from positions of prominence. Next, the prophet's description of wretched condition of Jews when time for captivity would come, but that the righteous should find favor. Further description of the people is given and mention of the Lord entering into judgment with leaders of people who mistreated those under them. Chapter ends with impressive description of customs of 'haughty' women of Jerusalem, and what the Lord would do to them because of their haughtiness, exhibitions of pride and immodesty.

In what chapters of history may we find statements of fulfillment of 1st part of this chapter? In 2 Kings 24 also in 2 Chron. 36 we read of subjugation of the kingdom of Judah, captivity of the king, placing of his uncle Mattaniah in his stead, and carrying away chief of the people.

What of vs. 6, 7? They set forth that when distress comes on a people then official position is unpopular.

What is indicated by v. 9? Evil effect of the wrong life Jews had lived. Their countenances indicated they were immoral.

Is it still true an immoral life shows in countenance of those guilty of such life? Even a month of ordinary immorality shows in countenance of all who practice it.

What of v. 10? Suggests Jer. 39:11-14, by which we learn of favor shown to Jeremiah, who was righteous before God even at risk of his life.

Is it still true leaders of the people cause them to err, as mentioned in v. 12? Religiously and morally, socially and politically, the masses of people are led into error by their leaders.

What effect should latter part of this chapter have on proud women of all generations in all grades of society in Bible lands? Should cause them to fear and tremble at the thought of wearing trinkets and ornaments in order to make themselves attractive. Good physical health, good manners, good morals, a good education and, above all else, a good conscience before God, resulting from obedience to the Gospel,—these are the best attractions and in harmony with the Divine will. These should be coveted and cultivated, nourished and cherished, to rejoicing of the heart and glory of God, by every woman and man privileged to read the Bible. The gospel of God's grace will beautify a human being more than all outward embellishments pride can suggest.

**Isa. 4** speaks of 7 women taking hold of one man, proposing to support themselves but requesting him to suffer them to wear his name. Then mentions beauty and glory of Jews who, would have escaped from destruction destined to come on the nation. Next, a prophecy sets forth the sentence which would be pronounced on the living in Jerusalem and Divine protection which would be over them.

What is meant by 7 women taking hold of one man, mentioned in v. 1? V. 25 of chap. 3 mentions death of men by the sword. As a result men would become few. Same idea indicated in chap. 13:12. Then, as result of men becoming few, women would be without husbands. Therefore 7 women are represented as trying to induce one man to become their husband.

What was meant 'branch of the Lord' in v. 2? Reference to those who would escape general destruction Jews would suffer at their captivity. Book of Ezra sets forth facts in this direction. Shows favorable condition of those who escaped from destruction of Jerusalem and returned from captivity.

V. 4 refers to cleansing Jerusalem from wickedness of its inhabitants (see also chap. 1:25-27).

Vs. 5, 6 refer in poetic language to protection God would exercise over Jerusalem and its inhabitants after Jews would return from captivity. Imagery adopted by the prophet was probably based on Exo. 13:21 and familiar to Jews who knew history of their fathers in the wilderness. The cloud that protected them from the sun during the day was light to them by night, indicated God's constant care for his people in all ages. 'I will never leave thee nor forsake thee' has been His sentence concerning obedient ones in all ages (see Gen. 28:15; Deut. 31:6-8; Heb. 13:5).

**Isa. 5** is a chapter of prophecy concerning overthrow of the Jewish nation. In the first part we learn of God's purpose to withdraw his protection from Jews and suffer their enemies to come on them, and his reason for so doing. A vineyard cared for as the one mentioned in this, yet brought forth 'wild grapes', was an illustration of the Jews. The Lord did everything for them he could have done to cause them to obey him. But instead of bringing forth 'judgment' or justice in their dealings they brought forth 'oppression', and instead of 'righteousness' in them the Lord beheld the 'cry' of the oppressed. This parable of the vineyard is excellent illustration of the illustrative style common in Prophetic writings. May be called 'picturesque', as it presents truth in bold, varied and beautiful descriptions, or word paintings.

Vs. 8-10 were intended to warn monopolists among Jews concerning Divine wrath that had arisen against them, and should warn those who worship wealth in the Gospel age.

Vs. 11, 12 were intended to warn pleasure-lovers among Israelites of their doom, and should warn pleasure-lovers in the Gospel age.

V. 13 shows ignorance of God's word was the secret of fleshly Israel's ruin, even as it has ruined spiritual Israel.

What of 'the mean man' in v. 15? Connection shows 'mean' refers to position rather than to disposition (see chap. 2:9). Then is mention of the Lord 'exalted in judgment' and of results. Then 'woe' is recorded against 4 different classes of characters: workers of iniquity, those that misnamed 'good' and 'evil', those 'wise in their own eyes', and those 'mighty to drink wine'. Vs. 24, 25 set forth what the 'woes' meant, also God's reasons for pronouncing them. Last part of the chapter indicates certainty and terribleness of the overthrow Jews



should suffer because of their sins.

Where may we find account of their overthrow? In 2 Kings 24, 25, also in last chapter of 2 Chronicles, likewise in Jer. 39. By considering Divine judgments against Jews we may learn God's longsuffering and forbearance will not continue always toward the disobedient. We may learn also that God's judgments are severe and even terrible.

**Isa. 6** tells of his vision concerning the Lord and certain of His heavenly host, also of his own overwhelmed feelings, what he said and what was done to him. Then his commission to Jewish people in which their overthrow was foretold, likewise captivity of those that would escape. Finally intimated those who should escape would be permitted to live during the captivity, even as life is in certain kinds of trees when their leaves have fallen.

What is meant by 'seraphim' in v. 2? Means 'burning' and is applied to a certain order of the heavenly hosts.

Is it marvelous that Isaiah felt overwhelmed when he had seen the Lord and his seraphim? No.

What effect should reading this record have on us? Should fill us with reverence.

What was meant by Isaiah's commission to Jewish people in latter part of this chapter? That God would send judgment of blindness or perverseness of spirit on them in order that they might continue rebellious 'til they should fully suffer Divine vengeance.

Was it right for God thus to afflict them? Yes, even as it is right for Him in the Gospel age to, send 'strong delusions' on certain persons (see 2 Thess. 2:11, 12). When mankind cultivate perverseness it is right for God to give them in abundance what they desire.

**Isa. 7** sets forth account of purpose of the king of Syria and the king of Israel to unite and overthrow the kingdom of Judah, also to set up over Judah a king of their own choosing. We are likewise informed what Jehovah said with reference to that purpose, then what He said to Ahaz king of Judah, a descendant of David, in regard to a 'sign' concerning what He had assured him with reference to Syria and Israel. Then from beginning of v. 17 to close of chapter we find prophecies in regard to overthrow of the kingdom of Judah and condition of the land during captivity which would follow that overthrow.

Where do we learn difference between Israel and Judah as separate kingdoms? 1 Kings 12 and on to close of 2 Kings 17.

Why is the kingdom of Israel called Ephraim? Because Ephraim was chief of the 10 tribes that revolted and became the kingdom of Israel in opposition to the 2 tribes, Judah and Benjamin, which constituted the kingdom of Judah.

Whence came the name Israel and what is its meaning? First found in Gen. 32:28 and

means 'prince oil God' or 'ruling with God'. Given to Jacob and he was afterward spoken of as 'Israel'. The nation that descended from him was called 'the children of Israel'. That nation remained one 'til the period mentioned in 1 Kings 12. After that the 10 tribes which revolted were generally called 'kingdom of Israel'. But people of Judah were sometimes called 'Israel' after the period mentioned in 1 Kings 17, at which time the 10 tribes were overthrown. For instance, in chaps. 1:3 and 4:2 and 5:7 of this book 'Israel' is used referring to Judah.

What of vs. 18, 19? Meaning indicated by last part of chap. 5 beginning with v. 26. Jehovah meant he would call the army of the king of Babylon who controlled the domain previously ruled by the king of Assyria. V. 20 is further prophecy in this direction. Ezk. 29:18, 19 indicates what is meant by 'hired'. The king of Babylon was intended to be used to, trim Jews of their earthly glory so close Jehovah spoke of the man who should be chief in that work as 'a razor that is hired'.

What is meant by the last part of this chapter beginning with v. 21? V. 22 indicates reference is made to those 'left in the land' at time of the captivity, and condition of the land of Judah during the captivity. The prophetic style is to mention a single or several facts separately, to indicate general condition of affairs. Vs. 21, 22 indicate that during the captivity there would be plenty of pasture in Judah. Vs. 23, 24 indicate there would be in that land plenty of hunting ground. Last verse refers to condition of that part of the land which would be cultivated.

**Isa. 8** records what file Lord said to him concerning a son, as a sign in regard to overthrow of Syria whose chief city was Damascus, and in regard to overthrow of Israel whose chief city was Samaria. Then mention of overthrow of Judah as well as of Israel, also that associations of nations should not stand when opposed to the Lord's purposes. Mention next of what the Lord said to Isaiah in regard to keeping himself separated from ways of the disobedient, but that the Lord should be his 'fear' and 'dread'. After that we learn what the Lord said he would be to both houses of Israel, and what would result to others, and what Isaiah would himself do. Last of the chapter sets forth God's disapproval of consulting evil spirits, also His law as the standard of measuring, and what would be the wretched condition of the disobedience.

What does 'Maher-shalal-hash-bas' means 'In making speed to the spoil he hasteneth the prey', and was intended to indicate haste with which enemies of Syria and Israel should come upon them. This son was mentioned in vs. 14-16 of chap. 7; at least both were intended as a sign of the same event.

What may we learn from vs. 6, 7? As Shiloh or 'Shiloah' means 'rest' or 'peace', the indication is that the prophet Isaiah here referred to disposition of people of Israel to turn from peace and rest, and rejoice in men who would lead them into trouble; and therefore the Lord would give them trouble by bringing on them the king of Assyria. It is also indicated that the Assyrian king should come as a mighty flood which should even pass through Judah. Nebuchadnezzar is called the 'Assyrian'.

What is indicated by v. 14? That the kingdom of Judah and the kingdom which consisted of the 10 tribes were each called house of Israel, as they are together called 'both houses of

Israel'. We learn also, by this verse in its connection, that God, in his words and ways, was a 'stone of stumbling' and 'rock of offense' to the Jewish nation. Same was true of Christ (see Rom. 9:33). In Isa. 55:8,9 and Luke 16:15 reason of all this is set forth. What was true of Jews in this respect is true of mankind generally. They lack faith, thus measure by sense. As a result God's words and ways are objectionable to them, and their words and ways are abomination to God. The only remedy for these differences is for mankind to study God's word 'til they have wholehearted faith; then continue to study it, in order that their faith remain wholehearted.

What of vs. 16-18? They show there were some disciples or learners of God in Isaiah's day, spoken of as Isaiah's children, also as 'signs' and 'wonders' in Israel.

And what does the last paragraph refer to? Refers to the fact that in their distress Jews would consult evil spirits and would, nevertheless, be 'driven into darkness'.

Had anyone, previously, consulted an evil spirit when in distress? 1 Sam. 28:7 answers. When the Lord did not answer king Saul he inquired for a woman possessed of an evil spirit.

What should this teach us? That we should keep clear of every phase of spiritualism and fortune telling (see Deut. 18:9-12; Rom. 15:4).

**Isa. 9** sets forth assurance that affliction mentioned in the last of the previous chapter would not be without hope, in that the 'dimness' should not be without 'light' as v. 4 foretold breaking the oppressor's yoke. Then mention of spiritual light by which oppression of sin's yoke would be broken by the Son who should be born.

We learn next of God's purpose to utterly overthrow the 10 tribes of which Ephraim was chief. In connection with this account we learn Israel when afflicted would not repent, and God's anger would not be turned away.

Where do we find account of what is mentioned in v. 1? In 2 Kings 15:29.

What is meant by 'light' in v. 2? V. 4 indicates what is meant by its prophecy in regard to overthrow of the oppressor. And Mat. 4:15, 16 informs that v. 2 was prophecy of double reference. First referred to political or national light for fleshly Israel; then to spiritual light for spiritual Israel; then for mankind generally. Prophecy in regard to spiritual light further indicated by vs. 6, 7. Shows when the prophet wrote of fleshly Israel his eye was occasionally unsealed so he could foresee what would pertain to spiritual Israel.

**Isa. 10** shows 'woe' pronounced on certain evil characters and what is meant by that 'woe'. Then an address to the Assyrian or king of Assyria, whom God purposed to raise up against Jews. Next a statement of the Lord's purpose against the Assyrian, and why. Then favorable assurances concerning Jews because they were God's chosen people. Chapter ends with prophetic description of certain advancements of the Assyrian king in overthrowing Jews.

What may we learn by what is said of the Assyrian king? We should learn the God of heaven rules in human governments (see Dan. 4:25). Also that if a man is great enough to amount to something in this world the God of heaven can use that man as an instrument to accomplish His ends; thus we learn folly of human conceit. The greater a man is among his fellow mortals the more likely that God is using him for His own purposes.

Does the fact that God uses men to accomplish His ends show the men are good in the Divine sight? No. Psa. 76:10 indicates God can use the wrath of man, thus use bad men, to praise Him.

Is it dangerous for mankind to exalt themselves and indulge self-conceit? This chapter shows God is offended at every thought and feeling, as well as at every act, of self-conceit. Because the king of Babylon, spoken of in v. 5 as an Assyrian, was boastful, the Lord said 'therefore shall the Lord of hosts send among his fat ones leanness'; and further declared the Divine purpose to overthrow his kingdom.

What of v. 20? Means Israelites who would escape death in time of captivity should not depend on the one who took them captive. Nebuchadnezzar as a king, and his kingdom as such, passed away before Jewish captivity ended. The books named Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther so indicate. So does the book of Daniel. Latter part of chap. 13 of this book informs that Babylonians should fall under power of Medes and Persians.

What of vs. 24-27? Set forth prophecies in regard to release of Jews from Assyrians and from their successors, the Babylonians; and that they should be released because they were God's anointed people.

What should we answer those who say they can't understand the style in which last part of this chapter is written, beginning with v. 28? Inform them that Isaiah wrote as an orator or rhetorician who, in making brief reference to American history, would say, 'Look at Lexington, Bunker Hill and Princeton, and behold what was done there!' Or if a man should make brief reference to English history he might say, 'Behold the English at Trafalgar, at Waterloo and at Sebastopol' Such speeches would be full of important meaning to those acquainted with American and English history, but unmeaning to those ignorant thereof. Thus it is with what Isaiah wrote of advancements of the king of Babylon against Jews. What he said is full of important meaning to those who know of places he mentioned.

**Isa. 11** is figurative language concerning Christ, then plainly declares certain prophecies with reference to Him. Next informs in a figure, or picture, concerning effect of Christ's doctrine on the hearts of mankind, and then, in plain words, final gathering of the Jews is foretold.

Why should we regard 1st part of this chapter as prophecy concerning Christ? 1, Because it refers to Jesse, father of David, from whom Christ descended according to the flesh. 2, Because that which v. 2 declares in regard to the Spirit of God resting on the one there spoken of is in harmony with Isa. 61:1 and Luke 4:18-24. 3, What is here said about smiting the earth with 'the rod of his mouth' is in harmony with Psa. 2: 9, a prophecy concerning Christ, evident from Acts. 4: 25, 26. 4, V. 10 of this chapter bears evidence in the same direction.

How should we regard vs. 6-9? Beautiful picture of peace, among animals, mankind and reptiles, and indicating peace and good will the Gospel makes of opposite temperaments. For instance, the apostle Paul, as a bitter, relentless persecutor, was, by the Gospel's power, made to sit down as a humble disciple with those he had persecuted, or intended to persecute. Thus in many other instances. Men and women who showed disposition of ravenous beasts, or of venomous reptiles, have been made humble, disciples of the Lord Jesus. But verses we are now considering also set forth actual conditions which shall exist when the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. That period seems indicated in Rev. 20.

What of the paragraph beginning with v. 10 and continuing to close of the chapter? V. 10 indicates it refers to the Gospel age, for it refers to an 'ensign' to which 'Gentiles' should 'seek'. But Gentiles never sought a Jewish ensign 'til the Gospel age began. Besides, the last 2 verses of this chapter mention events which have never been literally fulfilled; therefore the Bible student should look forward to future gathering of the Jews for fulfillment of those verses. God's care is still over Jewish people. Paul wrote of them: 'concerning the Gospel, they are enemies for your sakes; but as touching the election they are beloved for the fathers' sake' (Rom. 11:28).

**Isa. 12** is praise and adoration for Jews to adopt when their final gathering will have been accomplished.

What have we thus far learned concerning Jewish people from the prophet Isaiah? Chap. 1 sets forth ignorance, perverseness and corruption of the Jewish nation. God's effort to lead them to repentance, their captivity, and incidental mention of return to their land. Chap. 2 sets forth prophecy regarding the Gospel age, then the prophet dwells on corruption of the Jewish nation. Chap. 3 mentions what the Lord would do to Jews because of their wickedness. Chap. 4 mentions fewness of men by reason of what the Lord would do to the Jews, and results of separating them from their iniquity. Chap. 5 tells, under figure of a parable, what God would do to Jews because of their iniquity, then describes varied forms of their wickedness, and that they should be overthrown. Chap. 6 informs of Isaiah's vision in which he saw the Lord and other heavenly beings, also of the commission the Lord gave him, and what should be true of a residue of the Jews. Chap. 7 mentions union of Syrians and 10 tribes of the Jews in order to overthrow Jerusalem; what the Lord said to Isaiah on that subject; what he said to Ahaz king of Judah; and what the Lord determined to bring on the kingdom of Judah. Chap. 8 sets forth what the Lord said to Isaiah concerning a certain child who was to wear a significant name, likewise that Assyrians should come on both houses of Israel, after which we find warning against consulting evil spirits. Chap. 9 tells of light for Jews in midst of darkness, also records prophecy concerning Christ; then of perverseness of Jewish people and their terrible overthrow. Chap. 10 pronounces 'woe' on certain evil characters, foretells destruction of the Jewish nation, by whom accomplished, and what the Lord would do to the one who inflicted that destruction. Chap. 11 brings prophecy concerning Christ, results of his Gospel, also prophecy in regard to final gathering of Jews to their land. Chap. 12 records praise and adoration they will use after their final gathering together is accomplished.

The 12 chapters just considered refer to Jews except incidental mention of their enemies. The king of Babylon, called 'Assyrian' in chap. 10, was the chief character among the Jews'

enemies, and his overthrow is specially mentioned. Reason for that overthrow is declared to have been his self-conceit, and to this is added in chap. 47:6 statement of his oppression of Jews. The Lord foresaw what he would do, thus mentioned it in prophecy. Jehovah intended to punish Jews sufficiently, and did not intend anyone else should add to affliction He placed on them.

Chapters thus far considered mention Jews in their wickedness, in captivity, in return from captivity, and their condition after their return. The Gospel age is mentioned in several of those chapters, also final gathering of Jews, and glimpses of the Millennial age after Jews have been finally gathered to their land.

Woe then to the nation or individual that afflicts a Jew! We shall now proceed to consider 12 chapters referring almost entirely to Gentiles.

**Isa. 13** offers prophecies regarding destruction of Babylon and what its condition should continue to be. V. 2 refers to calling of the Medes, mentioned in v. 17. Indicated in v. 3 speaking of those who should destroy Babylon as God's 'sanctified ones', and as his 'mighty ones' for his 'anger'. Application of these names to those the Lord intended should accomplish his purposes against Babylon does not mean he approved their religion. The Lord sometimes chose bad men to accomplish his ends, and in all such instances his choice of them referred to their official, not to their personal character. Thus Cyrus of Persia was spoken of by the Lord as his 'shepherd' also his 'anointed' (see Isa. 44: 28 and 45:1). But those names were applied to him as king, thus with reference to his official character only.

What is meant by vs. 10, 11? When Isaiah wrote his prophetic eye was opened to destruction of the world of mankind for their wickedness. When destruction of Babylon was foreseen the prophet was enabled to look forward to destruction which will be inflicted in the last days of the Gospel age.

What is meant by v. 12? That men would be made 'precious' by being made few, and would be made few by destructions Jehovah would inflict. Thus it was in regard to Babylon; thus it will be in the last days (see Rom. 9:18). Prophecy in v. 13 should be considered in connection with Heb. 12:26,27; Rev. 6:12-14 also 20:11.

What of the prophecy that Babylon should never again be inhabited? Has thus far been literally fulfilled; so has all else here stated concerning its perpetual destructions. That destruction remains as a monument to Divine inspiration of Isaiah as a prophet, and to confusion of all infidelity concerning that inspiration. Jer. 50 sets forth similar prophecy in regard to perpetual desolation of Babylon. Then in Rom. 18 is prophecy concerning overthrow and everlasting ruin of spiritual Babylon. As with ancient Babylon, so it shall be with modern Babylon. The word 'Babylon' is the Greek form of the Hebrew word 'Babel', and means 'confusion'. We find it first in Gen. 10:10, then in 11:9 it is explained. The king of ancient Babylon was used to confusion of Jewish people, and doctrine of modern Babylon has been confusion of the Gospel church.

**Isa. 14** sets forth favorable prophecy in regard to Jews then a proverb for Jews against the king of Babylon; finally, warning for Jews.

When was the favorable prophecy fulfilled? In course of time mentioned in books called Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther. In Esth. 8:17 we learn 'many people of the land became Jews, for fear of the Jews fell on them'. Ezra 1 and Neh. 2 set forth fulfillment of what is stated here in vs. 2, 3.

What of the 'proverb' concerning the king of Babylon? It should be read specially by all the rich and haughty ones of earth. Should cause them and all others who read it to be impressed with their weakness and helplessness when they will fall under power of death. That proverb also sets forth conscious existence of mankind after death, and in figurative expressions represents inanimate objects as rejoicing over death of the king of Babylon.

Did the king of Babylon who overthrew the Jews receive warning in regard to his haughtiness and cruelty? Dan. 4, specially v. 27, answers.

Is there Bible history as to meaning of warning in last part of this chapter? Ezra 4 informs of trouble which came on the Jews after their return to Palestine at end of their captivity. Dan. 8, 11 indicate in same direction by prophecy. Outside the Inspired record we find a Jewish writer, Josephus, wrote extensively concerning history of his people during the period between their return from captivity and the New Testament era.

What should we learn by v. 32? That because the Lord founded Zion it should remain; and because he would overthrow haughty ones who would oppress the poor, therefore the poor should trust in him.

**Isa. 15** sets forth prophecies against Moabites.

Who were they? Originated with Moab, son of Lot, Abraham's nephew, by one of his own daughters (see Gen. 19:30-38). Also spoken of in Num. 22 and Deut. 23:3, 4.

What of Isaiah's style, in prophesying against Moab? Rhetorical; not that of the historian. It is the historian's business to state facts so they can be easily understood; but the rhetorician only mentions certain significant facts in a series, and these imply-or suggest all others important to those who have studied the subject. That style of speech is most forceful, as it omits details and mentions only most important items. Thus in vs. 1, 2 Isaiah declared 'because in the night' a city named 'Ar' and one named 'Kir' would be 'laid waste,' therefore the Moabite would go to other places, showing his grief by making 'baldness' on his 'head' and cutting off his 'beard'.

What is meant by 'burden' in v. 1? Means sentence, or heavy lot, or judgment.

What of v. 9? Means many would be killed at a stream named Dimon, and those who escaped the slaughter by their human enemies should be killed by ravenous beasts.

**Isa. 16** continues prophecies against Moabites.

What is meant by v. 1? Refers to obligation of Moabites to pay tribute to rulers of their land, and from one end of their country to the other. 2 Kings 3:4 mentions tribute Moabites paid when in subjection to the king of Israel. Moab was a good country for sheep, and the people were required, it seems, to pay their taxes in sheep. The prophet here commanded Moabites to be honest with their ruler, then told them the reason. In v. 3 he gave further instruction in regard to righteousness, even commanded them to show mercy, assuring if they would do so then mercy would be shown them. That is to say, the Lord knew when destruction would come on the Jews there would be many fugitives or 'outcasts' from among the Jews; and he told Moabites to let such dwell with them, for the time would come when 'daughters of Moab' would be 'as a wandering bird cast out of the nest'. Such a bird is always an object of pity because of its helplessness. In Jer. 40:11 we read of Jews who dwelt in the land of Moab.

What did Jehovah charge against Moab? V. 6 informs he was charged with 'pride' and 'haughtiness', 'wrath' and 'lies'.

Would such evils naturally prevent Moab from treating Jewish fugitives with mercy? They would, and remainder of the chapter informs of Moab's overthrow.

**Isa. 17** sets forth Divine sentence of judgment against Damascus, therefore against the Syrian nation of which Damascus was the chief city.

What is meant by reference to 'glory of the children of Israel' in v. 3? Earthly glory of children of Israel had been or would be destroyed, and the Lord intended 'the kingdom from Damascus and the remnant from Syria' should be like the 'glory of the children of Israel'; thus should be destroyed.

What, is meant by vs. 5, 6? Indicate a remnant of Syrians should be left. Indicated by what is said of 'gleaning grapes' and 'shaking of an olive tree'. Then v. 9 suggests same idea. A few Syrians would be left 'because of the children of Israel' or because of favors shown the Israelites, even as a few Moabites seem to have been left because of mercy they had shown to 'outcasts' of Israel.

What of vs, 7, 8? Inform in regard to this general truth: When a man is in deep distress he is not disposed to use shams. Thus it was, thus it is, and will be.

What of v. 10 Mentions what is manifest among all sectarians, whether guilty of innovationism or hobbyism. They profess and preach pleasant doctrines in general terms, but are guilty of mixing among its practices some things foreign to Christ's gospel. Thus they 'plant pleasant plants' but set them 'with strange slips'.

What of v. 14? Statement in regard to 'portion' and 'lot' of those who would spoil the Jewish people. Thus far every nation which has oppressed Jews has soon become involved in trouble. All ancient nations that afflicted them have been overthrown, and nearly all have been blotted out of existence. Egypt seems the chief exception, and in Deut. 23:7, 8 we find



favorable mention of the Egyptian. It was in Egypt the Israelites became a nation.

What will be the end of those who oppose and oppress Christians? In Mat. 25:34-46 we learn that anything and everything, good or evil, done to a Christian, the Savior regards as done to himself.

**Isa. 18** pronounces 'woe' on the land 'beyond the rivers of Ethiopia', which seems to have been Ethiopia itself.

What is meant by 'land shadowing with wings' in v. 1? Hebrew word here translated 'shadowing' is sometimes used in sense of 'protection', as in Num. 14:9 it's translated by 'defense'. Then 'wings' is translation of the same word and seems referring to sails of vessels mentioned in next verse. The idea then is, 'Woe to the land protected by sail boats which is beyond the rivers of Ethiopia'. 'Rivers' here may simply mean waters, and what the waters of Ethiopia were we may learn by Gen. 2:13. Besides, the plural form in Hebrew is often used for sake of emphasis when the singular is meant. We therefore conclude, specially in light of v. 2, that v. 1 means, Woe to the land, protected by sail boats, which is beyond the river Gihon.

What of v. 2? Refers to Ethiopia as giving command that sail boats should be sent against the Jewish nation. 'Rivers' in last of this verse is used to represent destruction wrought by an enemy's army (see chap. 8: 7, 8).

What is meant by remaining verses? In v. 3 the prophet called on inhabitants of the world to give attention to what the Lord would do and say. Then the expression 'clear heat upon herbs' and 'a cloud of dew in the heat of harvest' meant damage' even as 'cut off the sprigs' and 'cut down the branches' in v. 5 means destruction. V. 6 confirms this idea for it mentions vineyard as left to 'fowls of the mountains and to beasts of the earth', which meant destruction of the vineyard. Next the prophet mentions 'the present' that would be brought to the Lord from Jews at time destruction of Ethiopia would be inflicted. This chapter therefore teaches that Ethiopia had, or would have, evil purposes concerning Jews, but God would thwart them and overthrow Ethiopians, and at the same time would prosper Jews so they would worship him by offerings.

**Isa. 19** outlines severe lot or terrible judgment the Lord determined against Egypt, then mentions God's care for Egypt, Assyria and Israel.

What is meant by v. 1? Refers to swift destruction which would come on Egyptians when the Lord would bring their enemies on them. And in rhetorical style the prophet foretold in vs. 5-8. Egypt's defenses would fail and desolation would be as if its rivers and brooks would fail. This idea is confirmed by vs. 9, 10.

What of vs. 11-17? Bring before Bible readers Divine description of confusion God intended to inflict on Egypt, and results of that confusion.

And what of vs. 18, 19? Jer. 43, 44 give light on this. The Lord foresaw Jews who entered Egypt after captivity of the nation, as such, by Babylonians, would have effect on certain cities of Egyptians.

What of v. 22 to close of chapter? Reference to God's care for Egypt, even yet manifest; also to intermingling of Assyrians, Egyptians and Israelites after Egypt would fall under Babylonian power.

**Isa. 20** shows Egypt and Ethiopia were to be involved together in overthrow inflicted by the king over Assyria, who would be king of Babylon (see Jer. 42-44, specially chap. 43:10, 11).

Why is Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, often spoken of as 'king of Assyria'? He was king over the land formerly designated Assyria.

And what is meant by v. 6? Inhabitants of the country or coast land of the Jews would learn, when too late to benefit them, that they made a mistake in going into Egypt.

**Isa. 21** is prophecies against Babylon and Arabia, which countries are mentioned in vs. 9, 13.

What may we learn by the prophet's expressions of his personal distress? That he had visions so 'grievous' they stirred his sympathies.

And what of the broken style of his writings? The style, of one who speaks in distress and confusion (see vs. 5, 12). That style was most appropriate for the prophet when setting forth confusion which would result from wars that would overthrow Babylon and afflict Arabia.

What of v. 10? Isaiah had seen a vision against Babylon which when fulfilled would be like threshing grain. See also chap. 41:15, 16, where God's judgments against heathen and in behalf of Jews are mentioned as a 'threshing instrument' with teeth, or mouths; thus in advance of any instrument then used for threshing. Moreover the first part of this chapter in connection with v. 10 indicates the prophet Isaiah felt personally interested in nations concerning which he delivered Divine decisions.

What should this suggest to the preacher of Christ? He ought to learn it becomes him to be personally interested in welfare of those to whom he makes known the Gospel.

**Isa. 22** is what the prophet spoke of as 'the burden of the valley of vision'.

What did that mean? V. 4 indicates Isaiah beheld vision of affliction for Jews. Last part of this chapter beginning with v. 15 confirms that he referred to Jews in the former part. Besides, the expression 'house of the forest' in last of v. 8 suggests 1 Kings 7:2 and 10: 17, where we read of 'the house of the forest' Solomon built. Vs. 9, 10 of the chapter before us

confirm that what Isaiah saw in 'the valley of vision' referred to Jews and evils which should be brought on them.

**Isa. 23** is severe judgments of Jehovah against Tyre and Zidon, heathen cities prominent among merchant cities of their day.

To what was overthrow of Tyre likened? To overthrow of Egypt (see v. 5). Then in latter part of this chapter a promise concerning Tyre is recorded. Suggests chap. 19:22, where mention is made of Jehovah smiting and healing Egypt. He indicated, in the chapter before us, thus he would do with Tyre.

What may we learn by the last verse? That Jews would traffic with Tyre after it would be re-built, and what they would gain would be 'holiness to the Lord'.

In what respect? Remainder of the verse declares it should 'not be treasured nor laid up', but should be for them that would 'dwell' before the Lord, to eat sufficiently, and for durable clothing'.

What should we learn from such declaration? That whatever is contributed to welfare of the Lord's servants was 'holiness to the Lord' in the Jewish age.

Anything in the New Testament bearing in this direction? See Mat. 25:40; Philip. 4:18.

What else by considering the last verse? We may learn in the Jewish age the gain from traffic, which was 'holiness to the Lord', was not 'treasured nor laid up'.

What does this suggest? All the New Testament sets forth against Christians laying up earthly riches or material wealth.

**Isa. 24** informs that judgments are determined by Jehovah on the entire earth, and specially on 'haughty people' of the earth, otherwise spoken of as 'the host of the high ones' and 'kings of the earth'.

What special charges the Lord has here brought against inhabitants of the earth? V. 5 informs 'the earth is defiled under inhabitants thereof'. This is the general charge, and specifications are these: 1, 'They have transgressed the laws'; 2, They have 'changed the ordinance'; 3, They have 'broken the everlasting covenant'

What of vs. 6-12? Inform chiefly in rhetorical expressions concerning infliction of judgments previously threatened in general terms. Vs. 13, 14 indicate a residue will repent when final judgments will be inflicted. The last book of the Bible informs of 3 grades of judgments against 3 grades of rebellion. The oldest and most widely extended rebellion is Heathenism, and will be first in line of judgments (see Rom. 8, 9). The 2nd rebellion in chronological order is Judaism, and will be 2nd in line of judgments. The last extended

rebellion is the Apostate Church, spoken, of as 'the man of sin', and will be last in line of judgments. Jews will be the only ones who will repent (see Rev. 11:13). When Divine judgments will have been inflicted on the rebellions just mentioned, then will come the end of the Gospel age, next the Millennium, then the end of this world (see also, chap. 65:25 of this book).

The chapter just considered makes an end for the present of Jehovah's threatening of judgments against heathen nations. In our examination of Isaiah's prophecies thus far we have found 12 chapters referring chiefly to Jews, then 10 chapters against the heathen. Next we have one chapter (22) against Jews, then one against heathen. Now at close of chap. 24 we are prepared to consider several chapters filled almost entirely with information in regard to Jews.

**Isa. 25** informs that Isaiah wrote expressions of praise and adoration to God because of His wonders, then mentioned those wonders.

What is meant by vs. 6, 7? Suggest Psa. 36:8, 9, where 'fatness' or fulness of God's house is spoken of to indicate perfection of the Divine arrangement even in the Jewish age. The mind of the Bible reader is next turned to chap. 2:2-5 of this book and to fulness of the Gospel age. A rich temporal feast is spoken of in v. 6 to illustrate the rich spiritual feast which in the Gospel is offered to 'all people'. Clearly indicated by v. 7 which mentions destroying 'the covering cast over all people and the vail spread over all nations'. In Acts, 26:17, 18 we learn Paul was sent to the Gentiles to 'open their eyes and turn them from darkness to light'. Then in Eph. 4:18 we find expressions 'understanding darkened' and 'blindness of their heart' with referring to ignorance of the heathen, which the Gospel was intended to, dispel.

What of v. 8? In 1 Cor. 15:54 we learn the former part of this verse is applied to resurrection of redeemed ones, then in Rev. 7:17 and 21:4 we learn the latter part of this verse refers to blessedness of the redeemed after resurrection. The last paragraph, beginning with v. 9, mentions satisfaction Jews will have when they finally understand God's purposes concerning them, also His purposes concerning their enemies.

**Isa. 26** sets forth a song for Jewish people to sing when they understand God's purposes concerning them.

What of v. 18? Psa. 81:13-16 is suggested. The Lord's enemies would have been subdued in the Jewish age if the Jewish people had only obeyed Divine commands.

What might have been true in the Gospel age? All nations might have been led to accept the Gospel if the church of Christ, as first established, had only been faithful in all countries and generations.

What may yet take place if all who profess to be apostolic disciples will prove faithful? To say the least, the Lord's word will have 'free course and be glorified'.

**Isa. 27** first declares the Lord will punish 'leviathan', 'the piercing serpent', also called 'that crooked serpent' Next, 'mention of 'a vineyard of red wine' the Lord will 'keep'. Then of the Lord's power; next his desire for mankind to make 'peace' with him, also his promise that Israel shall fill the whole world with fruit. Smiting of Israel next mentioned, also purging of iniquity from Jacob; but we are informed Jerusalem should become desolate. Finally we read the Lord would 'beat off' enemies of the Jews and gather them one-by-one out of Assyria and Egypt, and bring them to the 'holy mount at Jerusalem'.

What is meant by the statement that the Lord would punish leviathan, also called 'the dragon of the sea'? In view of the fact that the period when the serpent would be punished is mentioned, the Bible reader very naturally thinks of the devil as described in Rev. 12:9 and of what is said about him in John 16:11, Heb. 2: 14 and Rev. 20:2, 3, 10.

What is meant by vs. 7, 8? The Lord determined he would not treat Jews as he had treated and would treat other nations Jer. 30:11 informs on this subject. The Lord destroyed certain other nations to raise them up no more; but he corrected Jews in order that he might save them from iniquity and prolong their existence as a nation

**Isa. 28**, first, we find 'woe' pronounced against drunkards of the chief tribe of the 10 which revolted in days of Rehoboam son of Solomon; and that 'woe' was explained. Next informed what the Lord of hosts would be to 'residue' or remnant of his people when the threatened 'woe' should be, inflicted, and this is followed by description of condition of those who erred through wine. Then a paragraph in regard to teaching knowledge, followed by a paragraph in regard to false confidence of wrong doers in Israel. Next a declaration of what the Lord would do for mankind generally, and against the Jewish nation by way of judging it. Chapter ends with exhortation followed by reasoning, which should have turned that nation from its errors.

What of the paragraph beginning with v. 9? Implied babes were the only ones who would receive Divine instruction. V. 10 suggests 2 Chron. 36:15, 16, which informs of God's effort to teach chief men of the Jewish nation, and of its results. V. 11 indicates God would teach Jews by their enemies when in captivity. Vs. 12, 13 mention the Lord's effort to teach them, and inform us of their perverseness.

What of v. 15? Not likely any Jews deliberately said 'we have made a covenant with death, and with hell we are at agreement', nor 'we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves'. Nevertheless such, in the Lord's sight, was the meaning of their words and actions.

May not same be true of persons in the Gospel age? Certainly. In God's estimation there are millions even of professed Christians whose condition is probably such as was that of Jews described in v. 15. What of v. 16? The New Testament informs that it is prophecy concerning Christ (see 1 Pet. 6:6-8).

Why was such prophecy inserted here? A fitting, preface to what follows. The Lord proposed to tell what he would do in behalf of all mankind before stating his judgments

against rebellious Jews.

What is meant by v. 20? That confidence of disobedient Jews was insufficient.

What is bearing of reasoning in the last of this chapter? intended to show rebellious Jews their disobedience was unreasonable.

**Isa. 29** tells of a 'woe' the Lord pronounced on 'the city of David', and what that 'woe' meant; also what those nations should be like that would distress that city. Then, what the Lord further said about people of 'the city of David', and what he would do against them. Next, another 'woe' against false reasoners, a charge against them, and statement of results. Chapter ends with favorable words for the deaf, blind, meek and ignorant, in connection with mention of Divine judgments against the terrible, the scorner, and for the one who would lay a 'snare for him that reproveth in the gate'.

What does 'Ariel' mean? 'Lion of God', and was applied as a name to Mount Zion, otherwise called 'the city of David'. But in its most restricted meaning 'Mount Zion' referred to the highest and most southern mount of Jerusalem. It was stronghold of the Jebusites, which David captured after he became king, and for that reason was called by his name (see 2 Sam. 5:6-9)

What should we say to those who pretend in favor of Divine revelations coming up out of the ground, and refer to v. 4 as evidence? We should show the voice of such should be as 'one that hath a familiar spirit', which means an evil spirit; and this indicates evil rather than good. Besides, when Ariel was brought that low it was under God's condemnation and under effect of his severe judgments.

What is meant by vs. 7, 8? That nations which would fight against Mount Zion should pass as a dream in the night.

And have they really passed away? Yes; at least the most prominent of them long ceased to exist except in history. The Assyrian empire has gone down to rise no more, and same is true of the Babylonian and Roman.

What is meant by vs. 9-12? God's judgment of blindness or confusion in regard to understanding, and illustrated by reference to a 'sealed' book which neither learned nor unlearned could read.

What is set forth in such illustration favoring modern pretension to Divine revelation only some favored person could read? Not the slightest reference to such pretension except in what is in vs. 9, 10 about God's judgments being such as to cause men to be 'drunken' and 'stagger' and to have 'the spirit of deep sleep' which 'closed' their 'eyes'. Men and women in modern times, who pretend to have Divine revelations, show by their ignorance of the Bible that they belong to the class mentioned in 2 Thess. 2:9-12.

Is the fear of anyone now 'taught by the precept of men', as mentioned in v. 13? Yes. In certain religious bodies the only fear which seems to exist in worshipers is taught by human precept.

Are religious teachers now living who are under 'woe' mentioned in v. 15? Multitudes are. False reasoners generally show disposition mentioned in that verse.

Will their false reasoning endure God's test? V. 16 indicates it will not. God understands all mankind.

**Isa. 30** records 'woe' against Jews for taking counsel, and being disposed to go down into Egypt without, inquiring of the Lord; and result of such misconduct. Then we find Isaiah was commanded to write in a book against Jewish people in regard to their rebellious disposition, and what the Lord would do to them because they would not 'hear the law of the Lord' but trusted in 'oppression and perverseness'. Record then of what Divine judgments would bring on them. Latter part of the chapter sets forth what the Lord would do to Jews after they would have been fully punished, and what He would then do to their enemies.

What may we learn by vs. 20, 21? That after Jews would return from captivity their teachers should not be set aside, but they should see their teachers and 'hear a word behind' them giving instructions in regard to the way they should walk.

What does this suggest to the Bible reader charged with being 'behind the times'? That in being behind the times he is very likely with the Divine 'word' which says 'this is the way, walk ye in it'.

What is suggested by v. 26? Joy of Jews when they would be brought back to Jerusalem after the captivity (see. Neh. 8:12).

What is meant by v. 33? That perdition, is large enough to receive all who will not obey the Lord, and it is the place Of severe punishment.

**Isa. 31** sets forth 'woe' against Jews for going down to Egypt for help instead of trusting in the Lord, then, reason for pronouncing that 'woe' is more fully stated.

When did Jews depend on Egypt? 2 Kings 17:34 informs. That part of the Jewish nation called 'Israel' formed alliance with Egyptians, but was not benefitted. On the contrary, that alliance hastened overthrow of Israel.

What should we learn by considering those facts? That the church in the Gospel age should not go to the, world for help, and should not trust in such help for success against its enemies.

What is meant by vs. 4, 5? Chaps. 36, 37 set forth facts which show when the Assyrian king came against Jerusalem he did not succeed.

What is indicated by vs. 6, 7? That Jews would in days of Hezekiah, when God would fight for Jerusalem, be free from idolatry.

What does v. 8 indicate? Death of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, as recorded in, chap. 37:37, 38.

And what of v. 9? Refers to fear among princes of Assyria as result of their army losing 185,000 of their fighting forces in one night by Divine judgment (see chap. 37:36).

**Isa. 32** mentions a king reigning in righteousness, princes ruling in judgment, also blessedness resulting from such reigning and ruling. Then wise admonitions and serious warnings are recorded for women living at ease and in carelessness. Chapter ends with comforting assurances concerning God's people.

What king is referred to in first of this chapter? We are not informed concerning a particular king; but a righteous king is mentioned, also result of his righteous ruling. All this was in great measure true in days of Hezekiah and Josiah in the kingdom of Judah. It's always true when the righteous are in authority people rejoice (Prov. 29:2). There may be reference to Christ in first part of the chapter but, if so, the reference is on general principles and by double reference of prophecy rather than by specific statement.

What of the admonition and warning to a certain class of women? Suggests last of chap. 3. Likewise, that God is displeased with indulgence is wrong.

What is taught in vs. 14-16? That destruction would prevail over the doomed city 'til the Lord would make the change by his spirit (see Ezra 1:2, 5). In these vs. 'forever' followed by 'until' indicates importance of modifying words to avoid wrong impressions.

**Isa. 33** informs concerning 'woe' the Lord pronounced against the spoiler and treacherous dealer, also of prayer of the prophet through whom the 'woe' was made known. Then informed in regard to overthrow of nations, exaltation of the Lord, and his benefits to Zion, also of fear which should take possession of sinners and hypocrites of Zion. Next we are informed of blessedness of the righteous. Last of the chapter foretells blessed condition of Zion or Jerusalem, and her inhabitants, when all her enemies will have been overthrown.

What is indicated by v. 6? Illustration of beauty and dignity of prophetic style. Same is true of first part of v. 20 'and wisdom and knowledge shall be stability of thy times ... look on Zion, city of our solemnities'. These sentences are beyond comparison with what is found in human literature, specially when all bearings are considered. Yet they are only illustrations of hundreds of sentences in prophetic writings. The Bible is beyond comparison in regard to truth and expression of truth. Therefore it proclaims its Divine origin.

When will v. 24 be fulfilled? The 20th chapter of John's vision on the island Patmos' indicates the time. Then, 'the camp of the saints and the beloved city' will be protected against all enemies (see Rom. 20:9).



**Isa. 34** tells of final judgments on 'all nations', and from these we learn the prophet passed in v. 11 to Divine judgments against Babylon. Certainty of these judgments is declared in conclusion of this chapter.

Why may we conclude that in v. 11 Isaiah began to mention God's judgments against Babylon Because of what is in chaps. 13:20-22; 14:23 also Jer. 50:89.

But may not reference be also made to overthrow of spiritual Babylon? Yes (see Rev. 18:2).

What is meant by vs. 16, 17? The 'mate' of every prophecy would be its fulfillment, and God declared not one prophecy recorded should lack its 'mate'; that is, not one should fail.

We have thus far in this book found 12 chapters devoted chiefly to Jews, then 11 (excepting the 22nd) chiefly devoted to heathen, then 10 chapters devoted chiefly to Jews. We have therefore found one series chiefly filled with information concerning Jews including both houses of Israel, one series chiefly filled with information concerning heathen, then another series chiefly in regard to Jews. These several series of chapters need to be distinguished from each other in order that outlines of the book of Isaiah be easily held by the mind.

**Isa. 35** begins with rhetorical picture of gladness and rejoicing in 'wilderness' and 'desert', then records command, or exhortation, in direction of strength and courage because of what God would do in regard to vengeance, recompense of salvation. Next is record of blessing, which should come on the blind, deaf, lame, and dumb. Followed by rhetorical picture concerning wilderness, desert, parched ground, thirsty land, habitation of dragons, and a highway called 'the way of holiness' over which the 'unclean' should 'not pass', where there should not be any lion nor other ravenous beast; but where the 'redeemed of the Lord' should walk and 'come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy'

What is meaning of all this? Vs. 5, 6 in light of Mat. 11:4-6 show this entire chapter is prophecy concerning blessings introduced among mankind by coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his church when established. The rhetorical picture of gladness and beauty in vs. 1, 2 is fitting frontispiece to the chapter of temporal blessings introduced by Christ's personal ministry in which he showed himself the friend of mankind by relieving their temporal distresses. Then the rhetorical picture in last of v. 6 and on to close of v. 9 is appropriate vestibule to the Lord's house with its spiritual blessings, as found in the New Testament church. Beauty of this chapter is somewhat marred because translators, and the one who divided it into verses, did not grasp its definite bearing on Christ's personal ministry, then on his ministry by the Spirit through the apostles.

**Isa. 36** records threatening of Jerusalem by the army of Sennacherib king of Assyria, in days of Hezekiah king of Judah. The threatening speech was by Rab-shakeh, captain of the Assyrian host.

In what other part of the Sacred Text is that threatening speech recorded? 2 Kings 18,

and mentioned in 2 Chron. 32.

What of v. 6? Sets forth what is now true of the church in relation to the world. When the church depends on the world for assistance it will be seriously damaged. And vs. 16, 17 suggest that which compromising churches offer to worldlings in order to secure them as members. They often say 'come join us and we will make it pleasant for you'.

**Isa. 37** records what Hezekiah did when he heard of the threatening speech of Rabshakeh against Jerusalem, also what the Lord said to Hezekiah through Isaiah in regard to that speech. Then we read Rabshakeh departed from Jerusalem but sent messengers to Hezekiah with a letter threatening and boastful. Next we read what Hezekiah did when he received the letter, of his prayer to God, also of what the Lord said to him through Isaiah. Near the chapter's end we find recorded that the Lord smote the, camp of the king of Assyria by His angel and slew 185,000. Lastly we read of death of Sennacherib by the hand of 2 of his sons who fled to Armenia, and another son reigned in his stead.

**Isa. 38** is record of king Hezekiah in sickness, the Lord's decision in regard to his death, his prayer for recovery, the Lord's answer, and the sign given to Hezekiah. Then we find that king's own record of his prayer and likewise we find what was done for him with reference to his sickness by Isaiah's instruction.

What of the 'sign' in v. 8? Indicates revolutions or rotations of the earth were reversed for a period. Josh. 10:12-14 informs of an event indicating rotations of the earth were then checked for a period; but in v. 8 of the chapter before us evidence is to the effect that motions of the earth were for a time really reversed.

What should we answer professed scientists who say that to reverse revolutions of the earth would be impossible? Inform them that men make engines which can be reversed, then ask Why could not God make a world that might be reversed? Moreover, men make engines which can be reversed in motion, and can reverse motion of machinery to which they are attached. Why then should it be thought impossible for the Creator of the universe to make an engine which, with all attached machinery, could be reversed? Is man wiser than his Maker? Does he know better how to arrange and manage his affairs than God knows how to manage His? (To ask these questions is to answer them.)

**Isa. 39** is account of messengers to Jerusalem from Babylon, who bore letters and a present to Hezekiah from the son of the king of Babylon; also of disposition of Hezekiah toward them, and that he showed them all his treasures. Then we find account of what the Lord said to Hezekiah through the prophet Isaiah in regard to his treatment of the messengers from Babylon, and Hezekiah's response.

What may we learn by considering mistake of king Hezekiah? God suffered him to be tried and, being off guard, he sinned (see 2 Chron. 32:31). Thus it has been with many others

and thus it will be in time to come. To be constantly watchful, is the only safe plan.

In view of results of that mistake of Hezekiah, would it not have been better for him if he had died when the Lord first decided he should die? To ask this question is to answer it. Had he died at time first appointed his record would have been clear, and his children might have been spared from becoming eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon.

What should therefore be our conclusion in regard to God's decisions? Should always be according to Psa. 18:30.

What of v. 8? Shows Hezekiah thought more of himself than of his descendants, and did not seem to care what became of them if he could only fare well during his own lifetime.

- L

**Isa. 40** reveals exhortation to comfort the Lord's people at some future date because of the measure of Divine judgments they would then have received. Next, prophecy concerning introduction of the Gospel age. Remainder sets forth God's greatness and goodness.

Had Jews suffered the full measure of punishment when Isaiah wrote? They had not, and in vs. 1, 2 that, prophet wrote in regard to what should come on the Jews at a future date. From beginning of v. 3 to close of v. 11 we find much that certainly referred to introduction of the Gospel age (see specially v. 3 as quoted in Mat. 3:3, also vs. 6, 7 as quoted in 1 Pet. 1:24, 25).

What may we learn by v. 22? That Jehovah making known his greatness indicated shape of the earth. The expression 'circle of the earth' shows the earth is a sphere, thus is round. This index in regard to the earth's shape might have been a guide to professed scientists if they had only been sufficiently humble and reverential to study the Bible. Thus, while correct translation of Job. 38:14 indicates motion of the earth, v. 22 of the chapter before us indicates form of the earth. Had professed scientists considered subjects mentioned in these scriptures they might have been saved from ignorance and blundering in regard to those subjects during many centuries.

What may be safely said of professed scientists and other pretenders to learning who are skeptical concerning the Bible, and seldom lose opportunity to cast reflections against its Divinity? They may be justly classed with the most dishonest men. They pretend to be learned, yet venture to speak against the Bible while densely ignorant of its contents. A just reference to the Bible is so seldom made by them that such reference seems unintentional. As a rule they blunder nearly every time they mention God's written word; thus reveal their lack of learning also lack of precaution. Skeptics concerning the Bible who proclaim their skepticism are a set of unblushing asserters of falsehood.

**Isa. 41** first declares Jehovah commanded 'silence' that the people might renew their strength, then began to reason concerning what he had done and would do. Then mentioned making of an idol. Next spoke consoling words to Israel, and declared all who opposed Israel should be confounded and perish, so they could not be found. He even declared he would make Israel a new sharp threshing instrument having teeth, whereby nations should be threshed.

That God would hear and consider the poor and needy is next stated, after which we find His challenge, and offer to test his wisdom and power by foretelling future events.

Who is meant by 'man from the east' in v. 2, and who by 'one from the north' in v. 25? Divine history indicates reference is to Cyrus king of Persia (see chaps. 44:28; 45:1-4 and Ezra 1:2). He was to come from the north, also from the east; that is, from north-east.

What is meant by v. 15? Connection shows the Lord meant the Jews deserved punishment and should receive it, but the nation that would cause their overthrow and oppress them, also nations that would rejoice in their misfortunes, should be punished. Thus it was that God would 'thresh' the nations, here spoken of as 'mountains' (see chap. 47:6-15, also Ezek. 25:12, 13). When God laid his punishment on Jews or any other nation, he did not allow man to add to it.

What may we learn by considering last of this chapter beginning with v. 21? Sets forth Jehovah's challenge to heathen in regard to their 'gods', and a proposition to test them by prediction of future events. Then in v. 24 we read Jehovah's estimate of heathen gods, and after that we find assurances in behalf of Jews. Chapter ends with declarations against idols.

Can mankind be idolaters without setting up images and worshiping them? Ezek. 14 indicates they could set up idols in their hearts during the Jewish age; and in the Gospel age 'covetousness' is declared to be 'idolatry' (see Eph. 5:5, also, Col. 3:5).

**Isa. 42** shows, first of all, prophecy concerning Christ, then beginning with v. 8 Bible readers find declarations from Jehovah concerning himself. Finally, beginning with v. 17 we find statements in regard to folly of idolatry, perverseness of the Jew, and words of Jehovah with reference, to his 'righteousness', his 'law', and Jewish people.

What evidence that the first part of this chapter is Prophecy concerning Christ? Mat. 12:18-20 informs.

What is meant by vs. 2, 3? V. 2 means Christ would not be noisy, but as a speaker he would be moderate, unlike blusterers of any age. V. 3 means he would be so gentle he would not, ignore nor destroy the least item or vestige of goodness until time for him to judge the earth. The poor, weak and ignorant of mankind are here set forth under figure of 'a bruised reed' and 'a smoking flax'.

What of v. 8? Against all idolatry, human creeds in religion, and man-made societies to advocate the cause of true religion. All idols, religious creeds and societies of human origin are human devices in regard to religion, and Jehovah declares he will not give his praise to such things; and this means he will not thereby give his 'glory' to authors of such devices.

What of vs. 19, 20? Refers to blindness and deafness of Jews when they refused to receive correction (see 2 Chron. 36:15, 16).

What may we say of those so full of self-esteem they are not willing to think they are liable to make mistakes? Impossible to convince them of error. They seem to regard

themselves as 'perfect', and are not open to conviction. As a rule they become offended at every intimation they have made a mistake. They illustrate Prov. 15:10.

Are there not others to whom correction is grievous? Yes. It is grievous to all who reason themselves into wrong conclusions. Whether they adopt such conclusions for sake of popularity, or in order to accomplish another end, the result, is the same. They are grieved when correction is offered. They seem to despise correction.

**Isa. 43** brings declarations of Jehovah as creator of Jacob and former of Israel, in regard to His care for Israelites, known in modern times as the Jewish people. What He was to them and what they were to Him; how he cared for them and how they disregarded him (leading thoughts in this chapter). Ends with statement of what God had done to Jews because of their sins.

What is meant by v. 3? Ezek. 29:17-20 informs.

What is true of v. 10? Still true Jews as a separate people, or distinct nationality, are witnesses of Divine inspiration of the Bible (see Jer. 30:11; 46:27, 28).

**Isa. 44** sets forth address of Jehovah to Jews, referring to them as 'Jacob' and 'Israel', and declaring his care for them; also declaring folly of idolatry, and finally foretelling return of Jews to their own land, likewise under what earthly monarch they should return and rebuild the temple and the city of Jerusalem.

What of v. 22? In plainest form possible it declares sins had been actually pardoned at that time, or would be when Jews would return from captivity.

This chapter is splendid illustration of grandeur and dignity of style in setting forth a grand and dignified subject.

**Isa. 45** informs of Cyrus the Persian king who would reign when the Jewish captivity of 70 years would expire. Next we read declarations in which Jehovah sets forth that he is the only God; and this truth is the leading thought through remainder of the chapter. Jehovah declares himself the comfort of his people, and calls on, all people, even to ends of the earth, to look to him and be saved.

When was the prophecy of Isaiah concerning Cyrus written? According to common chronology, on margins of the Bible, Isaiah wrote about 712 years before Christ or about 100 years before Cyrus was born (see chronology of Ezra 1).

Could evidence of Divine inspiration be clearer or stronger than a prophecy which named the king of a country 100 years before he was born, and even stated what he would do in certain important particulars? Stronger evidence could not exist.

What should we say to those who endeavor to cast reflections on this prophecy by

suggesting it was written by a Jew after the captivity? Refer them to difference between style of Isaiah and that of apocryphal books of the Old Testament period. Whoever cannot understand or will not admit the style of Isaiah is inimitable by any writer not guided by Divine inspiration is not to be reasoned with. The Bible proclaims its Divine, origin by conciseness, dignity and grandeur of its style, and this is specially true of that part called 'the prophetic books'. All who read with care the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, and having done so will say they were not impressed with super-human loftiness of the prophetic style, may be classed either with the unscrupulous or with the irresponsible. The sun, moon and stars as natural light bearers aren't more certainly beyond comparison with artificial lights than the history, law and prophecy set forth in the Bible are beyond comparison with any and all human documents

What of v. 9? Pronounces 'woe' on him who strives with his Maker, because the being that is made is too small and weak, too ignorant and short-sighted, to strive with the Being who made him. Then, to illustrate the absurdity of such striving Isaiah was instructed to say, Let pieces of the broken vessel of a potter strive with each other.

But what does that mean? That there is some appropriateness in such striving because there is something like equality between the things engaged in the striving, But for a man to strive with his Maker is as absurd as for clay in the hands of a potter to ask him what he was making, or for a man's work to say to him that he has no hands.

**Isa. 46** is brief description of idols and folly of idolatry also of an appeal to Israelites to consider Jehovah as their only God in view of all he had done for them and because he could declare 'the end from the beginning'.

What is meaning of v. 1? 'Bel' is another form of Baal name of a heathen idol; and Nebo was name of another idol. What is said in this verse concerning those idols indicates they had to be moved from place-to-place in vehicles; and that, as v. 7 shows, wherever they were placed, there they had to remain 'til moved to another. The prophet mentioned this to show folly of regarding such a helpless object as a god worthy of worship. On basis of such exposure of folly of idolatry. Jehovah urged his plea for Israelites to consider him as their only God.

Is heathen idolatry more unreasonable than modern religious creeds, societies and other religious arrangements of human origin? idols were introduced as helps. Berne's images, crucifixes and beads were also introduced and are still used as helps; and all human religious creeds, societies and musical instruments in religion are pleaded for because they are supposed to be 'helps'.

**Isa. 47** tells in regard to Jehovah's purpose against ancient Babylon and reasons why it should be utterly overthrown, with statements concerning results and completeness of the threatened overthrow.

What were reasons for Babylon's destruction as mentioned here? V. 6 shows the king of Babylon did not show Israelites mercy when God gave them into his hands. V. 7 represents

Babylon as refusing to be serious and consider end of such misconduct. V. 8 charges carelessness and self-conceit. V. 10 declares people of that city trusted in their wickedness and were perverted by their wisdom and knowledge. V. 13 charges Babylonians 'wearied' with their many 'counsels'.

May same charges be made with justness against people who live in the Gospel age? Yes. Modern Babylon with all her offspring are intolerant toward those who, by devotion to the Bible, show they are really God's people. They live 'carelessly', trust in wickedness at least of doctrinal kind; their wisdom and knowledge being of a worldly kind has perverted them; and they're all 'wearied in multitude of' their 'counsels'. Occasionally one, will say, 'We have too much organization', or 'We're killed with organization'; but remains with those he censures.

**Isa. 48** is an address to Israel in which hypocrisy and stubbornness of Israelites are set forth; also the Lord's comment on his purpose in giving prophecy, and that it was for his glory that he spared Israel. Chapter likewise sets forth what would have resulted if Israel had only harkened to his commands. Chapter ends with command to leave Babylon, and reference to God's care for Israelites in the wilderness and declaration 'there is no peace to the wicked'.

What was God's purpose in uttering prophecy as declared here? To show the God of Israel is the only true God because he is the only one who can foretell future events with accuracy and definiteness and have them fulfilled.

What of v. 3? Indicates that in creation God operated 'suddenly' as well as on later occasions; also indicated in Psa. 33:9. And v. 10 informs of the only place in which mankind can be refined. God desires to refine them under favorable circumstances; but when favored it seems mankind generally become careless, licentious or proud. In every case of that kind they become disobedient to God and, as a rule, refuse to repent 'til placed in the furnace of affliction. Even then many refuse to repent (see Amos 4:6-11).

What may we learn by v. 18? Shows God earnestly desired welfare of his people and lamented they hadn't been faithful to him.

But could not God have made them of such disposition they would have obeyed him more generally? Yes, but then their obedience would not have been as meritorious as when they were by nature inclined to do as they pleased, but obeyed him through love. 'We love him because he first loved us' in 1 John 4:19, indicates the end in view when God created mankind. He desired beings in his own image who would love him because he first loved them; not because they were so constituted they couldn't love anyone else.

**Isa. 49** shows God's care for Israel in the Jewish age, in the Gospel age, and even in the Millennial age. Relation of Israel to salvation of Gentiles by the Gospel is mentioned in v. 6, and eternal blessedness of the redeemed in v. 10.

V. 15 means just what it says, namely, God will never forget Israel.

What shall we say to those who say this verse means spiritual Israel? Refer them to vs. 20, 21, showing Gentile Christians are numbered with Israel because of their relation to fleshly Israel. Paul teaches this in Rom. 11:18. Gentile Christians are partakers of benefits God developed through Jewish people, called fleshly Israel. According to Rom. 11 disobedient Jews are natural 'branches' 'broken off' 'because of unbelief'; but when they will turn from their unbelief they will be 'grafted' into the stem, or 'root', of their own 'olive tree'. Therefore Gentile Christians are now 'the Israel of God' (Gal. 6:16), though not independent of the church established at Jerusalem. But when Jews turn from their 'unbelief' they will be the Israel of God, then we shall be of the Israel which will consist of them.

What will become of those who mistreat Jews? Vs. 25, 26 inform God will contend with them and they'll be overthrown. Thus it has been with every nation which afflicted Jews.

**Isa. 50** gives divorcement of Jews from the Lord, there mentions the Lord's power whereby unreasonableness of the mentioned divorcement is indicated. Then of what Isaiah said of himself, of what he endured, and of his confidence. Chapter ends with statements concerning importance of trusting in the Lord rather than walking in humanly arranged light.

What of v. 11? Describes work and mentions the end of all guilty of adopting humanisms in religion. They 'kindle a fire', compass themselves about 'with sparks', 'walk in the light' of their 'fire' and in the 'sparks' they have 'kindled'; and 'shall lie down in sorrow'.

**Isa. 51** tells Israelites were exhorted to hearken to the Lord and awake to their advantages and blessings, in connection with which reasons were set forth why the Lord's people should give ear to him. Folly of being afraid of man instead of trusting in the Lord, is also recorded.

What was meant by 'the heavens shall vanish away like smoke', in v. 6? Just what it says, as we learn by Heb. 1:10-12 and 2 Pet. 3:10.

Does the statement 'they that dwell therein shall die' refer to 'the heavens'? Refers only to 'the earth'. Beings that are mortal, thus subject to death, don't dwell in the heaven, s. Fowls of the air fly in the heavens, but. don't dwell there (see Gen. 1:20).

**Isa. 52** tells Jerusalem and Zion were exhorted to awake because of what the Lord would do in their behalf. Reference then to former history of Israelites and what the Lord had done for them, as evidence of what he would do. The prophet's eye was then unsealed so he could behold the Gospel age. We thereby learn when he beheld the most blessed earthly condition of Jerusalem he was enabled to behold spiritual blessings of the Jewish nation as manifest in the Gospel age.

What of v. 7? Nearly all quoted in Rom. 10:15 and applied to Gospel preachers.

What of vs. 13-15, Refer to Christ, as we may understand by what is said about his



relation to 'many nations'.

But what does reference to many nations mean? The common version, also revised versions English and American, are seriously wrong in translation of this passage. The word here translated 'sprinkle' means 'to leap (for joy), exult, to spring'; 'the primary idea is that of sparkling, flying out'. Best translation is, 'So shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself'. Attempt at translation found in the common version is a burlesque on pretension to translate. That attempt disregards primary meaning of the verb, disregards causative form of the verb, ignores the preposition 'in' and the pronoun 'himself'.

How may we explain such mistranslation? Sectarianism is responsible. Translators seemingly tried to find something in favor of sprinkling for baptism.

**Isa. 53** is prophecy concerning Christ. In v. 1 'report' means oral testimony, as Rom. 10:16, 17 indicates; and 'arm' means strength, as we learn elsewhere. Meaning that strength of the Lord is revealed to those who believe Divine testimony.

V. 2 means that as neither a 'tender plant' nor a root' is likely to, spring out of 'dry ground', so Christ would be an unlikely one in estimation of mankind. Moreover he was not to be of such 'form' nor 'comeliness' that he would be desired.

Does the Bible give intimation, except this, of Christ's personal appearance on earth? It does not. In view of this, what may be safely said of efforts of artists to represent Christ's personal appearance in picture, specially pictures of a beautiful personage? They are vain and sacrilegious.

Should Jews be censured for not understanding by reading this chapter that their Messiah would be a humble personage, and should die for them? Many that think they deserve censure for not understanding what has just been mentioned are guilty of rejecting plain declarations in Rev. 11 concerning death of the 'two witnesses' there mentioned, and censure those that accept that chapter as Jews should have accepted Isa. 53. This reveals a weakness of faith far more inexcusable than that shown by Jews concerning Christ's death. Besides, it disregards the command, 'If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God' (1 Pet. 4:11

**Isa. 54** records the prophet beheld obedience of Gentiles to Christ's gospel, thus beheld grafting of Gentiles as branches of a wild olive tree into the stem or 'root' of the 'good' olive tree. He beheld also more. Gentiles than Jews would obey, and in rhetorical style was instructed to write concerning an unmarried woman who had more children than the 'married wife'. The prophet then saw enlargement of the church and mentioned this as reason for Israel to rejoice. Remainder of the chapter bears in the same direction and ends with assurance all who would rise against Israel should fall.

What of those who declare this chapter refers wholly to the church as consisting of Gentile Christians, and that Jews are now wholly rejected? First ask them to compare v. 5 of this chapter with Jer. 3:14, then ask them to consider vs. 7, 8 of this chapter and state to

whom they refer.

**Isa. 55** tells of the Gospel invitation, also the 'leader and commander' of people in the Gospel age, and calling of Gentiles. Exhortation to seek the Lord, then difference between God's ways and thoughts on the one hand and man's ways and thoughts on the other hand. After this, effectiveness of God's word. Chapter ends with rhetorical description of results of accepting God's word.

If the Divine word is as effective as vs. 10, 11 indicate, why is it that many persons, permitted to hear it, are not converted? Parable of the Sower in. Mat. 13 and teaching in Heb. 6:7, 8 indicate differences in Muds of soil. Then Acts 13:46 and 2 Cor. 2:15, 16 indicate the Lord's word must be made known, and when made known it makes those to whom it is presented without excuse.

**Isa. 56** shows God's command to Israel to keep 'judgment' and do 'justice', and reason for that command. The prophet next pronounced that man 'blessed' who would do as the Lord commanded, and instructed the stranger who had 'joined himself to the Lord' not to regard himself as 'separated' from the Lord; then instructed the eunuch not to speak of himself as 'a dry tree'. Reason for such instruction next given. Chapter ends with degrading description of 'watchmen' of fleshly Israel.

What part of this chapter is quoted in the New Testament and applied to the Jewish temple? Last of v. 7 (see Mat. 21:13 and Mark 11:17 and Luke, 19:46). This quotation thus made and applied shows the chapter in which it is found applies to fleshly Israel.

**Isa. 57** brings remarks concerning death of the righteous, then arraignment of disobedient Israelites, first spoken of as 'sons of the sorceress, seed of the adulterer and the whore'. Those disobedient ones are then spoken of as treating the Lord most contemptuously, and going after idols even as an adulterous wife turns from her husband and goes after other men. Next we learn the Lord made declarations concerning those after whose idols disobedient Israelites 'wearied' themselves. Chapter ends with Jehovah's declarations concerning himself, then in regard to the wicked.

What condition of affairs in the Gospel age is suggested by description here of idolatrous Israelites? Rome's multitude of practices borrowed from Judaism and heathenism, and borrowing from Rome which many Protestants have done and still do. But while both classes of erring professors of Christ weary them' selves with humanisms, they fail to consider 'the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy', proposes to 'dwell with him, that is 'of a contrite and humble spirit'. Failing to consider this the church of Rome and her protesting daughters have tried to please the Lord and charm mankind with fine outward show of their own devising. In proportion as they have been guilty of so doing they ignored importance of possessing a 'contrite and humble spirit', thus ignored the chief essential to acceptance with God (see Luke 16:15 and Jas. 4:10 and 1 Pet. 5:6).

**Isa. 58** is God's command to cry aloud and spare not, lift up the voice like a trumpet, to show Israel their sins. We find also Israelites represented as seeking the Lord daily and delighting to know his ways; yet complaining because Jehovah would not accept them. Then we read of reasons why they were not accepted, and they indicate Jews at that time were more correct in doctrine than in practice. Next we learn of the kind of fast the Lord approved, how he would treat Jews if they only obeyed him; also what he would call them if they obeyed him instead of pleasing themselves.

What is true of mankind with reference to doctrine and practice in the Gospel age? Some are more ready to be reformed in doctrine than in practice, while others seem disposed to yield in regard to practice more readily than with reference to doctrine. Comparatively few are willing to reform in, regard to both doctrine and practice. As a result, only a few, comparatively speaking, are willing to become Christians of the New, Testament order. They seem to prefer some modern or modified order, but turn from strictness of the New Testament. In view of this the Savior said 'strait is the gate and narrow the way which leadeth to life, and few there be that find it' (Mat. 7:14).

**Isa. 59** sets forth Jehovah's arraignment of the Jewish nation for its iniquities, then a speech of self-accusation and condemnation for that nation to adopt. Next we find record of what Jehovah said he would do in order to bring salvation; and explained he would first recompense His enemies, then the Redeemer should come to Zion. Chapter ends with assurances concerning God's covenant with the obedient.

What is suggested by last part of this chapter? Heb 8.

What of the style of speech in this chapter? Divine in conciseness, severity and loftiness. Proclaims its origin.

**Isa. 60** shows the prophet's eye unsealed with reference to future of the Jewish nation, and he was able to see God would use that nation to introduce the Gospel so even Gentiles should come to the 'light' offered through Jews. Next the prophet foresaw final gathering of Jews, and their exaltation by accepting the Gospel. Then the prophet's eye was further unsealed so he could behold glory of that same people in the Millennial age, and its consummation of glory when the, redeemed will be gathered into New Jerusalem.

What should we say to those who regard this chapter as referring wholly to the, Gospel church, and speak of Jews as entirely rejected? We should quote the Savior's words in Mat. 22:29, then go over this chapter and show it certainly embraces the Jewish nation when it will be finally gathered.

**Isa. 61** is another prophecy concerning Christ and exaltation of Jews.

What is best evidence the first part of this chapter is prophecy regarding Christ? Luke

4:16-21 gives best evidence on this.

What is best evidence that reference is made in this chapter to the Jewish nation? What is said about 'shame' and confusion' in v. 7, likewise v. 9. Jewish people are now in 'shame' and 'confusion', but the time will come when they will be delivered from those evils (see 2 Cor. 3:14-16).

What is meant by the declaration 'I hate robbery for burnt, offering' in v. 8? Simply what it says. The Lord did not desire the Jew to rob someone in order to make offerings' to Him. In chap. 1:17 he said to them 'seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow'. Then in Hat. 23:14 the Savior said to certain Jews 'ye devour widows' houses and for pretense make long prayers'. Mat. 15:5 bears in same direction.

In view of such teaching what should we conclude concerning rich men who defraud the poor, then make gifts to charitable, institutions? They are abomination to God.

And what of those disciples who withhold from the Lord's treasury 'til their wealth accumulates, then make a large gift to a religious, benevolent or educational society of which the Gospel does not make slightest mention? They rob the Lord's cause to benefit something not mentioned in his Word.

**Isa. 62** is another chapter of prophecy concerning the Gospel age and final triumph of the Jewish nation.

What may we safely say of v. 2? Referred to when Gentiles should hear the Gospel 'and become obedient'. Then branches of the wild olive tree should be grafted in and a new lame given (see Acts 11:26, also Rom. 16:16, where we find mention of 'Christians' and 'churches of Christ').

**Isa. 63** is prophecy concerning Christ, then the prophet was required to state certain events in past history of the Jewish nation. Then we find a prayer that God would look on the Jews because he was their father and redeemer, the Abraham did not know them and Jacob did not acknowledge them. God's judgment of blindness on the Jew is next mentioned, also prayer. for return of the tribes, and mention of preference they should have over Gentiles.

What is best evidence the first of this chapter refers to Christ? What is said in Rev. 19:15 about Christ treading the winepress is sufficiently clear on this subject.

**Isa. 64** expressed longing that God would, by shewing his mighty power, make his Name known to his adversaries and cause nations to tremble. Mention then of terrible, things God had done and of those things He has prepared for those that wait for Him. Next, that God was angry with Jews, and the reason, is given. Chapter ends with prophecies concerning condition of Jerusalem during days of the captivity, and this was in words suitable for Jews to use in approaching God in behalf of Jerusalem.

**Isa. 65** is first a prophecy concerning God's purpose to make himself known with favor to Gentiles, also statement of rejection of Him by the Jews, and of their abominations and hypocrisy, followed by statement of God's purpose to recompense them. Then we read of Divine, purpose to save a remnant of the Jews. Now we read further of God's rejection of disobedient Jews and differences which should exist between them and servants of the Lord who should be called 'by another name'. The prophet was next permitted to glimpse the final abode of the redeemed, then to see backward to the Millennial age.

Why may we say vs. 1, 2 refer to Gentiles and Jews? Rom. 10:20, 21 so inform.

What is meant by v. 3? God ordained his people should build an altar for worship where he would record his Name, and build it of earth or whole stones (see Exo. 20:24, 25). Therefore Jews provoked the Lord when they built altars in gardens and of brick.

What of v. 8? Under figure of a cluster of grapes which should not be destroyed because of a blessing in it, the Lord mentioned his purpose not to destroy all Jews (see also Rom. 11:1-5).

What is that other name by which God's servants should be called? Acts 11:26 informs.

What may be said of vs. 18-25? Rev. 20 informs, specially v. 9 which mentions the 'beloved city' in the Millennial age.

What does v. 24 suggest? That the Bible is not only 'up-to-date', but beyond. Many have thought the telegraph and telephone are wonders beyond anything indicated in the Bible, because of instant transmission and sound so persons far away can answer as soon as called. But here the Lord declares the time will come when he will answer his people 'before they call'. But that time will be in the Millennial age, that will come after the Gospel age will have eroded and before the earth will be destroyed (see Rev. 20).

**Isa. 66** informs concerning God's greatness and loftiness, also in regard to his condescension. Then, of HIS estimate of the disobedient Jew when engaged in his worship. Then, God's address to those who trembled at his word among the Jews. They represented Zion on the day of Pentecost mentioned in Acts 2 when the church received the Holy Spirit, thus began to breathe the breath of spiritual life. Remainder of the chapter mentions joy of Jews when they behold their blessedness. Also mentions judgments of the last days when Jehovah will 'plead with all flesh' by his judgments, likewise when he will gather Jews together from all lands. Chapter ends with statements of constancy of Jewish people before him and final overthrow of transgressors.

How should we regard vs. 1, 2? So seriously that they'll fill us with reverence. That Jehovah, who has his throne in Heaven, and regards earth as his footstool, looks to the man who is 'poor, and of a contrite spirit, and trembles at' God's 'word'—these revelations should cause us to humble ourselves in the dust and be filled with adoration. Should also cause us to understand all efforts to please God by fine meeting houses or any other kind of finery are a species of foolishness.

How should we regard vs. 3, 4? While the Jew was wrong in his private life his public worship was not acceptable. On the contrary, it was abomination even when he formally did what the Lord required (see chap. 1:11-15). Thus for a Jew while wrong in life, to kill an ox in sacrifice to God, was not more acceptable than if he slew a man; and for him to offer a lamb was not more acceptable than if he cut off a dog's neck (see Psa. 66:18). Thus it was, thus it is, thus it will be.

What of vs. 5-9? Refer to that part of the Jewish church despised by the Jewish nation generally, but which represented the true Zion in last of the Jewish age, and brought forth the Gospel church,—at which time Zion travailed and brought forth a new nation in a day, by being born of water and of the Spirit. Some of them had been born of water before the day of Pentecost, and some had received a measure of the Spirit (see John 20:22). But not 'til the day of Pentecost, mentioned in Acts 2, did the Holy Spirit descend in ful-ness of the Divine promise.

What of vs. 10-14? Exhortation to Jewish nation to rejoice because of what would be accomplished thru her in that the Gospel church would be brought forth by the faithful of that nation consisting of John the Baptist, Christ, the apostles and the others of the 120 that waited at Jerusalem 'til the day of Pentecost.

What of vs. 15-24? Refer to judgments of the last days, mentioned in the last book of the Bible. Then we read of final gathering of Jews, and that they and their offspring, as seen in the Gospel church, shall be as the new heavens and the new earth before the Lord,

What is meant by 'new moon' and 'sabbath' in v. 23? Constancy, even as is meant by 'day and night' in Rev. 20:10. Such expressions are used on the principle of Rom. 6:19, 'I speak after the manner of men because of infirmity of your flesh'. The Holy Spirit sometimes used accommodative language. V. 24 will be fulfilled when Rev. 19:17, 18 will have been accomplished.

**Jeremiah 1** informs first that Jeremiah was son of priest in the land of Benjamin, also that 'the word of the Lord' came to him in days of certain kings of Judah, and even to time of the captivity. Record then of what the Lord said to him, and what he said to the Lord, in regard to ordaining him 'a prophet to the nations', and specially to Jews, in connection with which we find prophecies in regard to overthrow of the Jewish nation.

Did Jeremiah's period of prophesying come after that of Isaiah? Yes. The former prophet declared words which came to him in days of certain kings of Judah who reigned before those of whom Jeremiah informs.

What of Jeremiah's call to the prophetic office? Indicates God fore-ordained him to that office before he was born, and made it known to him while he was 'a child', also that he put his words in Jeremiah's mouth and in other respects prepared him for his work as prophet.

Does such fore-ordination justify anyone in concluding everything which comes to pass in this world was foreordained? No. What is here said about the Lord calling and ordaining

Jeremiah referred strictly to his official character, and does not of necessity pertain to personal character. Jehovah sometimes called a man to official position which implied the kind of personal character he should have. But this was incidental rather than necessary, and therefore it may be safely said Jehovah's fore-ordinations of men to certain positions referred specially to their official work. This was certainly true in case of Pharaoh of Egypt and Cyrus of Persia (see Exo. 9:16; Isa. 44:28 and 45:1-4).

What has been result of not observing the difference just mentioned in regard to personal and official character? The doctrine of fatalism has been connected with religion in the Gospel age, and millions have been confused, made indifferent, unhappy and ruined.

How was Jeremiah set over nations? By words Jehovah put into his mouth. When those words were fulfilled certain nations were east down and destroyed, and others were built up and established (see chap. 25: 15-29 also Hos. 6:5 as further evidence).

What does 'almond' mean? 'Hasten', and therefore 'a rod of an almond tree' was appropriate sign of God's purpose to hasten his judgments against Jews. A 'seething pot' was also appropriate sign of his purpose against them.

What should we conclude from the declaration 'and the word of the Lord came to me, saying', so often found in prophetic books? Shows the prophets regarded themselves as directly and verbally Inspired. Shows also if they were not thus Inspired they were all contemptible impostors or miserable dupes. In either case they are unmitigated liars unworthy the slightest confidence or tolerance.

What should we then conclude in regard to those persons who deny the prophets were directly and verbally Inspired, but profess to regard them as worthy of respect? To declare all such persons are conscious hypocrites might be undue reproach on their religious profession and unique compliment on their logic. Therefore we say they 'err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God' (Mat. 22:29). For if the prophets were not all they professed to be, they are unworthy the slightest confidence or respect.

**Jer. 2** is statement of God's remembrance of Israelites when they obeyed him, then of God's arrangement of them for their iniquity, his reasoning with them concerning their evil course, and his threatenings against them.

At what period in their wanderings in the wilderness were Israelites obedient to the Lord? In the latter period. First they were fearful and rebellions, but in the latter part of their time in the wilderness they were disposed to obey the Lord.

What may we conclude from v. 11? Nations that worshipped idols were disposed to cling to their idols; but those who worshipped the only true God were disposed to turn from him.

Is same disposition still in mankind? Yes. Those who adopt human creeds and other humanisms in religion are generally disposed to cling to them, while those who profess to take the Bible as their only religious guide are often disposed to turn from it.

Why is this? Mankind quite generally prefer a religion largely of their own devising.

As why have they such preference? Because they're disposed to do as they please.

And why are they thus disposed? Because God so made them; and it seems his purpose in thus making them was to make salvation so difficult to secure that only those who would become wholehearted in devotion to him could be saved. Deut. 8:1-4 is index in this direction.

What is meant by v. 13? In rhetorical style the prophet declared the Jews turned from him as their true confidence and turned to false, confidences.

What is referred to in v. 16? Reference to events recorded in 2 Chron. 12:9, which informs of what Egypt-tans had done against Judah.

What is meant by vs. 23, 24? In rhetorical style they refer to disposition of certain wild animals in their mating season, as illustration of disposition shown by Jews in trying to be like other nations.

Is such disposition shown in modern times? Yes. All religious denominations show it just in proportion as they try to arrange their worship and work so as to make them popular with the world. As indicated in v. 33, they trim their ways 'to seek love'—such love as the world gives. Then they declare themselves 'innocent', even as v. 35 indicates Jews did.

What did the Lord declare should be result of Jews gadding about and changing their ways to suit nations about them? 'The Lord hath rejected thy confidences, and thou shalt not prosper in them', was his declaration.

And what does He say to professed Christians who follow the mentioned example of Jews? 'So then, because thou art lukewarm and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth' (see Rev. 3:16).

**Jer. 3** tells of a man putting away his wife, and of her becoming another man's wife, and later returning to her former husband,—as illustration of God's dealing with the Jewish nation. He said he was 'married' to it, and that it had departed from him and gone after others: but he called on that nation to return to him. Then the Lord set forth misconduct of Israel and Judah, by speaking of them as two 'treacherous' sisters who played the harlot most flagrantly. Yet He called on them to return to him, and mentioned them after they would return from captivity into which Israel had gone and Judah was destined to go. Chapter ends with words appropriate for both houses of Israel to adopt during their captivity and when they returned to their own land.

Is there anything in conduct of modern religionists which resembles 'treacherous' behavior of Jews toward God? There certainly is, for with very few exceptions the various denominations endeavor to please the world so as to gain its patronage; and thereby show disposition of adulterous women. Besides, those denominations quite generally rival each other in fine meeting, houses, fine choirs, fine organs, fine pulpit performances, and in nearly



everything else except deep devotion to God's word, to prayer, praise and thanksgiving. By so doing they show they worship the God of Popularity rather than the only true God, and they rival each other in making offerings to Popular Applause rather than to the Divine Father and his Anointed One.

**Jer. 4** mentions first what the Lord would do to Jews if they returned to him by putting away their 'abominations'. Then of what He said to 'men of Judah and Jerusalem' in regard to turning to him, and in regard to the 'destroyer of Gentiles' being on his way against them. Impression this made on the prophet, in view of what the Lord had said to him about peace, is next recorded, also statement of ruin Jerusalem should suffer. Again the prophet's expression of his own feelings is in the record,—a dark picture presented to indicate ruin Jews should suffer, then assurance that the Lord would not 'make a full end' of Jews. Chapter concludes with statements in regard to, overthrow of Jerusalem.

What is meant by breaking up 'fallow ground' in v. 3? When ground is fallowed it is plowed and left unseeded. Purpose of fallowing is generally to clear it of briars, weeds, thorns, or other objectionable growth. This being understood we can see bearing of the command 'break up your fallow ground, and sow not among thorns', specially as indicated by v. 4, which required Jews to cut themselves off from their misconduct and turn to the Lord. These 2 verses show the Lord intended Jews should repent sincerely.

What is meaning of the dark picture in vs. 23-26? In Gen. 12, 13 we find a dark picture and its explanation. A horror of darkness fell on Abraham to, indicate sufferings of his descendants in Egypt. So in this instance Jeremiah saw a dark picture to triplicate the Lord would bring severe judgments on the Jewish nation.

What of the last, of v. 30? Declares 'lovers' of the Jews would 'despise' them.

Is that true now in regard to churches which make bids for popularity? It is. Churches which compromise their doctrine or practice, or both, in order to be popular with the world, or to secure money from the world, are seriously discounted by sensible people of the world. Besides, those worldlings who are, for a time, attracted by such churches soon grow weary of their entertainments, and despise them.

What then is the safe course for churches to pursue? Remember that man lives 'not by bread alone' but that he lives, spiritually, 'by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of the Lord'. They should act in harmony with that declaration of both Old Testament and New, and instead of trying to conform the Gospel to the world they should try to conform the world to the Gospel.

**Jer. 5** says the Lord proposed to pardon Jerusalem if the prophet could find one honest man in it. The prophet then recorded he thought some people refused to return to the Lord because they were 'poor' and 'foolish', also that he went to the 'great men' and found they had thrown off all restrictions. He then stated what should befall them, and arraigned them for their iniquities. He next recorded he was commanded to destroy, but not utterly. Treacherous

dealings of Jews with the Lord are next mentioned, also results. Chapter ends with declaration of 'a wonderful and horrible thing' of which Jews were guilty—their prophets prophesied falsely and priests bore rule by their means; and the people were pleased to have it so.

**Jer. 6** is address to children of Benjamin, calling on them to go out of Jerusalem. Then Zion was likened to a delicate and comely woman against whom shepherds arrayed themselves. Next, Jerusalem, showing its wickedness, was like a fountain casting out its waters. That the word of the Lord was a reproach to Jews, is next recorded, also that the Lord's fury would be on them and what would result. Their lack of shame is stated and what the Lord would do to them. The command to ask for 'the old paths' and how Jews treated that command, we find here recorded. Next, God's rejection of offerings to him by the Jews, likewise of evil threatened from the 'north country'. Latter part of the chapter records words which would have been appropriate for Jews when the threatened evil came on them. The 'daughter' of the Jews was then addressed, and Jeremiah was told the Lord's purpose in regard to that rebellious people described as 'grievous revolters', 'walking with slanders', also as being 'brass and iron' and 'corrupters' Chapter ends with declaration that they should be called 'reprobate silver' because the Lord 'rejected them'.

Are persons now on earth to whom the Lord's word is a 'reproach', and who don't delight in that word? Multitudes of them, even among professed Christians. Announcements that 'the Bible will be unfolded' or that the 'Gospel will be preached' indicate to them that they would not be interested in the performance. Therefore they remain absent and go after that which promises to be sensational, or that offers entertainment without edification.

What is meant by v. 14? False confidence which resulted from smooth speech of flatterers.

Does the New Testament inform concerning smooth talkers? See Rom. 16:17, 18.

What is meaning of references in this chapter anti others to the 'north' and 'north country'? That Babylonians would come to Jerusalem by way of the north.

What may we learn by v. 29? Everything was in vain for God's people when the wicked were not separated from them.

Is same true now? It is. When discipline is neglected the church goes down.

**Jer. 7** states what the Lord told Jeremiah to say to men of Judah as they entered the city gate.

Did the Lord seem desirous to save the city and people who dwelt therein? He did, and made every proposition possible, far as we can judge, to cause people to turn from their evil in order that he might save that city. But people were perverse and went onward in wrong doing 'til destruction was necessary.

What was reference to Shiloh intended to mean? The record clearly shows. The ark was placed at Shiloh, and God recorded his name there. But he brought destruction on Shiloh because of wickedness there. Then we learn as God judged Shiloh so he would judge Jerusalem.

What is suggested by vs. 17, 18? Different kinds of work in which men, women and children engage in getting ready for a church festival which they offer the public for purpose of securing money for religious ends. And as Jews not only provoked the Lord but brought confusion on themselves, so it is now. Confusion results from adoption of festivals and other human devices to obtain money for church purposes.

What may we conclude from last part of v. 31? Same idea presented in chap. 32:35, and reveals the Jewish people had done worse than the Lord thought they'd do. He had made them and he knew their possibilities, but did not think they would go to extent of their possibilities in doing evil. Shows that though the Lord is capable of knowing all things, yet he does not occupy himself with all details of human affairs.

**Jer. 8** informs of what the Lord said to Jeremiah in regard to bones of those who worshipped the sun, moon and all other objects in the heavens, being brought out of their graves and spread before those objects; also distress of the evil time when that would be accomplished. Next; a record of what the Lord said to Jews in regard to their fall and rising again, and that their backslidings and perverseness showed them more unreasonable than certain lower orders of creation. The stork, turtle, crane, swallow, are referred to as showing more knowledge than disobedient Jews. Chapter ends with lamentations on the part of the prophet because Jews would not repent, thus were destined to be overthrown.

What may we learn by vs. 8, 9? There was conceit among Jews to the effect that they were safe because the Lord's law was with them. But the Lord indicated that in view of their method of treating his word it was written in vain, and the pen of the scribe wrote in vain. We next learn 'wise men' among them were 'ashamed' and 'dismayed'; then the implication that as they rejected the Lord's word their wisdom was gone.

Is it true now that mankind lack wisdom in proportion as they turn from God's word? In Job 28:28 and Psa. 111:10 we learn the fear of the Lord is wisdom.

What of v. 20? Lamentation of Jeremiah because Jews sinned away their day of grace.

**Jer. 9** is lamentation of the prophet over condition of Jews, and longing that he might weep over them and separate from them, because of their iniquity. Threatening of the Lord's vengeance next recorded in connection with further description of wickedness of the people. Next, the Lord's command to call for 'mourning women', and reasons why. Then, that men should not glory except because they know the Lord. Chapter closes with Divine declarations against the circumcised as well as uncircumcised, and statement that Jews were uncircumcised in heart.

What is suggested by 'mourning' and 'cunning' women in vs. 17, 18? Custom was to have

hired mourners and lamenters; but in modern times custom of many churches is to have hired singers and players to assist in worship. These hired singers and players as a rule are destitute of interest in worship except by reason of their hire. Thus it was with hired mourners.

What of instructions in vs. 23, 24? As applicable now as in days of Jeremiah. Men of all classes, who have special advantages or imagine they have, are constantly liable to glory in those advantages. But the Lord desires all who glory shall do so because they understand and know the Lord who exercises loving kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth (see 1 Cor. 1:31).

**Jer. 10** shows Israel, as consisting of the kingdom of Judah, was exhorted to hear the Lord's word, and warned not to learn way of the heathen; nor be dismayed at the signs of heaven as the heathen were. Reasons for such warning and exhortation were that customs of the heathen were 'vain', but the Lord is the 'King of nations'. Another reason was that gods of the heathen should perish from the earth; so decreed by Jehovah who made heaven and earth. Folly of worshipping idols is further mentioned, and difference between 'the Lord of hosts' and idols is indicated. Chapter ends with Jeremiah's prayer against heathen.

What is suggested by v. 14? Human devices in religion, with final confusion of those who depend on them.

**Jer. 11** informs in regard to an interview between the Lord and Jeremiah, in which the prophet was told to hear the words of the Divine covenant, and speak to men of Judah, pronouncing a curse on the man who would not obey that covenant. Then we are informed in regard to the Lord's protest to the fathers in the wilderness and how they treated that protest. Next, a conspiracy among men of Judah, and what the Lord would do to them. Idols and altars are next mentioned; also that the Lord called them 'a green olive tree', after which is statement in regard to what they had done 'against themselves'. Their purpose against Jeremiah is next mentioned; also how he felt in regard to it, and what the Lord commanded him to say to them.

What customs in modern, times are suggested by v. 13? Custom of building meeting houses according to and beyond wealth of the congregation; likewise custom of arranging for costly choirs and preachers in proportion as churches are able to pay for them or can, by appeals to the world, obtain, money to support them. Backslidden Jews spent much of their wealth in idols and idol altars; while ungodly professors of Christ spend much of their wealth in, outward show, seen in costly houses of worship and other costly arrangements.

What does last of v. 15 suggest? That human nature is same in all ages. When disobedient Jews did evil they rejoiced; and thus it is with religious sectarians, including innovating disciples. They rejoice in proportion as they injure the churches.

**Jer. 12** is a speech of Jeremiah addressed to the Lord, and the Lord's response. Then another

speech in which he mentioned his house, heritage and wife, and what his heritage had become like. From this the prophet passed to what the Lord said against those 'evil neighbors' who touched Israel's inheritance. Then he spoke of opportunity the Lord would give them to learn ways of his people after they would be taken out of the land of those 'evil neighbors'.

Did Jeremiah understand ways of the Lord toward his enemies? He did not, but seemed confused in mind because they prospered.

What other writers discussed that subject? See Job 21:7-18 and Psa. 73:1-19.

What is meant by vs. 5, 6? Jeremiah's own family' relations had turned against him; and if they 'wearied' him, how could he hope to contend with others?

What is meant by Jeremiah's remark about 'a speckled bird' in v. 9? As other birds were against 'a speckled bird', so those who were round about his inherit' and were against it.

What is meant by reference to 'pastors' in v. 10? In chap. 2:8 'pastors' of Jewish people are mentioned as separate from those who, handled the law, and from prophets. They must therefore have been the class of men spoken of as 'shepherds' in Ezek. 34, whose business it was to 'feed the flocks'. This being true, they must have been those 'elders' in Ezek. 20:1-3. See also Exo. 3:16; 12:21; Deut. 27:1 and 31:9. They weren't doctors of the law, nor prophets; but were those whose business was to teach the masses of the people. Near Testament elders have similar work.

What is meant by 'many pastors have destroyed my vineyard'? 'Vineyard' in such connection is explained in Isa. 5:7 to have been 'the house of Israel'. Then in Isa. 9:16 we learn 'the leaders' of the people caused them to 'err', while they that were led of them were destroyed. Pastors therefore were the leaders, for they 'destroyed' the Lord's people.

How has it been in the Gospel age? Paul said in Acts 20:30 that from among the elders, shepherds, pastors, of the church should 'men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them'. Thus it was that the first falling away from the faith resulted, to some extent, from perverse elders who were 'pastors'.

How has it been in modern times? The last falling from the faith has been through 'pastors' who weren't elders but college fledglings. To pervert the church through elders has been too slow for the devil in modern times, and he has used preachers.

**Jer. 13** informs of what the Lord instructed Jeremiah to do in order to signify how he would mar the pride of Jewish people; then we read of what was said in order to indicate 'drunkenness' with which those people should be afflicted, also of evil results. Next, exhortation of the Lord to people to give glory to God, also to the king and queen of Judah to humble themselves; then statement of evils which should come. Conclusion explains reason those evils would come in connection with which the prophet intimated Jewish people had gone so far into iniquity they could not repent.

Was drunkenness mentioned in last of v. 13 intended to refer to physical drunkenness?

Isa. 29:9 indicates it was judgment of blindness or confusion, which would cause rulers and all other people in rebellion against the Lord to stagger in judgment.

What of v. 16? Dignified rhetorical reference to gloom and despair which would come on the minds of Jewish people when they would fall into hands of their enemies.

What of v. 23? Indicates force of habit, and implies Jewish people had gone so far into wrong doing they were unable to save themselves.

Why then did the Lord exhort them to give glory to him? If they had only done what was possible for them in that direction the Lord would have helped them even as he now helps those who call on him sincerely.

**Jer. 14** first gives what the Lord said to him concerning 'the dearth'; then we find prayer of the prophet in, behalf of Israel as it then consisted of the kingdom of Judah. Next, the Lord spoke to Jeremiah in regard to disposition of the Jews, commanded him not to 'pray' for them, and told him why. What false prophets said is next recorded, and what the Lord would do to those to whom false prophets delivered their false assurances. Chapter ends with record of what the Lord told Jeremiah to say by way of lamentation and confession, followed by statements in regard to weakness of 'vanities of Gentiles' and in regard to power of the Lord.

**Jer. 15** shows men of Judah were destined to go into captivity because of wickedness of one of their kings; also the Lord would destroy them because they had forsaken him, and what results would be. Next, Jeremiah's lamentation because of his own official position,, and its results. The prophet's record of his plea in his own behalf is near close of this chapter, followed by what the Lord said concerning the people and in regard to himself.

What is meant by v. 1? Influence of Moses and Samuel in behalf of Jews would not be sufficient to cause the Lord to change his sentence against them, and the

prophet Jeremiah should pronounce words against them which would cast them out of their land when those words should be fulfilled.

And what of v. 4? 2 Kings 24:3, 4 definitely inform Yet destruction of the city might have been avoided (see chap. 27:17).

What may we learn by v. 10? Indicates Jeremiah was a man of 'strife' and 'contention' to Jews and other nations because he had been born to be the Lord's prophet (see chap. 1:5, 10). But v. 11 indicates the Lord would cause him to be well treated 'in time of evil and affliction'.

When was that fulfilled? See chap. 39:11-14 and 40:1-5.

What may Christians learn by such an event? It is always safe to do right (see Heb. 13:5).

**Jer. 16** gives command to Jeremiah not to take a wife in that place, as he should not have either sons or daughters there; and reason for such command is given. Next he was commanded not to go into the house of feasting; and reason for that command is given. Then the prophet was told what he should say to Jews, when they would ask why the Lord pronounced evil against them. But the prophet was next instructed to inform them that in after history they would speak of their return from captivity in 'the land of the north'. The Lord then informed Jeremiah in regard to care he would exercise to have his judgment inflicted against Jews, and reason for that care. Chapter ends with revelation concerning Gentiles turning from their idols.

**Jer. 17** records Judah's sin was written indelibly; then reason for such a statement. Followed by statement of what the Lord would do to people of Judah because of 'fire' they had kindled in the Divine 'anger'. Next, of the man cursed, what he would be like; then of the man blessed, and what he would be like. The 'heart' is then declared 'deceitful above all things and desperately wicked', and that the Lord searcheth the heart and will render justice to all. The man who obtains riches dishonestly is described. Mention of the Lord as 'hope of Israel' and prayer to him by the prophet in his own behalf, in connection with which he mentioned what Jews said to him about the Lord's word. Chapter closed with declarations from the Lord in regard to favors he would show men of Judah if they would observe the sabbath, and in regard to judgments he would inflict if they would not.

**Jer. 18** shows the Lord sent Jeremiah where a 'potter' was making vessels of clay,—that he might behold what the potter would make that was marred in his hand. We learn also when Jeremiah saw this the Lord's word came to him making revelation with referenee to the 'house of Israel', which house then consisted of men of Judah in connection with people of Benjamin. Next, what Jeremiah was commanded to say to people of Judah and Jerusalem, also what those people responded. Then the Lord's decision concerning them, followed by record of their evil purposes against Jeremiah and his prayer against them.

What revelation of Divine character is set forth in connection with the story of the potter and the clay? Therein revealed that repentance on God's part was possible, and consisted of change of the Divine sentence based on change in human conduct either good or bad. Reveals God could repent of an evil sentence, also of a good sentence he pronounced; but in each instance repentance on God's part was simply change, of sentence based on man's change of conduct. For illustration read book of Jonah.

Was repentance on God's part based only on change of conduct in man? Not only on change of humane, on-duct but sometimes based on the plea of a worthy mediator (see Exo. 32, specially vs. 12-14).

What should we say to those who teach man is entirely helpless in the Divine hands, and base that teaching on what is said in Rom. 9:21 about the potter and clay? Call attention to the record in this chapter in regard to the potter and clay. So doing we show people here

spoken of as clay are represented as having power to repent, thus were not entirely helpless.

What is suggested by v. 15? All bids for popularity by churches may be justly designated as burning 'incense to vanity' and causing many 'to stumble in their ways from the ancient paths, to walk in paths in a way not cast up'. All such misconduct is a venture in an unauthorized 'way' different from 'ancient paths'.

And what of evil purposes of men of Judah against Jeremiah? Simply outworkings of human nature, and same have been manifested among mankind in all generations. Those outworkings illustrate Prov. 15:10-'Correction is grievous to him that forsaketh the way, and he that hateth reproof shall die'. As a result they 'smite with the tongue' those who reprove them.

**Jer. 19** finds the parable of the bottle, in connection with which terrible destruction of Jews is foretold.

What is meaning of 'the valley of the son of Hinnom' in v. 2? 'Hinnom' means 'wailing', and the valley called by that name is a narrow valley S.E. of Jerusalem, first mentioned in, Josh. 15:8. Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias generally mention it as 'south-west' of Jerusalem. But Jeremiah speaks of it being 'by entry' of the east gate'. Indicates its eastern extremity at least was by the 'east gate' of Jerusalem. In that valley a heathen god called Moloch was placed, and worship was offered him by sacrifice of human beings, specially children. The valley of Hinnom was also called 'Tophet', which means place of burning. Used after the captivity as dumping place for refuse of the city of Jerusalem, and kept constantly on fire; thus ge-hinnom, or Gehenna, is used in the New Testament to represent the place of everlasting burning or torment.

**Jer. 20** informs that a man named Pashur, son of Immer, persecuted the prophet Jeremiah; and the prophet then changed his persecutor's name to that which meant 'fear round about', because the Lord would make him a 'terror' to himself. The prophet then declared doom of the kingdom of Judah, with strength of the city of Jerusalem; and that Pashur his persecutor should be taken to Babylon and die there. Jeremiah then appealed to the Lord in view of his serious work in pronouncing evil on the Jews and manner in which they treated him. Chapter ends with lamentation by the prophet that he was not slain at time of his birth instead of being permitted to live to a time of sorrow.

**Jer. 21** finds what the Lord made known to king Zedekiah when he sent to Jeremiah because the king of Babylon had commenced to make war against Jews.

What was the bearing of the answer to Zedekiah? That the Lord was against him, and his opposition to the king of Babylon should not prosper; but that the Lord would himself fight against and overthrow him. That answer also set forth that those who would fall away from Jews and go out to the king of Babylon should save their lives; but those who remained in



Jerusalem should die by the 'pestilence', 'sword' and 'famine'. Chapter ends with warning to Jews dwelling in Judah outside Jerusalem.

Was the war mentioned in first part of this chapter the first, or the second, the king of Babylon waged against Jerusalem? The second.

Who was king of Judah when the king of Babylon first sent an army against Jerusalem? Jehoiakim was king then; and the king of Babylon overcame him, put him in fetters and took him to Babylon. Then his son Jehoiachin reigned in his father's stead. He was but a child and reigned only a short time. The king of Babylon took him to Babylon, made Mattaniah, his father's brother, king in his stead, and changed his name to Zedekiah (see 2 Kings 24 also 2 Chron. 36). Then in 2 Kings 25 we read of the war mentioned in, the 1st chapter now under consideration.

**Jer. 22** records what Jeremiah said to Zedekiah when the Lord sent him to the king's house to tell him and his servants what to do in order that the city might be saved from ruin; and that if they would not do as he commanded them Jerusalem should be a desolation, so it should be a monument of their rebellion against the Lord.

Who was meant by Shallum in v. 11? 2 Kings 23:29-33 indicates it must have been another name for Jehoahaz.

Who was meant by the name 'Coniah' in vs. 24, 28? Chap. 24:1 shows reference was to Jeconiah, otherwise called Jehoiachin; for 'Coniah' and 'Jeconiah' are names referring to that king who, was son of Jehoiakim.

**Jer. 23** first informs the, Lord pronounced 'woe' on 'pastors' who destroyed and scattered the Jewish people, and that the Lord would gather together his people and set over them shepherds who should feed them. Then we find reference to Christ and spiritual Israel. Next the prophet turned back from days of spiritual Israel and spoke of days after captivity in the 'north country', referring to captivity in Babylon which afterwards became part of the Persian empire. Then, Jeremiah wrote against prophets and priests, but specially against the prophets of Jerusalem, who saw vain visions concerning that city. Chapter ends with statement of Divine sentence against the expression 'the burden of the Lord'.

What were people authorized to say? They were commanded to ask, 'What hath the Lord answered? and, What hath the Lord spoken?' and were forbidden to inquire, 'What is the burden of the Lord'?

What difference between what the Lord commanded and what was forbidden by him on this subject? Very much like difference between asking, 'What saith the Scripture'? as the New Testament authorizes, and 'What is the meaning of Scripture'? as perverters of God's word generally ask. Those who believe the Gospel and therefore are disposed to obey it 'are satisfied' that Scripture means what it says and says what it means. All such are disposed to ask, 'What saith the Scripture'? and are satisfied to 'speak as the oracles of God' (see Gal.

4:30 and 1 Pet. 4:11).

Many perverters now ask about the 'burden of the Scriptures, also the 'tenor' and 'general tenor', and shield themselves behind such words.

What of those prophets who spoke a 'vain vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord' who said 'I have dreamed, I have dreamed', who were 'prophets of deceit of their own heart', and who use 'their tongues' and said, 'He saith', as mentioned in this chapter? The genuine prototype, of theological ancestors, of all preachers and other teachers in modern times who deliver their own experiences and, in so, doing, tell of their own emotions instead of making known God's word. Those who thus proceeded in days of Jeremiah caused people to 'forget' God's name by telling dreams, and they caused people to 'err by their lies and by their lightness'. Entire tendency of telling experiences is to turn attention from God's word to vain imaginations of the human mind and unscriptural emotions of the human heart. This chapter of Jeremiah and Ezek. 13 clearly define that class of deceivers who tell how they 'feel' instead of telling what the Gospel requires and promises. Those who constitute that class then proceed to 'talk about the 'burden' or 'tenor' of Scripture, and endeavor to generalize certain specific commands, so they may feel privileged to do as they please. All who constitute that class regard certain emotions or internal feelings as best evidence of pardon, and are doubtless numbered with those spoke of in Scripture as 'deceiving and being deceived' (2 Tim. 3:13).

**Jer. 24** shows Jeremiah was shown 2 baskets of figs—one good, the other bad—to illustrate 2 classes of captives, the 1st and 2nd from among the Jews. The 1st were of the better class of people. In Isa. 3:1-3 we read of Divine purpose that the best of the people should be taken away first. Over such the Lord intended to exercise his care, to preserve them and bring them back to their own land. But those who would rebel against the king of Babylon under reign of Zedekiah should go into captivity, be scattered and die there.

**Jer. 25** states Divine, decisions against all nations as the Lord made them known to him in the 4th year of Jehoiakim king of Judah, which was the 1st year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon. In this statement the Lord revealed he held all nations responsible for their misconduct. He had decided to use Chaldeans or Babylonians to punish Jews for their evil deeds, and, had decided then to punish Babylonians for their evil.

On the same principle He had decided to treat all other nations. He had begun to punish Jews and would not suffer other nations to go unpunished (read Psa. 22:28 also Dan. 4:24, 25).

**Jer. 26** records that in beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah the Lord required Jeremiah to stand in the court of the Lord's house and speak to people of all cities of Judah all the Lord commanded him to speak without diminishing a word. Then he was required to command people, to turn from their evil ways so the Lord might repent of evil he had threatened against them. To this was added the statement that if they would not return then the Lord would make the temple like unto Shiloh, and the city of Jerusalem a curse to all

inhabitants of the earth. Next we learn on account of what Jeremiah had said to the people 'the priests and prophets'—false prophets—with 'the people' threatened to put him to death. Then 'the princes' went up to the house of the Lord and heard complaints against Jeremiah, after which he made a statement to the princes. Then they decided Jeremiah had not done anything worthy of death. After that we find certain elders made a speech and Jeremiah was delivered from death.

What is meant by the threat to make the temple like unto Shiloh? 1 Sam. 4 informs the ark was at Shiloh, therefore Shiloh was for a time the place of Jewish worship. It was God's house while the ark was there. But the ark was taken from Shiloh and never returned, likewise the priesthood that officiated there was overthrown.

**Jer. 27** informs concerning the Lord's word to Jeremiah commanding him to make 'bonds and yokes', put them on his neck, then send them to certain kings with explanation that they should all serve the king of Babylon. They were also to be informed those nations which would bring themselves under the Babylonian king should remain in their own land; but those that would resist him should perish. Jeremiah then uttered warnings against prophets who would speak in opposition to his words, and proposed a test by which those prophets who spoke 'lies' might be known. V. 17 indicates the Lord desired to avoid destruction of Jerusalem.

**Jer. 28** records what a false prophet, Hananiah, said to him in the house of the Lord in presence of priests and, people; also what he responded. Then is record of another revelation the Lord gave Jeremiah which ended with that false prophet's death.

What did Jeremiah mention as true test of a true prophet? Fulfillment of the prophecy would show whether the Lord had sent the prophet who uttered it. When Jeremiah said Hananiah should die that year he risked the test he had mentioned; and when Hananiah died that year people should have believed Jeremiah was a true prophet.

**Jer. 29** is a letter the Lord commanded Jeremiah to write to captives in Babylon stating they should remain there 70 years; also what would be done by the Lord and by them when those years should be fulfilled. We next read warning Jeremiah wrote to captives in Babylon against false prophets who had arisen among them, specially one named Shemaiah who sent letters to Jerusalem in opposition to Jeremiah. Chapter ends with the Lord's sentence against Shemaiah the Nehelamite, and against his offspring.

Why did the Lord decide to leave Jews in captivity 70 years? Lev. 25 informs He commanded the lands should rest every 7th year, and 2 Chron. 36:21 indicates Jews robbed the land of 70 sabbaths: they had, during 490 years, tilled the soil every year. Even the best of the kings overlooked the Lord's law regarding the sabbath for the land. But the Lord did not forget it. Therefore, when he gave the best of the Jews into the hands of their enemies he suffered them to remain 70 years, so the land might remain untilled during that time and

thereby enjoy her sabbaths.

What conclusion should these facts impel us to accept? That the Lord never forgets his word; and those who violate it will not be suffered to go unpunished except they repent. But even repentance will not save mankind from evil results of violating nature's laws.

**Jer. 30** shows Jeremiah was commanded to write all the words of the Lord to him in a book, because He would bring his captive people again into their own land. Then we read special revelation to the people concerning their captivity and return to their own land, in connection with statement that though the Lord would make 'full end of all nations' whither He would scatter Jews, yet He would not make 'full end' of them. We next read because they should be punished other nations would reproach them as 'outcasts', and on that account the Lord would favor them by returning them to their own land and giving them rulers of their own people after they would have been duly punished.

What of revelation in v. 11? Further stated in chaps. 31:35-37 and 46:27, 28.

In view of such prophecies concerning Jewish people what shall we say to those who think God has cast them off forever, and that his purpose in regard to them has ceased except to punish them? We should say as the Savior said to Sadducees in Mat. 22:29, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'. It is still true, as Paul declares, 'they are beloved for the fathers' sake' (Rom. 11:28). Therefore we should be careful not to mistreat a Jew nor speak of him reproachfully.

**Jer. 31** reveals continuance of favors the Lord promised to bestow on his people when they returned from captivity. He even declared if sun, moon and stars cease before the Lord, then Israel shall cease to be a nation before him.

Is special mention in this chapter concerning 10 tribes that constituted the kingdom of Israel separate from Judah 'til it went into captivity under Shalmanezar king of Assyria? The tribe of Ephraim, chief of the 10 tribes, is here spoken of hopefully.

Does the Bible speak of the 10 tribes as 'lost'? On the contrary, the New Testament speaks of the 12 tribes (see Acts 26:7 and Jas. 1:1 and Rev. 7:5-8).

How should we then regard all that is said about the 'lost 10 tribes'? As fiction, and as among errors of which those are guilty who cultivate ignorance of the Bible.

What is in this chapter in regard to a 'new covenant' When Jeremiah beheld the best of earthly blessings fleshly Israel should enjoy as a nation, then he foresaw the covenant by which spiritual Israel should be established (see Heb. 8:8-13).

**Jer. 32** records what the Lord said about overthrow of Jerusalem after it began to be besieged

by the Chaldean army. Then we read the Lord informed Jeremiah a certain one would approach him proposing he should buy a certain field, and that thus it came to pass; also that he bought the field according to usual method of purchase among Jews, then explained meaning of such purchase. Next, Jeremiah's prayer to the Lord in which he thought it inconsistent to buy a field at that time. But the Lord explained meaning to him more fully.

Has v. 40 been fulfilled? As far as time has permitted. Jewish people have feared God ever since captivity in Babylon. Previous to that they were disposed in direction of idols, but since then they have kept clear of idolatry quite generally. Divine remedy for their weakness was terrible, but effective.

What of last part of v. 33? Same idea in chaps. 7: 31 and 19:5; and idea indicates Jews in their iniquity went beyond what the Lord thought of. He knew their possibilities, but had not thought they would go to that full extent.

**Jer. 33** reveals the word of the Lord came again to Jeremiah while in prison, declaring the name of the Lord, mentioning his might, and revealing his purposes concerning captivity of Israel and Judah; also that in accomplishing his purposes he would bring them again into their own land and bless them. Jeremiah was then instructed to write concerning David and his descendants, also in regard to Levites; indicating constancy of the Lord's people in their fleshly and spiritual character should be as constancy of day and night.

What of v. 6? Indicates sufferings of Jews in captivity of 70 years, which the best of them suffered, was sufficient to 'cure' them of idolatry; and suggests sufferings Jews now endure should 'cure' them of infidelity Concerning Christ.

In what light should we consider vs. 17, 18? In light of Acts 2. Latter part informs God's promise to David, in regard to constancy of his throne, referred to Christ, who is of David's offspring according to the flesh (see Acts 2:29-36). In the passage just referred to, transition from a temporal to a spiritual king is set forth. God promised he would raise up some one always to sit on David's throne; and the apostle Peter, by the Holy Spirit, declared that promise fulfilled in Christ's ascension to Heaven. This shows God's promise to David referred to what is spiritual as well as what was temporal.

**Jer. 34** gives words the Lord commanded Jeremiah to say to Zedekiah, king of Judah, in course of the time the army of the king of Babylon fought against Jerusalem. Positive statements that the king of Judah should go to Babylon and die; also that he had made a covenant with the people that they should set their He' brew servants free, but afterwards those who freed. their servants again brought them into bondage. After that we read severity of Divine judgments definitely. declared.

What does disposition of those Jews who freed their servants but took them again suggest? Disposition of religious persons who once rejected humanisms in religion but afterwards adopted them; also disposition of those who will under pressure confess wrong and afterwards denounce their confession.

What is meant by last of v. 21? Chap. 37:5, 11 informs Egyptians moved in direction of domain of the Babylonians, and on that account the Chaldean army was for a time withdrawn from Jerusalem. But Jeremiah assured Jews the army of the Chaldees would return.

What is meant by the part of v. 18 which mentions cutting 'the calf in twain' and passing 'between parts thereof'? Gen. 15 informs when the Lord proposed to make a covenant with Abram he told him to divide certain animals, and when that was done and the sun went down 'a smoking furnace and a burning lamp' 'passed between those pieces' of the animals.

How did such arrangement indicate a covenant? A covenant is agreement between 2 parties; and when an animal was divided in the middle there was agreement between the 2 parts, indicating agreement between 2 persons, or 2 parties.

**Jer. 35** records what the Lord told him to do in regard to Rechabites, also what they said, then what the Lord declared concerning them and declared to them.

What was the Lord's purpose in referring to Rechabites and saying what he did of them? Vs. 12-14 clearly indicate the Lord's purpose was to bring them before Jews as object lesson of obedience to an earthly father in midst of contrary examples and influences.

What should we conclude from such examples? That children of upright parents ought to be encouraged by history of Rechabites to obey their parents in all they know to be right.

What is generally true of children in regard to parents? They are disposed to treat them as Jews treated the Lord. Because parents are good to them, they seem disposed to be ungrateful, at least in, a majority of cases. They will in many instances follow example and accept advice of the most contemptible specimens of humanity rather than example and advice of their own judicious parents. Thus Jews treated the Lord; and they went to ruin. Children who treat their parents after that manner are on the highway to ruin.

**Jer. 36** tells that Jeremiah was commanded by the Lord to write in a roll revelations made to him concerning Israel and Judah, from the first words he received from the Lord. We learn he did so or, rather, that he spoke the words and a scribe named Baruch wrote them. We learn also Baruch then, by Jeremiah's command, read those words in healing of the people, after which 'the princes' desired to hear them. Next informed the king of Judah was informed of Jeremiah's written words, sent for the roll in which they were written, and after reading a few leaves cut it with his knife and burnt it in the fire before him. Chapter ends with account Jeremiah was commanded by the Lord to take another roll, write in it the same words, and that many other words were added to them. Among the added words we find declaration of punishment which would be inflicted on the king of Judah.

Was it possible to defeat the Lord's word by burning a copy of it? No. The Lord could cause another copy to be made at any time. Mankind may by disobedience prevent Divine desire for their salvation from being accomplished. But they cannot defeat the Divine word as such, nor prevent Divine judgments from being inflicted.

**Jer. 37** mentions Zedekiah reigning and of his disobedience, likewise that he sent to the prophet Jeremiah and requested him to pray to the Lord for him. Mention also of the Chaldean army leaving Jerusalem for a time, on account of the army which came out of Egypt. Next the Lord's word came to Jeremiah and told him the Chaldean army would retrain to Jerusalem and destroy it. That Jeremiah attempted to leave Jerusalem is also recorded. Then he was put in prison, into the dungeon, and Zedekiah sent and took him out, and secretly asked if there was word from the Lord. Jeremiah told him there was and what it was. Chapter ends with plea Jeremiah made for himself and of the command the king gave concerning him.

What should we conclude in regard to false prophets declaring the Chaldean army would not return to Jerusalem? Then record indicates they were very much like multitudes in the Gospel age who seem to regard it their business to say what they think most people wish to hear. All who constitute that class judge by appearances which seem favorable, and refuse to consider what seems unfavorable. They boast of being 'optimists', which really means they are superficial observers.

**Jer. 38** records conspiracy against Jeremiah's life because he declared the Lord revealed to him that those who remained in Jerusalem should die by the sword, famine' and pestilence; but those who went over to the Chaldeans should live. We find also they put him in a miry dungeon, and that he was taken out because of the plea a certain Egyptian made before the king. Near close of the chapter we read an interview between Jeremiah and king Zedekiah. Chapter ends with statement that Jeremiah was in Jerusalem when it was taken by the Chaldeans.

What of v. 17? Sets forth Jehovah's last proposal to save Jerusalem from being destroyed. But as Zedekiah would not do what Jeremiah told him by the Lord's word, what resulted? Next chapter answers.

Do mankind in the Gospel age generally manifest disposition of Zedekiah? They do. Flatter themselves that perhaps, or probably, or possibly, there may be another plan by which they can be saved. As a result they will not submit to the Lord's plan, and will risk final condemnation rather than humble themselves to become Christians according to the New Testament.

**Jer. 39** is testimony in regard to length of the siege against Jerusalem, and its results.

How long did the siege last? A year and 6 months; that is, from the 10th month of the 9th year of Zedekiah's reign 'til the 4th month of the 11th year of that reign.

What occurred after the siege began? The king of Egypt with his army came out of Egypt, and the Chaldean army broke up the siege for a time (see chap. 37: 5). But it was after a time renewed and the city destroyed.

Who of the Jews were permitted to remain in Judah? The poor of the land, also Jeremiah and the Egyptian who pleaded for Jeremiah before the king when that prophet was in the miry dungeon.

What may we learn by the favor shown Jeremiah and to the Egyptian who approached the king in the prophet's behalf? That it is always safe to do right, and those who do right shall be rewarded. The New Testament as well as the Old teaches this doctrine (Mat. 10:40, 42).

Was it important for Jeremiah and his Egyptian friend to receive favors when Jerusalem was destroyed? More important than at any other time.

What will be the most important times for mankind who live in the Gospel age to find favor with God and Christ? In death and in the final judgment.

How may we all live so as to be favored then? (see Mat. 7:24, 25).

**Jer. 40** shows treatment Jeremiah received after Jerusalem was destroyed, and that he preferred to remain with the poor of the land whom the king of Babylon left there, rather than go to Babylon. Then in regard to the one the king of Babylon made governor of the poor left in the land; also what he said to the poor and from what places Jews were gathered to them. Finally we read of conspiracy against the mentioned governor, and that he would not believe report of the conspiracy.

**Jer. 41** informs that a man named Ishmael, descendant of a king of Judah, also certain princes of the people, slew Gedeliah, whom the king of Babylon had made governor over the poor of the land. We learn also they slew others and escaped to the land of the Ammonites. Chapter ends with statements in regard to remainder of the Jews being afraid to remain in their own land because the governor, the king of Babylon had set over them, was killed; so they decided to enter Egypt.

**Jer. 42** tells that Johanan, who succeeded Gedeliah, as governor of the remnant of Judah, went with the people under him to Jeremiah, and asked him to pray to the Lord for them and inquire in their behalf; promising to do what the Lord commanded. Jeremiah did so, and delivered the Lord's message to them in connection with which was warning not to go into Egypt.

Were Johanan and those with him sincere when they requested Jeremiah to pray for them and inquire of the Lord in their behalf, and when they promised to do what the Lord would command? They were not sincere, and Jeremiah told them so.

Should not the fact that Jeremiah told them of their hypocrisy have been sufficient to convince them he was a true prophet and they could not deceive God? Should have been sufficient; but Jeremiah had previously said 'the heart is deceitful above all things and



desperately wicked: who can know it? (chap. 17:9). Certainly very few seem to know their own hearts. But self-deception is common. Multitudes practice deception on others 'til they flatter themselves they can deceive God. Thus it was with hypocrites in the Jewish age, thus it is with hypocrites in the Gospel age. Even those who try to serve God sincerely are often in danger of deceiving themselves to think God's will is determined by appearance of good results regardless of God's written word.

**Jer. 43** sets forth that when Jeremiah delivered the Lord's message to the remnant of Jews in favor of remaining in their own land, and against going down into Egypt, they would not believe him, but declared he spoke falsely. Also that they all went into Egypt and Jeremiah with them. Next the revelation the Lord made to Jeremiah in regard to Nebuchadnezzar invading Egypt and giving those he would find there 3 dreadful alternatives from which to choose. Egypt's overthrow is definitely foretold.

According to this prophecy in regard to Egypt's overthrow by the king of Babylon, also called king of Chaldeans, what may we say of Jews who went into Egypt? They went into the very place where they would suffer exactly what they feared,—and all because they would not believe the Lord's word delivered through the prophet Jeremiah. In them was fulfilled this saying of Solomon: 'the fear of a man bringeth a snare' (Prov. 29:25).

Do certain preachers, elders of churches and others among disciples sometime show fear to do what is right because of evil results they imagine will follow right doing? They do; and thereby involve themselves in serious difficulties which those escape who do right always. 'The fear of a man bringeth a snare; but whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe'.

**Jer. 44** records first what the Lord said to Jews in Egypt by the mouth of Jeremiah beyond what he previously declared. Then) answer certain Jews made to, the prophet and his response; also further declaration of Divine, sentence against them.

What of v. 10? Indicates Jews' stubbornness, refused to humble themselves. What their nation suffered seemed not to affect them in the right direction. Their stubbornness was stated in Isa. 1:5.

And what of v. 17? Shows those Jew's who there expressed themselves were wrong by determination as well as self-deception. Because the Lord bore long with them, and they had plenty to eat while he bore with their idolatry in their own land, they concluded idolatry was benefit to them.

Do persons now make similar mistake? Multitudes forget John 7:24 and, as result, judge wholly by appearances strictly transient. From these they conclude the Lord approves their conduct regardless of what he says in his Word.

**Jer. 45**, the last chapter of Jeremiah's writings against Jews, records a message to Baruch the scribe who wrote what Jeremiah dictated to him. The Lord told him not to seek 'great things'

for himself; because what the Lord had built he would break down) and what he had planted he would pluck up and 'bring evil on all flesh'. Yet the Lord promised his life should not be cut short, but he should have his life for a prey wherever he would go.

What then are the outlines of this book? Consists of 45 chapters of prophecy and history chiefly concerning Jews, 6 chapters against heathen, and the last chapter pertains to Jewish history.

**Jer. 46** is a series of prophecies against Egypt in which overthrow of that nation by Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon is recorded. Near conclusion is prophecy that, after having been overthrown by the king of Babylon,, Egypt would be again inhabited. Chapter ends with words of comfort to Jews, in which they were assured the Lord would make a full end of all nations whither they should be scattered, but he would not make full end of them.

**Jer. 47** consists of prophecies against Philistines.

From what direction should power come that would overthrow them? From 'the north'.

What did that mean? That Nebuchadnezzar would overwhelm Philistia after Egypt smote Gaza, indicated by chap. 27:7.

What is meant by 'overflowing flood' in v. 2? Isa. 8:7, 8 informs reference was to the army of the enemy. Destruction wrought when a country is overrun by an army is like destruction by a flood.

**Jer. 48** is a series of prophecies against Moabites, in which their overthrow is declared and promise in regard to their return from captivity.

What was special reason for Moab's overthrow? Pride was charged against him, and he was charged with rejoicing when Israel was afflicted.

What does this indicate? Shows when the Lord punishes a nation he does not permit another nation to rejoice over the punishment (see Prov. 24:17, 18).

**Jer. 49** reveals prophecies against Ammonites, also promise in their favor for fulfillment after their captivity. Also revelation of judgments against Edomites but fail to find a promise in their favor. Next, prophecies against certain cities of Syria, also against Kedar of Arabia, Hazer of Naphtali, and against Elam otherwise called Persia.

What was special sin of Edomites? Ezek. 25:12 informs it was vengeance they took on Judah.

**Jer. 50** reveals Babylon should be overthrown utterly, and forever, after its 1st king had served God as the 'hammer' to break other nations. In connection with this revelation is mention of Jews and their safety.

What may we learn concerning God's pardoning, power? V. 20 declares the Lord promised to exercise it toward Jews on their return from captivity.

What of those who speak as if the Lord could not pardon sins before Christ's death? They do 'err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God' (Mat. 22:29).

**Jer. 51** continues prophecies against Babylon in which destruction of that city is again declared complete and everlasting.

What is said concerning Jews in relation to other nations? The Lord declared Jews as a nation were his 'battle ax and weapons of war'.

What did this mean, That He would punish all other nations for evil they had inflicted or would inflict on Jews.

Will the Lord take vengeance on those who afflict his people in the Gospel age? All that is done toward his people the Lord regards as done to himself (see Mat. 25:40 and 1 Cor. 8:12).

What use should be made of such prophecies as these from Jeremiah against Babylon? Should be placed in one of the advanced reading books in public schools, and in connection with them should be placed quotations from encyclopedias showing the mentioned prophecies were fulfilled and ancient Babylon is still in ruins.

These prophecies and those in Isaiah's writings declaring utter and perpetual overthrow of ancient Babylon are standing refutation of all infidelity concerning Divine inspiration of those prophets. Besides, condition of the Jewish nation during the last 1800 years is constant declaration of truth of Deut. 28. That Moses was inspired of God to write that chapter the exiled condition of the Jewish nation constantly proclaims.

**Jer. 52** is brief history of reign of the last king of Judah and treatment he received from the king of Babylon; also of overthrow of Jerusalem, burning of the temple, the king's house and all houses of the city. He stated likewise of spoils the Chaldean army carried to Babylon. Near the end is statement of the number of Jews carried to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar king of Chaldeans. Chapter ends with account of Jehoiachin, otherwise called Jeconias, and kind treatment he received from that king of Babylon who succeeded Nebuchadnezzar.

What should we conclude, in regard to Jewish people as represented in this book? Their history shows they illustrate these words of Solomon: 'correction is grievous to him that forsaketh the way, and he that hateth reproof shall die' (Prov. 15:10).

What of the wealth Solomon displayed in connection with the temple? An exhibition of

earthly glory the Lord suffered Solomon to manifest; and the fact that the last of it was carried into Babylon indicates this saying of Solomon: 'riches profit not in the day of wrath' (Prov. 11:4).

What of the style of Jeremiah compared with Isaiah? Equally dignified, but does not abound so much as Isaiah in imagery. Both prophets manifest grandeur and solemnity in their writings, and loftiness of their style as well as dignity of their themes proclaims they were Divinely inspired. Only reason anyone possessed of ordinary intellect and education has ever been skeptical concerning Divine inspiration of the mentioned prophets is to be explained on the principle of perverseness and ignorance. Skeptics show they object to the Bible because the God of the Bible objects to their misconduct; and hatred for the Bible constrains them to remain ignorant of its contents. Those who object to the Bible manifest ignorance of its contents in nearly all their objections. Therefore the best remedy for that abnormal condition of mind, called skepticism concerning the Bible, is careful and consecutive study of the Bible.

**LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH.. . Chap. 1** introduces the book which sets forth lamentations of the prophet over the city of Jerusalem when destroyed, over Jewish people in beginning of their captivity, and concerning sorrows which came on him by reason of afflictions Jews suffered and were, at that time, still suffering. This chapter consists of lamentations over Jerusalem and confession of sins of that City, in connection with which we find description of Jerusalem's desolation and the prophet's own emotions by reason of its desolate condition. Chapter ends with mention of the Jews' enemies and Jeremiah's prayer against them.

What may we learn by this chapter? Severity of Divine wrath. Jehovah had been good to Jews, even merciful, longsuffering and forbearing. But His forbearance had ceased. He had brought before them many considerations to move them to repentance. When they refused He gave them another opportunity. When they persisted in refusing He exhausted his warnings and finally gave them into hands of their enemies. This chapter records statements of their wretched condition at time of destruction of Jerusalem and afterwards.

**Lam. 2** tells of Jerusalem's destruction more fully stated by Jeremiah in his lamenting style, in connection with which he mentions what certain false prophets had said, and what enemies of that city did and said against it. Chapter is closed with statement of most dreadful condition of suffering which could possibly exist.

What difference between 'the daughter of Zion' and 'virgins of Jerusalem' in v. 10, Former referred to Jerusalem and latter to the daughters or unmarried women of Jerusalem. In regard to 'daughters of Zion' see Isa. 3:16-24. But the prophet passed from the city to the people, and from the people back to the city, in many instances, without explanation.

What may we safely say of such style? Strictly rhetorical and the style strong emotions suggest.

What may we say of rhetoric of the Bible? Illustrates all possible styles of speech even as nature illustrates all possible forms of life. Style of the Bible as well as its subjects proclaims its Divine origin.

Why then are some persons skeptical concerning origin of the Bible? Ignorance of contents and style of the Bible is chief reason, for skepticism in regard to its origin. The other reason is dishonesty in hearts of skeptics.

**Lam. 3** sets forth remarks of Jeremiah concerning his own sufferings by reason of overthrow of the Jewish nation. He then wrote of his humility and stated by reason thereof he had 'hope', after which he spoke of the Lord's 'mercies', and advantage of mankind being humble before the Lord 'who will not cast off forever' but 'will have compassion according to multitude of his mercies'. The prophet next proceeded to magnify the Lord as the only one who could correctly foretell future events. Next we find confessions of sins and exhortations to turn from them, after which the prophet mentions his enemies and prayed to the Lord against them.

What of vs. 27, 28? As true now as in Jeremiah's time on earth, that it is good for a man to have borne 'the yoke in his youth'. Patient self-control thereby learned is always advantage to a man.

What should be our conclusion in regard to Jeremiah's prayer against his enemies? An instance thereof in Jer. 18:21-23. While he thought only of offenses of Jews against the Lord he was disposed to pray for them; but when they persecuted him he prayed against them. This shows Jeremiah was possessed of human nature which occasionally was manifest in his writings when he wasn't under direct inspiration from God.

**Lam. 4** records the prophet's further expression of lamentation over ruin which had befallen Jews, in which he 'spoke of Jewish women having become like 'ostriches' in regard to their offspring, and declared their punishment worse than that which befell Sodom. He also mentioned Jewish women eating their own children because of destruction which came on Jerusalem. 'Sins' of false prophets and 'iniquities' of priests also mentioned. Then we read of 'persecutors' of Jews, also, warning to Edomites, and finally expression of comfort for Zion, followed by mention of sins of Edom.

**Lam. 5** records prayer of Jeremiah in which he called on the Lord to 'remember' what had come on the Jews and to 'consider' their reproach. In connection with that prayer is description of humiliation Jewish people suffered by reason of their overthrow, also special sufferings of women, the maids, princes, the elders and young men. Chapter ends with declaration of the Lord's rejection of Jews and his wrath against them.

What is in v. 7? Fulfillment of doctrine of retribution declared in Exo. 20:5.

Was it just for the Lord to visit iniquities of fathers on the children? Such visitation was Jehovah's last and severest decree in order to prevent his people from disobeying his commands.

Does Jehovah still visit iniquities of fathers on their children? Nationally and physically he still punishes children for sins of parents. 'Whatever a man sows that shall he also reap'

is the Divine doctrine which is true of nations and individuals. If evil results of wrong doing are not inflicted on a man in course of his lifetime it will often come on his descendants. This doctrine should cause men and women to do right for sake of their children, even if they are disposed to disregard Jehovah's authority and their own personal welfare. If men and women will not love God and obey him, he appeals to them by love they have for their offspring, to do His will in regard to morality, also in righteousness toward their fellow mortals.

Before leaving this book mention should be made of it as a dignified, solemn, beautiful, touching document. The Inspired Volume would not be complete without it. In sentiment also in style it is valuable contribution to Divine revelation and rhetoric. Human language with Divine precision chosen is here found expressing, as far as possible, inexpressible ruin of the city which was called 'the perfection of beauty', and inexpressible grief of those of her wretched inhabitants who survived that city's ruin.

The Bible reader may confidently inquire, Whoever wrote law like Moses? or psalms like David? or prophecies like Isaiah? or lamentations like Jeremiah? In all these respects the Bible excels all other volumes and thereby declares its Divine origin.

**EZEKIEL chapter 1** sets forth what the Lord said to the prophet regarding the Jews and certain other nations. Also account of a vision of 'the glory of the Lord'.

At what time did Ezekiel behold what is recorded here? V. 2 informs it was in midst of the period of about 10 years that elapsed between captivity of Jehoiachin and time when Jerusalem was overthrown at close of Zedekiah's reign.

What does this imply regarding to Ezekiel? That as he was in the land of Chaldeans, 'among the captives', he was taken from Jerusalem among the first Jews who went into captivity.

What is suggested by his vision of 'living creatures'? Isa. 6. When the Lord was about to give Isaiah commission to the Jews he first gave him a vision of His own 'glory'; and the chapter before us sets forth a vision of 'the glory of the Lord'.

What effect did Isaiah's vision have on him? Isa. 6: 5 informs that he said 'woe is me for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips and dwell in midst of people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts'.

What effect did Ezekiel's vision have on him? He said 'I fell on my face'.

In what respect was God's glory manifest in living creatures which had faces of a man, a lion, an ox and an eagle, and connected with wheels? Rev. 4 answers, specially the last verse where it is declared 'all things' were created for God's pleasure. Moreover it is manifestation of God's glory to control, by his Spirit, the world of mankind, all kinds of wild beasts, all cattle-kind, all kinds of fowls, and even all machinery man has invented (read Psa. 22:28 and 47:7-9).

What was indicated by the fact that the vision Ezekiel saw came 'out of the north'? Jer. 1:14 and 4:6 and 6:1 answer by declaring 'out of the north' evil should come on Jerusalem.

Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came from the 'north' to Jerusalem the 1st and 2nd times.

**Ezek. 2** records what a certain 'voice' said to Ezekiel, and that he saw a 'hand' in which was 'a roll of a book' which set forth 'lamentations, mourning and woe'.

What was indicated by words of the 'voice'? The Lord's commission to him with reference to 'children of Israel', describing them, and warning him not to fear them,—this was meaning of that voice.

What was indicated by contents of the 'book' Ezekiel saw? Destruction of Jerusalem as set forth in Jeremiah's writings. Historic limitations impel to this conclusion.

**Ezek. 3** commanded the prophet to eat the roll given to him, after which he was commanded to go 'to the house of Israel' and speak God's word to people of that house. Then description of Israelites or Jews was given the prophet; next in a vision he heard a voice praise 'the glory of the Lord' and in same connection heard noise of wings of the living creatures and wheels of the vision he previously beheld. Next we are told of Ezekiel going to certain captive Jews, what he did, and of the Lord's word that came while he was with them.

Are there facts recorded in the Bible in harmony with last Of v. 6? Yes. The book of Jonah informs that people of the great city of Nineveh repented by reason of one man's preaching. Besides, the book of Daniel informs Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar of Babylon believed the Lord's word as made known to them, even when unfavorable to them.

Why were Jews more perverse than heathen? Prov. 15:10 informs. Those who forsook the right way were more perverse than those who never knew it. Same is true now. The most 'impudent and hardhearted' persons on earth are apostate disciples—who once knew the right way but forsook it.

Did the Lord reveal to Ezekiel his responsibility as 'a watchman unto the house of Israel'? He did.

Does the New Testament reveal such responsibility? Paul mentions it in Acts 20:26, 27.

What may we learn by v. 23? Of the 3rd time 'the glory of the Lord' appeared to Ezekiel; also that when, he beheld it the 3rd time he fell on his face.

What of the last of this chapter? Further account of the Lord's word to Ezekiel in regard to what Jews would do to him, and how the Lord would cause him to be silent, then cause him to speak.

What have we thus far learned concerning Ezekiel? That he saw a vision of 'the glory of the Lord', then received a charge or commission to go to 'the house of Israel'; next that he saw a vision of a book in which were written 'lamentations, mourning and woe', after which he ate the book and received a charge to go and speak to 'the house of Israel'. Again we read he 'heard' a vision; after which he received another charge to go to the house of Israel. Finally we learn he beheld again 'the glory of the Lord' according to his 1st vision, after which he received another charge in regard to the house of Israel.

What else in Ezekiel's writings concerning his vision of 'the glory of the Lord'? Chaps. 8:4 and 10:1-22 answer.

Was it in harmony with other parts of God's revelation, for him to speak with a priest in connection with a vision of cherubim? It was. In Exo. 25:18-22 we learn God's promise was that he would speak to the high priest, 'from between the two cherubim', what He wished to reveal to Israelites. As such was His arrangement in connection with the tabernacle, it was altogether appropriate for him to speak to Israelites through Ezekiel in connection with a vision of cherubim.

What may we then say of Ezekiel's vision of cherubim? It is as plain as any other part of the Bible when scripturally considered: the Divine method of giving Ezekiel a vision of 'the glory of the Lord'.

**Ezek. 4** tells that Ezekiel was required to present to the house of Israel in captivity 4 object lessons. The 1st was in regard to the siege Nebuchadnezzar would arrange against Jerusalem. Next lesson was in regard to the 10 tribes, indicating period of their rebellion. The 3rd lesson was with reference to the house of Judah, indicating 40 years of iniquity the Lord wouldn't pardon. Then the object lesson given by the prophet's cooking, eating and drinking was to show famine that would prevail at destruction of Jerusalem, and indicate the Jews would eat polluted bread among Gentiles.

What was the period of iniquity of the 10 tribes? 390 years cover the period from time of the revolt recorded in 1 Kings 12 'til Jerusalem was destroyed.

What was period of iniquity of the kingdom of Judah? That occurred in reign of Manasseh (see 2 Kings 21:16 and 24:1-4). 2 Chron. 38:11-16 indicates a period in Manasseh's life as king when he was not altogether wicked.

Why was iniquity of the 10 tribes charged against them 'til destruction of Jerusalem? We are not informed but may safely say it was appropriate to charge iniquity of those tribes against them that long because their example and influence led Judah to sin; so the unpardonable wickedness was committed which caused the Lord to send the kingdom of Judah into captivity.

**Ezek. 5** is series of object lessons and their meaning.

What verse sets forth most clearly meaning of the object lessons? V. 12 answers.

What of style of this chapter? Like the style of declaring Divine revelation as in 1st part of Isa. 5, and in harmony with picturesque manner of prophecy generally adopted by the Holy Spirit in Old Testament prophets, also in the apostle John. Truth in such style is presented in pictures, and in every instance we find, in connection with pictures, indication of the position in history and real meaning of the revelation.

**Ezek. 6** reveals, first, prophecy against mountains of Israel. Next, declaring a remnant of Israel should escape the sword when the Jewish nation would be scattered in other countries. Then, Ezekiel was commanded to 'smite' with his hand and 'stamp' with his foot because of



'evil abominations of the house of Israel'. Chapter ends with declarations of severe judgments of God on Jews as punishment for their sins and that they might know him as Lord.

Why did Jehovah pronounce against 'mountains of Israel'? In those mountains altars to heathen gods had been built; and the Lord pronounced against them on that account and to call definite attention to them and foretell evil that should come on them, so when his prophecy would be fulfilled people who knew of what he, foretold would know he is 'the Lord'.

Why did the Lord command Ezekiel to 'smite' with his hand and 'stamp' with his foot? Connection in v. 11 indicates such outward demonstration would be in harmony with terrible revelations the Lord made through him at that time.

Is authority here for preachers to gesticulate while preaching? Indication is that delivering severe doctrine may be accompanied by suitable actions.

**Ezek. 7** was Divine prophecy against land of Israel, which involved sentence against the 'buyer' and 'seller', thus against 'all the multitude' of the land of Israel. Likewise a prophecy that silver and gold should be cast aside because the Lord would give the land into hands of 'strangers', and 'even the worst of the heathen' should possess houses of the Jews. This prophecy states also that in midst of 'destruction' that should come on Jews they would 'seek a vision of the prophet', but should not receive any, for, according to their deservings the Lord would judge them, and they should know him as the Lord.

What is the style of speech in this chapter? Strictly rhetorical; its broken and nervous sentences indicating strong emotion and confusion of thought which would be common among Jews in day of Divine judgments. It is also rhetorical in figurative language as in the expressions 'the rod hath blossomed, pride hath budded', in v. 10.

What is meant by last of v. 26? Means exactly what it sets forth, and mentions fulfillment of prophecy Leo. 26:19 and Deut. 28:23.

Did a king of Israel have personal experience of fulfillment of that prophecy? Yes, king Saul had such experience (see 1 Sam. 28:6, 15).

Will the Lord treat mankind after that manner in the Gospel age? He will treat them worse; for he will even send 'strong delusion' on those who receive 'not love of the truth that they might be saved'.

**Ezek. 8** records the hand of the Lord 'fell' on Ezekiel as he sat in his house, and in a vision he was taken to Jerusalem where he beheld 'glory of the Lord', and was required to see 'the image of jealousy' and 'abominations' committed by Jews in Jerusalem, even in the Lord's temple. Chapter ends with declaration of Divine 'fury'.

What is meant by 'the seat of the image of jealousy which provoketh to jealousy'? Deut. 32:16, 17, 21 indicates all idol worship on the part of Jews was an 'image of jealousy'.

And what is meant by v. 6? Indirectly stated here that 'abominations' Jews committed were such as to cause the Lord to go 'far off' from his 'sanctuary', or temple, in Jerusalem.

What is suggested in vs. 10, 11? Importance of keeping clear of pictures of a religious kind and all other kings in connection with religion, specially that Christians should not forget God can behold them in the dark (see also Psa. 139:11, 12).

What is meant by last of v. 14? That Ezekiel saw Jewish women in Jerusalem weeping for a Syrian idol named Tammuz.

What of those who think abominations Ezekiel saw were like symbolic worship in certain secret orders? All who engage in symbolic worship in secret would do well to consider this chapter.

What is meant by 'they put the branch to their nose'? The Sacred Text does not indicate, and we ought not speculate.

**Ezek. 9** is account of what Ezekiel heard and saw in regard to slaying of men at Jerusalem; also of a question he asked the Lord with reference to the slaughter, and the Lord's answer.

This chapter brings before us advantage of protesting against evils even when we have not power to correct them. Those in Jerusalem who did 'sigh' and 'cry' 'for all the abominations' done in that city were marked and spared. Rom. 3:4 indicates in same direction.

**Ezek. 10** shows Ezekiel beheld a vision of 'the glory, o ( the Lord' in the cherubim, even as in chap. 1. And in connection with that vision he beheld the man clothed with linen, mentioned in the previous chapter.

What is meant by 'coals of fire', and scattering them over the city'? Rom. 8:5 indicates scattering or casting forth fire meant destruction.

How can we harmonize the vision recorded in chap. 1 with the vision recorded here in chap. 10? Ezekiel says 'likeness of their faces was the same faces'; but in chap. 1 the face of an 'ox' is mentioned (here it is omitted and the face of a 'cherub' is mentioned). The only scriptural answer is that the face of a cherub and of an ox appear the same. These 'living creatures' were 'cherubim', not 'cherubims', and 'cherubim' is plural of cherub. Not every cherub had same appearance, but each had different appearance or facial expression. But in Ezekiel vision several cherubs or cherubim were united in order to give that prophet a vision of 'glory of the Lord'. That was the end in view as chaps. 1:28 and 3:23 and 8:4, as well as the chapter now before us, all unite in showing forth.

Is Ezekiel's vision of cherubim difficult to be understood? No. It was a vision of 'glory of the Lord' When the tabernacle was set up and when the temple was dedicated 'glory of the Lord' appeared in a cloud (see Exo. 40:34, 35 and 1 Kings 8:10, 11). But to Ezekiel the Lord was pleased to make his 'glory' manifest, by 'living creatures' called 'cherubim', and not by 'smoke'.

**Ezek. 11** sets forth revelation the Lord made to him in regard to certain men, who devised 'mischief' and gave 'wicked counsel' in Jerusalem; then of certain prophecies the Lord gave Ezekiel against those men, also against Jerusalem. Next, what the prophet's own brethren and

others said of those Jews who had gone into captivity, and what the Lord said he would be to them in captivity, and what he would afterwards do in their behalf. Then we are informed of what would be the oneness of Jewish people after captivity; but that the Lord would punish those who practiced 'detestable things'. Finally we learn the vision of 'glory of the Lord' which Ezekiel had seen 'went up' from him, and that he spoke to those of the captivity what the Lord had shown him,

Why have Bible readers generally supposed Ezekiel's vision is difficult to be understood, and ventured to speculate concerning its meaning? Simply because they failed to note his vision was manifestation of 'appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord' (chap. 1:28). The Lord chose to make his 'glory' manifest in such 'appearance' to Ezekiel, even as he did on former occasions in a 'cloud' and in 'smoke'. Therefore it is as unreasonable to speculate concerning the 'appearance' Ezekiel saw as it would be to speculate about 'smoke' Moses saw. We have found the 1st 11 chapters of Ezekiel's vision set forth 'glory of the Lord' in 'likeness of the appearance' of living creatures called 'cherubim', and set forth many revelations concerning Jewish people in connection, therewith.

**Ezek. 12** shows the Lord told the prophet to do certain things, as a 'sign' to the house of Israel in captivity to indicate what should befall those of their brethren who had been left in the land of Israel. In connection with revelation to Ezekiel on that subject was prophecy concerning Zedekiah, here called 'the prince in Jerusalem'. Then we read in regard to destruction of people of Israel generally, that the Lord would soon fulfill his threatenings.

What is meant by v. 13? Jer. 39:7 informs the king of Babylon put out both of Zedekiah's eyes; therefore this prophecy was fulfilled (he never saw Babylon because he could not see).

**Ezek. 13** sets forth 'woe' the Lord commanded Ezekiel to pronounce against false prophets and prophetesses of Israel.

What were charges against those false prophets? Ezekiel declared they prophesied 'out of their own hearts' and followed 'their own spirit' when they had 'seen nothing' that was real; but they saw 'vanity and lying divination'.

What else was true of them? They 'seduced' people, saying 'peace' when there was 'no peace'.

What is meant by last of v. 10? Figurative representation of weakness of predictions of false prophets of Israel.

What may we learn by considering vs. 17, 18? That certain women of Israel falsely prophesied also adopted certain practices or customs by which they tried to 'pollute' people.

Are there characters in modern times like false prophets against whom Ezekiel wrote? Multitudes of them.

Who are, they? Those preachers and people who depend on their own feelings more than on the Lord's word resemble Israel's false prophets. They preach their own feeling instead of preaching the Gospel, and as a result they 'seduce' and 'pollute' people who be-Here them. God's 'woe' against false prophets of Israel should warn false teachers of modern times.

**Ezek. 14** shows certain men of Israel, who set up idols in their hearts, went to Ezekiel to inquire of the Lord; and He revealed to the prophet that they were hypocrites, also that all such characters the Lord would answer himself. We learn likewise the Lord spoke of himself as sometimes deceiving a prophet. Then we read of certainty of Divine decrees of punishment. Chapter, ends with Divine assurance concerning remnant of the Jewish nation which the Lord intended to save from general destruction of the people.

What is suggested by account here of men who set up idols in their hearts inquiring of the Lord? The thought that idols may be set up in the heart, even when not set up outwardly, is suggested.

What may be said of those who profess to be of spiritual Israel, but for sake of a musical instrument or another human device will divide a church, and thereby destroy unity of the Spirit? All such have 'set up idols in their heart and put the stumbling block of their iniquity before their face'. The Lord will answer all such according to his righteousness in the last day. He knows their motives and understands what they deserve.

What may we learn by considering references to Noah, Job and Daniel in latter part of this chapter? We may learn folly of those who profess to believe the Bible generally but reject the book of Job and declare it is fictitious. In the chapter before us Job is classed with Noah who had been dead about 1800 years; and with Daniel whom was then living as a captive in Babylon. Moreover Job was spoken of by Ezekiel as a man having a soul, as being righteous and having influence with God. Nor is this all. The Savior endorsed Ezekiel as a true prophet in general endorsement he gave Old Testament prophets in Luke 16:29, 31 (see James 5:11).

What of those who profess to believe in Christ but reject the book of Job? They 'do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'. Besides, they're not logicians. If they would reason logically they would know they could not believe in Christ without believing in reality of every character the Savior mentioned directly or indirectly. They would know also their belief in Christ as the Son of God would imply their belief in righteousness of every person Christ endorsed. Therefore those who reject Job from among real characters, and the book bearing his name from among reliable documents, yet profess to believe in Christ's divinity, thereby prove themselves unscriptural and illogical.

**Ezek. 15** shows the Lord informed Ezekiel, under figure of a vine and its worthlessness for timber, concerning what he would do to 'inhabitants of Jerusalem'. He revealed he would make them as a burnt vine, and when they would 'go out from one fire' then 'another fire' should 'devour them'.

What should we conclude from frequent repetition of Ezekiel's statement 'and the word of the Lord came to me, saying ...? That he was verbally inspired to write what he declared was 'the word of the Lord to him. Any other conclusion would imply Ezekiel was a common liar, thus a reckless impostor.

But did not all Old Testament prophets write concerning 'the word of the Lord' coming to them even as Ezekiel did? Yes, and Moses wrote after the same manner declaring over 70 times—'and the Lord spake to Moses, saying...'

In view of such professions that explicit Divine communications were received, what should we conclude in regard to those persons who profess respect for the Bible but declare they do not believe in verbal inspiration of the Bible? That they fail to consider aright bearings of their words. If those writers who profess verbal inspiration were not verbally inspired, then they certainly were impostors, and should be thus regarded, and the books made up of their writings should be rejected.

**Ezek. 16** sets forth history of the Jewish kingdom from beginning of its people, under figure of a lowbred female infant, uncared for in her birth, but made to live by the Lord's decree, and nourished to womanhood, at which time the Lord made her his wife, after which he made her rich, and she became beautiful and prospered into a kingdom so her renown went forth among the heathen on account of her beauty. Then sets forth the woman thus renowned trusted in her beauty and played the harlot with many nations, even as 'an imperious, whorish woman' would ast in departing from her husband and going after other men. Then we learn the Lord addressed her as a 'harlot' and declared he would judge her 'as women that break wedlock and shed blood are judged'. Next we read the proverb 'as is the mother so is the daughter' should be used against the Jewish nation, also that Samaria is mentioned as the 'elder sister' and Sodom as the 'younger sister' of Judah in wickedness. Sin of Sodom then mentioned, also her overthrow; next we find mention of Samaria. Then Sodom, Samaria and Judah are spoken of as destined to the same future except that the Lord would establish with Judah his 'everlasting covenant'.

What may we safely say of those who teach all nations will, after the resurrection, be restored to their former estate; then urge v. 53 in favor of such doctrine? We, may safely say the 'former estate' of Sodom and Samaria would be one of wickedness, likewise that Sodom is suffering vengeance of eternal fire' (see Jude 7). Therefore Sodom cannot be restored to her 'former estate'. Moreover Jer. 29:10-14 informs of God's purpose concerning Judah, which shows exception in her behalf; but that exception did not take her to her former estate'. Besides, the entire history of Jews in remainder of the Bible, specially Ezek. 37, is against the idea of either Judah or Israel being restored to its former estate as separate kingdoms.

In view of such historic limitations what is meaning of v. 53? That the Lord would not restore any one of those 'sisters' to their 'former estate'; but he would as soon restore Sodom and Samaria to their former estate as to restore Judah to her former estate. Historic records of remainder of the Bible clearly show neither Sodom nor Samaria will be restored to her former estate. The former is suffering 'vengeance of eternal fire' (Jude 7), and the latter is 'one nation' with Judah, never to be again divided (see chap. 37:20-22). In view of such historic testimony the idea that Sodom, Samaria or Judah will be restored, before or after the resurrection, to a 'former estate', is infidelity.

**Ezek. 17** indicates in a parable treachery of Zedekiah, king of Judah when Ezekiel wrote his prophecies, likewise the Divine purpose to inflict judgment on account of that treachery. Latter part of the chapter mentions in figurative language purpose of the Lord to restore remnant of those already gone into captivity; and in the last verse we find figurative statement of Jehovah's decrees favorable and unfavorable toward Jews.

What was Zedekiah's special offense in God's sight? Vs. 18, 19 inform he disregarded the oath he swore when, Nebuchadnezzar made him king (see 2 Chron. 36:9-13 also v. 59 of the previous chapter of this book). The king of Babylon exacted an oath of Zedekiah; and

instead of keeping his oath he attempted to form alliance with the king of Egypt (indicated in v. 7 of this chapter). The king of Babylon was referred to by what the prophet said of 'a great eagle in v. 3; and the king of Egypt was referred to in what is said of 'another great eagle' in v. 7.

What may we safely say of the style of figurative speech in this chapter? Very impressive, easily understood and remembered. Same may be said of prophet-i.e. styles of speech quite generally, when carefully studied.

**Ezek. 18** is statement of Divine justice and mercy, indicated by Divine exposure here of the proverb which implied evil doers among Jewish people were not responsible for their evil conduct. Chapter ends with exhortation to the wicked to turn from their transgressions and live.

What of v. 26? Shows the Lord used 'dieth' in 2-fold sense, for it mentions the wicked man who 'dieth' in his wickedness, then declares 'for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die'. The word 'die' in last part of this sentence must therefore refer to punishment after death, and for iniquity not repented of before death of the body.

What does this show with reference to the Old Testament in regard to punishment after death? That the doctrine of future punishment is taught there (see also Dan. 12:2).

How could Jews make themselves 'a new heart and a new spirit'? Chap. 36:24-28 informs on this. When they would return to their own land and comply with Divine requirements, then the Lord would so bless them that they would have a new heart and disposition. The books titled Ezra and Nehemiah show out-workings of such disposition.

**Ezek. 19** records 2 parables. One in which the Jewish nation was spoken of as a 'lioness', and in the other that nation was likened to a 'vine'.

Where do we find historic facts referred to in these parables? In last chapter of 2 Chronicles. Jehoahas was the king taken into Egypt, and Jehoiachin succeeded him as king of Judah, who was taken captive by the king of Babylon. The parable of the 'vine' referred to the Jewish nation as such,, and its overthrow, also its condition among the heathen where it was without a king of its own people.

**Ezek. 20** gives account of certain elders of Israel approaching Ezekiel to inquire of the Lord, then of what the Lord commanded Ezekiel to say to them. In that response is account of the Lord's brief review of Jewish history from bondage in Egypt 'til time of their captivity; and their future history even to return to their own land after captivity among Babylonians.

What is meant by v. 25? That among the heathen they would, by the Lord's judgments against them, be under 'statutes that were not good'. Thus it was when they were under tribute to the heathen in days of the Judges, and thus it was among Babylonians.

What leading thoughts do we find in the Lord's review of Jewish history in this chapter? The Lord's choice of Israel in Egypt, Israel's rebellion against the Lord before leaving Egypt, and deliverance he wrought for his name's sake. Next we read of laws given to Israelites in the wilderness, and of the fact they 'despised those laws. But the Lord wrought for his name's

sake and brought them safely through. Near conclusion of the chapter is statement that the Jews should know the Lord when they should be returned to their own land after captivity in Babylon. Chapter ends with prophecy against the south, and Ezekiel's lamentations by reason of that prophecy.

**Ezek. 21** informs of the word the prophet was required to pronounce 'toward the holy places' and 'against the land of Israel', in which God declared he would cut off 'the righteous and the wicked'. Then we read of outward demonstration the prophet should make by reason of dreadful results of the word he would speak. The Lord even represents himself as smiting his own 'hands together' because of his 'fury' against Jews. Revelation next concerning the king of Babylon endeavoring to decide which way to go and that indications would be for him to go against Judah and Jerusalem. A certain man was then addressed as a 'profane and wicked prince' commanded to depose himself from his kingly position. Chapter ends with prophecy against Ammonites.

Who was the 'profane and wicked prince' in v. 25? Zedekiah, who swore allegiance to Nebuchadnezzar but violated his oath (see 2 Chron. 36:11-13 also chap. 16:59 and 17:18, 19).

What is evident in Ezekiel's style in this chapter? The broken or nervous style characterizes his writing, which is perfectly natural in view of sentiments he was required to express.

What does this indicate in regard to sacred rhetoric? It is the Divine adaptation of truth to mankind. Rom. 6:19 covers this idea. The Bible is set forth in human language with Divine perfection chosen.

**Ezek. 22** shows the Lord spoke to Ezekiel in regard to judging Jerusalem, here mentioned as 'the bloody city'; also that he arraigned that city for several prominent offenses besides shedding of innocent blood, and declared, as result of its wickedness, it could not 'endure' nor 'be strong' when the Lord would deal with it. We learn also the Lord declared 'the house of Israel' had become 'dross' to him and he would gather it into midst of Jerusalem to be melted. 'Conspiracy' of Israel's false prophets, unfaithfulness of its priests, dishonesty of its princes, and 'oppression' practiced by the people, we find in latter part of this chapter. We next learn the Lord sought for one man among the Jews who was exception to the rule and on whose account mercy might be shown. We finally learn that as result of not finding such a man God's divine decree was to pour out his 'indignation' on the Jewish nation.

What should we learn by v. 26? That God, whose attributes are always the same, was grievously offended when, sacredness of his Divine institutions was not regarded by Jewish priests. Moreover, in light of Gal. 5:1-4, we should learn not to mix Divine institutions of the Old Testament with those of the New. Jehovah has always been jealous for his appointments, and always been offended when they have been disregarded, displaced or mixed with humanism.

What general charge may be correctly brought against the sectarian world in the Gospel age? Preachers of the sectarian world have failed to distinguish between the Divine and the human in religious doctrine and practice. On the contrary, they have generally endeavored to intermingle what the Gospel sets forth with their own ideas so ordinary persons would not be able to distinguish between Divine and human in their teaching.

What is chief mistake of sectism in regard to this subject? Teachers of sectism generally presume the Savior's last commission to the apostles is applicable to themselves. All sects seem guilty of that mistake, thus show they do not believe the apostles are still officially doing their work through their writings and thereby executing the last commission Christ gave them.

**Ezek. 23** records that Israel and Judah, as separate kingdoms, are represented as 2 adulterous women; and that those kingdoms should be judged 'after the manner of adulteresses, and after the manner of women that shed blood'.

What was the purpose of such judgment on Israel and Judah? Two-fold, as stated in v. 48. First was to 'cause lewdness to cease out of the land', and 2nd was 'that all women may be taught not to do after' 'lewdness' of those 2 nations. The Lord's word in this chapter was therefore intended to end spiritual lewdness among Jews, and to warn all women against physical lewdness.

**Ezek. 24** shows, first of all, the Lord commanded him to write 'the name of the day' because that 'same day' the king of Babylon set himself against Jerusalem. Then the prophet was commanded to 'utter a parable unto the rebellious house', by which the idea was set forth that all inhabitants of Jerusalem would be taken by their enemies. Next we read the Lord caused Ezekiel's wife to die but did not permit him to mourn for her; and all this to illustrate that Jews in Babylon should not mourn when Jerusalem should be overthrown. Thus it was the prophet was made a 'sign' to the Jews in order that, they might know who is the Lord.

**Ezek. 25** records Divine prophecies against Ammonites, Moabites and Edomites, in which overthrow of each nation is foretold.

What was special offense of those nations? Rejoicing over afflictions of Israel. Jehovah had decreed punishment of Jews, and to that punishment he didn't propose anyone should add nor in any particular take advantage of it. For that reason above all others he was offended when Ammonites, Moabites and Edomites spoke or acted against Jews in their calamity.

What else does the Sacred Text set forth on this subject? Prov. 17:5 declares 'who so mocketh the poor reproacheth his Maker: and he that is glad at calamities shall not be unpunished'. Then in Prov. 24:17, 18 we read 'rejoice not when thine enemy falleth, and let not thine heart be glad when he stumbleth; lest the Lord see it, and it displease him, and he turn away his wrath from him'. These scriptures set forth principles of Divine wisdom which should be remembered by Christians and all others. The Lord does not permit us to take vengeance nor rejoice when he takes vengeance. On the contrary, we should imitate David (see Psa. 35:13, 14). That is to say, we should be humble and prayerful, instead of rejoicing and feeling revengeful, when our enemies are afflicted.

**Ezek. 26** shows the Divine sentence against ancient Tyre, mention of its overthrow by Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon.

What was Tyre's special offense? Saying 'aha, she is broken' in regard to Jerusalem. In other words, inhabitants of the city expressed satisfaction when Jews were punished and Jerusalem destroyed.



What does v. 6 indicate the Lord intended to accomplish by punishing Tyre? That Tyrians should know him as the Lord (see also last verse of previous chap.) Was Tyre ever built again? Never on the old site.

**Ezek. 27** is lamentation over Tyre, which the prophet was commanded to express. In that lamentation beauty and riches of Tyre are mentioned, likewise merchants of many nations which trafficked with Tyre as a merchant city. Chapter ends with statements concerning lamentations merchants who had dealt with Tyre would express when they would behold its overthrow.

What of histories which declare Tyre was never overthrown? Their authors failed to distinguish between old and new Tyre. The old city was overthrown by Nebuchadnezzar and never rebuilt. The new city was overcome by Alexander the Great.

**Ezek. 28** is prophecy concerning overthrow of 'the prince of Tyrus', in connection with which is description of that 'prince' indicating he was a very wise man. Next we find prophecy against 'the king of Tyrus' in connection with mention of that king's wisdom, beauty and riches; all indicating he was specially gifted by nature. Then we read prophecy against the city of Zidon. Chapter ends with prophecy in regard to safety and prosperity of Jews when they would return to their own land.

What is meant by the oft repeated statement 'and they shall know I am the Lord'? Means Jehovah desired to be recognized and acknowledged by the nations. He is author of the universe and all blessings enjoyed by all nations. Therefore he desires to be acknowledged by all nations even if people of the nations will not serve him so as to be finally saved. If the nations will not acknowledge him while in prosperity, he will compel them to do so in adversity.

Does the New Testament teach on this subject? Yes. The Lord Jesus Christ will finally be confessed by all mankind. Those who refuse to confess him and be saved will be compelled to confess him in the final judgment when they will appear for condemnation (see Philip. 2:10, 11).

**Ezek. 29** is prophecy concerning overthrow of Egypt as a nation by Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, to whom riches of Egypt were given as reward for what he had done in the Lord's behalf against Tyre.

Was captivity of Egypt limited? To 40 years, said the prophecy was that the Egyptians should then be gathered into their own land, but should never afterwards be exalted among the nations.

Has that prophecy been fulfilled in regard to Egypt? It has been strictly fulfilled, and Egypt has never since that time been very prominent among the nations.

What was the special charge Jehovah made against Egypt? Vs. 6, 7 indicate Egypt was guilty of pretending to be friend, ally to Israel; but was never a true friend.

What does that charge against Egypt reveal? That Jehovah notes all hypocrisy in nations as well as in persons.

What may we learn by considering that riches oil Egypt were given to the king of Babylon as wages for his army? That God is just even to a heathen king.

He used Nebuchadnezzar to accomplish certain important ends and paid him for the work.

**Ezek. 30** continues prophecy against Egypt in connection with prophecies against Ethiopians and other peoples. Statement also of dominion of the king of Babylon over the king of Egypt.

What is meant by 'woe worth the day' in v. 2 Means 'alas for the day' as translated in another version of the Sacred Text.

Why was Nebuchadnezzar called 'the terrible of the nations' as in v. 11? He was a mighty warrior, and Jehovah used him to subdue many nations (see Jer. 27: 2-11).

**Ezek. 31** is prophecy against the king of Egypt personally. Greatness of the Assyrian king and his overthrow is mentioned as illustration of greatness of Pharaoh and his overthrow.

What is meant by v. 14? The Lord overthrew the Assyrian king and intended to overthrow the Egyptian king in order to show mankind they should not exalt themselves.

What would study of such record accomplish if studied by all who can read the Bible? Would certainly tend to divest them of pride,

**Ezek. 32** is the Lord's concluding prophecies concerning Pharaoh and his hosts in connection with which certain nations, previously overthrown, are mentioned

What of the prophet's style in this chapter? Lofty and figurative, clear and impressive.

What have we found of divisions of this book so far? 24 chapters almost entirely devoted to prophecies concerning Jews, and 8 chapters devoted to prophecies concerning heathen.

**Ezek. 33** states the prophet's responsibility as a 'watchman unto the house of Israel', likewise warning the wicked not to continue in wickedness, and warning the righteous not to turn to wickedness. This chapter also pleads for Jehovah's fairness, and condemns those who charged him with unfairness. Mention then of when Jerusalem was overthrown, of Ezekiel being able to speak again after having been dumb for a period, and what the Lord said to him concerning wickedness and hypocrisy of Jewish people. Finally mention of evidence the Lord would give that a prophet had been among them.

Is it true in the Gospel age that those who occupy position of teachers have great responsibility? Acts 20:26, 27 indicates if Paul had shunned to declare, all the counsel of God he would not have been 'pure from blood of all men'.

What is suggested by vs. 30-32? Self-deception and hypocrisy of many professors of Christ now living. They pretend to wish for knowledge of 'the word that cometh forth from the Lord', and 'with their mouth they show much love; but their heart goeth after covetousness'. Besides, they make fun of the one who faithfully sets forth the Lord's word to them; or they praise him with their lips while disregarding what he says.

**Ezek. 34** sets forth Jewish people as a flock, and their oppressors as evil shepherds; also captivity of Jews as scattering of a flock. Then gathering Jews from captivity and setting a 'prince' of the house of David over them is illustrated by mention of gathering of flock and placing over it a good shepherd. Chapter ends with plain declaration that God's 'flock' consisted of 'men'.

What lesson should be specially impressed on our minds by this chapter? Danger of mistreating God's people. While Jews were in captivity their heathen rulers were their shepherds (see what is said of Cyrus in Isa. 44:28).

**Ezek. 35** is prophecy of overthrow of Edomites dwelling in Mount Seir, also that their overthrow should be perpetual.

What is here given as reason for such severe sentence against Edomites? Their hatred of Jews, their vengeance on them 'in time of their calamity', and purpose to take possession of land of both Israel and Judah (reasons why the Lord decided to overthrow them forever).

**Ezek. 36** is Jehovah's sentence in favor of mountains of Israel and in behalf of Jews as a nation.

Why did the Lord pronounce prophecy favoring these mountains? Because heathen had spoken against them. q

Did the Lord favor Jews for their own sakes? No; but for his own name's sake.

What is taught in v. 25? The Lord's purpose to cleanse his people from connection with idols and other abominations when he would bring them back from captivity in Babylon. This is evident when we consider vs. 24, 25.

What of those who quote v. 25 in favor of sprinkling for baptism? They 'do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God' as set forth in the Gospel. Those practicing sprinkling for baptism are in error; and the only semblance of Scripture evidence they can present in their favor is perversion of Scripture. Jews were in captivity, but the Lord intended to bring them back and place them in their own land. When that time would come the Lord intended they should be cleansed by 'the water of separation', here called 'clean water' (see Num. 19).

Why should we say 'clean water' here referred to was 'the water of separation' mentioned in Num. 19? Because Jewish law did not require 'clean water to be sprinkled on anything nor on any person, for cleansing from legal defilement. Therefore 'clean water' spoken of in v. 25 must have been water with some ashes of a red heifer mingled with it. Historic limitation of the Old Testament record impels and confines us to this conclusion. All who carefully consider v. 24 will be constrained to decide that v. 25 referred to legal cleansing of Jews after they returned from captivity.

What should we say to those who pretend to think v. 25 is prophecy of double reference and therefore referred to sprinkling in the Old Testament, also in, the New? We should ask them to show its fulfillment in the New Testament. In so doing we should insist they show fulfillment in harmony with the prophecy, if this verse is prophecy of a New Testament

institution. We should also insist New Testament facts shall not be ignored nor even perverted in order to make semblance of such fulfillment.

**Ezek. 37** made a record of his vision of dry bones, and of the Lord's word concerning 2 sticks.

What was the vision of dry bones intended to mean? Vs. 11-14 show the vision was intended to show 'the whole house of Israel'—then nationally dead because its ruling power was overthrown and people of Israel generally were in captivity—should return from captivity and become nationally alive.

What was meant by the record of 'two sticks'? That was intended to be an object lesson to show the two houses of Israel (the tribe of Judah on the one hand and Ephraim on the other) should, after return from captivity in Babylon, become one people under one 'shepherd' or ruler.

What of those that teach the vision of 'dry bones' and lesson of 'two sticks' refer to the Gospel age? They 'do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God' (Mat. 22:29). What is here said referred to reviving of Jews and making them one people.

What may we say of those that refer to the vision of 'dry bones' as illustration of the 'first resurrection' mentioned in Rev. 20, and try to prove thereby that the mentioned resurrection will not be literal, but refers to rising-up of such as Martin Luther and certain, others in the 16th century of the Gospel age? We should remind them that return of Jews to their own land was a very literal and fleshly raising up, though the word resurrection is not applied to that event in either Old Testament or New.

**Ezek. 38** is prophecies against a character or person named 'Gog', described as an enemy to Israel that would 'think an evil thought' against Israel, and try to encroach on that nation. In latter part of this chapter, 'Gog' indicates a character spoken of in Rom. 20:8 also represented as an enemy of the Lord's people.

What is revealed against 'Gog' as a person and character? Utter overthrow is revealed.

What does this indicate? Entire overthrow of all enemies of the Lord's people.

**Ezek. 39** is prophecies against 'Gog' as an enemy of Israel the Lord would overthrow. We read also of return of Israel after captivity, and of 'mercy' the Lord would show to 'the whole house of Israel'. In connection with these prophecies are declarations indicating this character was intended to refer to overthrow of all the Lord's enemies in close, of the Gospel age. Compare vs. 17, 18 with Rev. 19:17-21.

**Ezek. 40** is Ezekiel's vision of 'the frame of a city' in 'the land of Israel' 'in the fourteenth year after the city (of Jerusalem.) was smitten. He also saw in vision a man 'with a line of flax in his hand and a measuring reed', who spoke to him, 'Declare all thou seest to the house of Israel'. Next find record of measurements that man with the measuring reed made, of 'the building', of 'the threshold of the gate' which opened 'toward the east', of 'the porch of the gate', of 'the gate', also measurement he made of the 'north' gate and the 'south' gate. Other measurements likewise, which the prophet beheld, were recorded. Mention also of 'eight

tables' for 'sacrifices' to be slain on, and 'chambers of singers in the inner court'. Chambers for different classes of men are also spoken of. Chapter ends with account of measurement of 'the porch of the house'.

What is meant by such measurements? The prophet was in captivity with Jews who were to return to Jerusalem about 45 years from date of this vision. After giving captive Jews many assurances of return to their, own land the Lord was pleased to give Ezekiel a vision of the frame of a city and certain arrangements for worship in 'the land of Israel', to assure them further that they should certainly return to that land, even to the city of Jerusalem, and worship there.

**Ezek. 41** is in regard to measurement of the temple by the man with the measuring reed Ezekiel saw in his vision. We likewise learn of 'cherubim and palm trees' also of 'the altar of wood' which was called 'the table before the Lord'.

What was bearing of these measurements and descriptions? Their bearing should have been to convince Jews in captivity the Lord would certainly take them back to their own land and permit them to have a temple there in which to worship him.

**Ezek. 42** is record of what Ezekiel saw in regard to what is here called 'the utter court', likewise 'holy chambers' and certain outer dimensions.

What did those outer dimensions indicate? That the city Ezekiel saw was square.

What other city is mentioned in the Bible as square? Rev. 21:16 informs, and we can understand the city Ezekiel saw in his vision as the future home of fleshly Israel should be in some respects like the everlasting home of spiritual Israel.

**Ezek. 43** informs that Ezekiel saw 'the glory of the God of Israel' like the 'appearance of the vision' the prophet saw when he 'came to destroy the city'. Ezekiel also informs he was taken in his vision 'into the inner court' and 'the glory of the Lord filled the house'. Then we read what the Lord said to the prophet in regard to his punishment of Israel, and what he would do to that nation if it would put away its 'whoredom'. He was then commanded to show people of Israel they might be 'ashamed of their iniquities', and 'let them measure the pattern', and then, if they would be 'ashamed of all they' had 'done', he should 'show them the form of the house' and all else the Lord had shown him in regard to it, even 'the law of the house'. Then the prophet was commanded to set forth certain measurements and ordinances, also certain regulations with reference to priests and worship after Jews should return to their own land.

What impression should such revelations have made on the minds of captive Jews? They should have been thereby impressed more intensely, if possible, than by previous assurances, that they should certainly return to Jerusalem and worship there.

**Ezek. 44** sets forth that Ezekiel was brought 'to the way of the gate of the outward sanctuary' 'and it was shut'; then we are told it should be shut in future because the Lord 'entered in by it', but 'the prince' or ruler of the people should sit in it. The prophet then declared 'the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord', and that the Lord commanded him to 'mark well' and be careful in regard to what the Lord said to him concerning 'the house' and what pertained

to it. Then the Lord told him what to say to the 'rebellions' house of Israel' in regard to former abominations also what regulations of the Lord's 'sanctuary' should be in time to come. Levites 'gone away' from the Lord were then assigned their place, likewise sons of Zadok were assigned their place. Priestly garments, behavior in regard to death of relatives, and marriages of priests, were next mentioned by the Lord through the prophet. Certain duties of priests were set forth, likewise that the Lord would be their 'inheritance' and possession'.

What was meaning of all such revelations to captive Jews? That they should be restored to their own land, and their worship, according to the Lord's commands, would be acceptable in his sight.

**Ezek. 45** gives instructions through Ezekiel to Jews in captivity in regard to land they should set apart as offering of the Lord. In that offering we find 2 measurements commanded: one for the sanctuary and priests who should 'come near to minister to the Lord' and another for Levites not chosen as priests to occupy. We find also the 'prince' who should be temporal ruler of the people after their return from captivity should have a place in the 'holy portion' intended for priests. Next, directions concerning conduct of 'princes of Israel' after the people should return from captivity. Mention then of just balances and measures which should prevail among Jews after return to their own land, likewise of offerings which should then be made to 'make reconciliation' for the people. The part 'the prince' should take in regard to offerings made is next mentioned, and followed by directions concerning the 'passover' and feast of the 7th month of the year.

What bearing should these instructions have had on Jewish people in captivity? Should have confirmed them in hope that the Lord would cause them to return to their own land.

What other benefit should these instructions have been to Jews? It was evidence to them that when they would return to their own land they should arrange themselves as a nation and worship even as the law given through Moses required; likewise that they should have a 'prince' in place of judges of the former period of their history and in place of the king of the latter period.

**Ezek. 46** informs concerning time during which 'the gate of the inner court' should be kept shut and 'opened', also concerning where 'the prince' and 'people of the land' should worship. Next, instructions in regard to 'the prince' and offerings he should make, and in regard to the way he should 'enter' and 'go forth'. Next, instructions in regard to 'the people' entering and going forth, and the place 'the prince' should have among them. The 'offering' in 'solemnities' of 'feasts' was next mentioned; after that we find directions in regard to 'voluntary' offerings of the prince. The daily 'burnt offering' was next mentioned, likewise 'meat offering'. Regulations then in regard to the prince bestowing gifts. Ezekiel then wrote what he saw and heard after he had in his vision been brought to another position.

Why were these instructions given? The law was given before the city of Jerusalem became the place of worship for the Jewish nation. Regulations of the law in regard to worship were given with reference to the tabernacle service, and not with reference to the temple and its surroundings. Therefore the Lord amended the law by giving certain regulations which would enable Jews, when they again became worshippers in Jerusalem, to understand what the order should be with which the Lord would be pleased.

**Ezek. 47** gives Ezekiel's account of 'waters' which 'issued out, of the, sanctuary', also of their depth, their effects, and of trees on the 2 sides of the 'river' of waters. Then, what the prophet wrote in regard to 'the border' of the land, and that sons of Joseph should have 'two portions'; also that after return from captivity the 'stranger' among them should not be regarded as, a stranger, but should have 'inheritance' even as 'one born in the country.' and 'among the tribes of Israel'.

What does this vision of waters suggest? The apostle John's vision of the river of life proceeding from the throne of God, and of the tree of life on each side of the river, as recorded in 1st part of Rev. 22.

What is indicated by v. 8? That when Jews should return to their own land something should go forth from them for healing of all nations.

What does the New Testament show was intended for healing all nations? Christ's gospel was given with that intention. Poetic reference to the Holy Spirit as 'living water' is found in John 7:37-39, and by that Spirit the gospel of man's salvation was made known.

Are all nations healed by Christ's gospel? They are saved from guilt of Adam's sin and will be saved from the grave by the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. But whether those persons in the nations, whom the Lord will regard as responsible beings, will be finally and eternally saved, will be decided by obedience to the Gospel (see 1 Tim. 4:10 and Heb. 5:8, 9).

What is indicated by vs. 22, 23? That the Lord intended to lift the restriction in Deut. 23:3 in regard to certain other nations, and that such restriction should not be observed after Jews returned to their own land.

**Ezek. 48** sets forth names of 7 tribes and borders of their inheritances, also inheritance which should be measured 'by the border of Judah from east side unto the west' for 'priests', then measurement of inheritance of 'Levites'. Then we read of the border of 'the profane place for the city'. That the 'holy oblation' or offering of territory round about the city should be 'four-square', also what should be for 'the prince'. Then names of the 5 other tribes and borders of their inheritances. Chapter ends with instruction that names of gates of the city should be according to names of the 12 tribes of Israel.

What special differences between tribes as here named in connection with gates and as they were named in connection with their inheritance? Joseph is mentioned as representing his 2 sons who are not named here; but in regard to their inheritances those sons are named.

What difference between arrangement here for lands of priests and that made for them in the law given by Moses? In Moses' writings the priestly tribe was to be divided among the 12 tribes, part of the Le-rites living in each tribe (see Num. 35). But in Ezekiel's vision the Lord arranged for all the priestly tribe to dwell round about the sanctuary, therefore round about Jerusalem.

What is set forth in the New Testament in regard to 12 gates? The 21st chapter of John's vision informs that the New Jerusalem will have 12 gates in which will be written 'names of the 12 tribes of the children of Israel'.

Was there anything specially appropriate in commanding that names of the gates of Jerusalem should be according to names of the 12 tribes of the Israelites? It was entirely appropriate, as the tribes would chiefly constitute those who would enter the city by them, except the 'east gate' (see chap. 44:1, 2).

But why should the New Jerusalem have gates named according to 'the 12 tribes of the children of Israel'? From among those tribes were chosen writers through whom the Bible has been given, therefore through whose writings the redeemed ones will finally have entered the saved state set forth in the Bible.

In view of mention of the 12 tribes by the prophet Ezekiel and the apostle John, what should we say of those who state '10 tribes were lost in the captivity'? They 'err, not knowing the Scriptures'. The Bible does not intimate '10 tribes' were lost, therefore the conclusion that those tribes were lost is erroneous. Those who have declared '10 tribes of Israel were lost' have not only declared what is contrary to Scripture but have reflected seriously against their own honesty.

After considering the book of Ezekiel what may we say of its outlines or chief subjects? Those outlines may be mentioned under 3 headings: 1, Destruction of Jerusalem; 2 Overthrow of other nations; 3, Restoration of Jews to their own land. Under this last heading Ezekiel beheld 'the frame of a city', 'the sanctuary' the worship re-established, the 12 tribes again settled on inheritances, also priests and Levites settled round about the sanctuary city. Finally, that, which Ezekiel beheld of the form of the sanctuary city, the waters he beheld flowing from the sanctuary, purpose of the waters, and gates of that city,—together indicate the New Jerusalem beheld by the apostle John in his vision, on the island called Patmos, was, in a measure, foreshadowed. That vision included the Gospel age which should intervene between Ezekiel's prophetic vision and the New Jerusalem beheld by the apostle John.

**DANIEL I.**—This book consists of a record of facts, dreams and interpretations, with visions and their meaning, in connection with which is a record of prophecies. Chapter 1 is simply a record of important facts.

What is meant by 'pulse' in this chapter? Means peas, beans,, or anything edible which grows in pods. Such edibles are very nourishing to the body, therefore we can understand why 'faces' of Daniel and his friends, after eating such food for a time, seemed 'fairer and fatter' than faces of those who ate 'of the king's meat'.

**Dan. 2** records a dream concerning a great 'image' Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon dreamed but forgot, and which was repeated to him by the Lord through Daniel, and the interpretation. Then is record that Nebuchadnezzar was entirely satisfied with Daniel's statement of the dream and its interpretation, also that Daniel was made 'chief of governors over all the wise men of Babylon', and that at his request his 3 friends were set 'over affairs of the province of Babylon'.

What may we say to those who declare there is discrepancy between v. 1 of this chapter and Jer. 52: 12, also between this 1st verse and what is said about 3 years 'learning' in, the



previous chapter? We may say the 1st verse of this chapter does not state length, of time that passed between occurrence of the forgotten dream and the date when Nebuchadnezzar called the wise men of Babylon to bring it to his remembrance. Jer. 52:12 informs that Jerusalem was destroyed in the 19th year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. This indicates he had reigned about 8 years before Daniel, who was among the 1st captives taken to Babylon. Besides, the 1st chapter of this book informs Daniel was instructed in 'the learning and the tongue of Chaldean' before he was examined by the king. These facts indicate Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which he forgot must have occurred several years before he called on wise men of Babylon to bring it to his remembrance and give its interpretation. Those years may be admitted between events mentioned in v. 1 and those mentioned in v. 2. Therefore we may say he had the dream in the 2nd year of his reign but did not find it so 'troubled' him that 'his sleep brake from him' 'til 11 or 12 years later. Men sometimes have dreams even in the Gospel age which they do not relate for a long time, and some they never relate. Besides, men are sometimes 'troubled' with dreams they forget, but which keep them awake in some instances simply by general impression they have made. Thus it seems to have been with Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon.

**Dan. 3** is account of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon making a great image of gold and commanding officials of his dominion generally to bow down at its dedication when they would hear sounds of 'all kinds of music'. Then we read Daniel's 3 friends refused to bow to that image and, as a result, were cast into 'a burning fiery furnace' from which they were delivered by Divine, care in their behalf, after which they were 'promoted' 'in the province of Babylon.

What may we safely say of faith manifested by Daniel's 3 friends in refusing to bow to a golden image even when given 2nd opportunity to do so? It was wholehearted, and their speech before Nebuchadnezzar was grand. Showed they were unreserved in devotion to Jehovah, and not afraid of the mightiest of earthly monarchs.

What of v. 25? Declares 'the form of the 4th' man in the fire was 'like the Son of God'; and, as this state-meat was recorded by the prophet Daniel without explanation, we should accept it without comment.

What should we say to those who declare that for men to pass through a hot fire without a 'hair of their head singed' or 'the smell of fire' on them was impossible? We should inquire whether men know enough to arrange for controlling machinery and other powers they invent or adopt. When we receive affirmative answer we should inquire why they declare the God of nature did not arrange to control forces of nature. We should further inquire who created forces of nature and adapted them to ends accomplished by them. When this question is answered we shall have a basis on which to answer those who say the miracle recorded in this chapter was impossible. If man—frail and shortsighted man—knows enough to arrange for control of his machinery and forces, why should, it be thought impossible or unreasonable that the Author of the universe did arrange for control of his machinery and forces? To ask this question implies all skepticism concerning miracles recorded in the Bible is foolish.

**Dan. 4** informs concerning another 'dream' of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon—the dream concerning a great tree which he told to Daniel and received from him the interpretation. We are also informed when interpretation of that dream was fulfilled the king of Babylon was given 'a beast's heart' and did, for a period, 'eat grass as oxen', after which his 'understanding

returned' to him, and then he expressed 'praise' and 'honor' to 'the King of heaven' and declared 'those that walk in pride He is able to abase'.

What should be the effect of this chapter of Nebuchadnezzar's history on minds and hearts of mankind? Should cause them to fear and tremble at possibility of pride, and of its dangers.

What is meaning of 'basest' in last part of v. 17? Means 'lowest' without meaning low in character. The Hebrew word here translated basest in the Common Version, and 'lowest' in the American Revised Version, means 'earth', and may be translated 'earthiest'. The idea in v. 17 is that as God rules 'in the kingdom of men' he sets over it 'the earthiest of men', that is, the most common of mortals; and therefore those who are set over such a kingdom should not be proud, but should remember they are made of the same clay with other men.

What should mankind generally learn by considering Nebuchadnezzar's history? That the greatest of heathen monarchs made a golden image, tried to destroy those who would not bow down to it, and was an oppressor of the poor; likewise that God humbled him so that he wrote this: 'Now I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise and extol and honor the King of heaven, all whose works are truth and his ways judgment; and those that walk in pride he is able to abase.

Nor is this all. We should learn by considering Nebuchadnezzar's case that he committed his fatal offense by saying, 'Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power and for the honor of my majesty? From this we should learn whenever a person—heathen, Jew, Christian, or non-professor of religion—leaves God out of any greatness, then a fatal offense has been committed. That is to say, all persons who ascribe greatness to themselves or to their fellow mortals, without confessing the God of heaven, as Author of all greatness, certainly offend God, and their offense will not be forgotten.

**Dan. 5** is record of the last night of the reign of the last of Babylonian kings; also of beginning of reign of a Median, king over the dominion of Babylon.

What may Bible readers learn here? That by use of strong drink Belshazzar,, last king of Babylon, was incited to commit sacrilege in misuse of sacred things.

What impression should this make on Bible readers? That strong drink is opposed to religious reverence.

What else may we learn by considering Belshazzar? He didn't consider God's dealings with his father and, as result, did not humble his own heart but 'lifted himself up against the Lord of heaven' and committed the crime called 'sacrilege' by desecrating sacred vessels Nebuchadnezzar had taken from Jerusalem.

Is all misuse of sacred things sacrilegious? Yes, specially all irreverent use of them.

Why did Daniel use the word 'Peres' instead of 'Upharsin' when he gave interpretation of the handwriting on the wall in Belshazzar's hall? Because 'Peres' means 'divided', even as 'Upharsin' means 'divided'. These 2 words are related to each other grammatically. in certain

particulars which do not need to be explained in order for us to understand their historic meaning.

**Dan. 6** shows wicked men moved with envy to plot overthrow of the prophet Daniel; also of God's care in that prophet's behalf, and of overthrow of wicked ones

What scriptures were illustrated by these facts, of those who plotted against Daniel, of his deliverance and their overthrow? Psa. 37:12-15 are illustrated.

Do wicked persons still plot against the just? Yes, and do so to their own destruction, in the world to come, and sometimes in this world.

**Dan. 7** reads of Daniel's vision of 4 beasts, and interpretation of that vision in the 1st year of Belshazzar.

What relation of this vision of Daniel to the forgotten dream of Nebuchadnezzar recorded in, ch. 2? Both cover the period of 4 kingdoms of men, and end with the period of the kingdom Jehovah had decreed to establish and continue forever.

**Dan. 8** tells of a vision of Daniel, then of its interpretation,—all in the 3rd year of Belshazzar.

What of this vision and its interpretation? Indicates what is in chaps. 2, 7, except that in each of the former chapters the kingdom of Babylon is indicated and God's kingdom briefly described, while in the chapter now under consideration the kingdom of Babylon isn't explicitly mentioned and God's kingdom but slightly indicated.

Is this vision plainer than those in chaps. 2, 7? No. But interpretation of 3 of the beasts here mentioned is plainer because kingdoms indicated by 2 of those beasts are named. Besides, the last of those earthly kingdoms is so clearly indicated in this chapter that the reader of history of the Jewish people and the Roman empire will be impelled to conclude pagan. Rome must have been meant; then that the: Gospel power must have been indicated by the expression 'broken without hand'.

And what of the last beast in each of the former visions we considered? The vision concerning that beast is so interpreted in each former instance as to cover the period of papal or apostate Rome.

Does not the vision in the chapter before us cover the period of apostate Rome? Yes, by what is mentioned in v. 14.

What is meant by vs. 12-14? The taking away of the daily sacrifice of Jewish people, mentioned in chap. 11: 31, in connection with 'the abomination that maketh desolate'. When this was to be accomplished was indicated by the Savior in Mat. 24:15. Then, as recorded in Luke 21:20, the Savior stated Jerusalem would be 'compassed with armies' at that time. This impels us to conclude 'the daily sacrifice' was taken away when Jerusalem was destroyed by pagan. Romans in the year 70 of the Gospel age. Ever since then the Jewish 'sanctuary', the temple, has been polluted.

When will it be 'cleansed'? V. 14 indicates that it'll be in the year 2370.

Of what will that cleansing consist? The fatal 'transgression' of the Jewish nation was its rejection of Christ; and cleansing of that nation from that 'transgression' will consist of its acceptance of Christ (see Rom. 11:23-25 and 2 Cor. 3:15, 16).

What may we say of those who have for many years been naming the date for ending of the Gospel age? They 'do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'. With one accord they have overlooked v. 14 of the chapter before us. Besides, they have all shown they do not understand John's vision on the isle called Patmos. In that vision God's judgments against heathen, and against Jews even after they will have returned to Jerusalem, also God's judgments against the apostate church,—all these judgments are recorded by the apostle John in the order just mentioned, and must all be inflicted before the end can come. Therefore while the heathen flourish, while Jews remain scattered, and the apostate church (mystic Babylon) continues, the end of the Gospel age cannot come, except the Lord will shorten the time, as he did when Jerusalem was besieged by Romans.

What may we safely say of the 2nd, 7th and 8th chapters of this book taken together? Indicate the Babylonian empire should be succeeded by the Medo-Persian empire, and that should be succeeded by that Grecian. They also indicate the Grecian empire should be broken and divided into 4 parts; also that one of those parts should gain supremacy over the others and become a mighty and terrible power. Next we learn in days of this last power, consisting of 10 kings, the God of heaven would set up an 'everlasting kingdom.'

What is meant by 'everlasting kingdom'? Mat, 16: 18 and 2 Pet. 1:11 inform (see also Luke 16:9).

What may we learn by considering the command in v. 16 and what is recorded of obedience to that command? We may learn what was meant by the apostle Peter when he said 'no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation' (2 Pet. 1:20). V. 16 of the chapter before us shows Daniel was not left to decide by 'private interpretation' what was meant by the vision he had seen; but the angel Gabriel was commanded to make Daniel 'to understand the vision'. This indicates certainty of Divine revelation in the Bible.

Does secular history confirm what has just been stated in regard to kingdoms the visions recorded in this book indicated? It does; and Divine inspiration of the prophet Daniel should be thereby established, even in minds of the skeptical. The God of heaven was pleased to foretell destiny of certain ancient kingdoms then in existence, through Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel; but through Daniel he was pleased to foretell both the supremacy and destiny of certain kingdoms, likewise origin and destiny of others. By so doing Jehovah challenged attention of mankind to his own supremacy, as indicated in Isa. 22:28, and by fulfillment of what he foretold he proves his supremacy to all honest enough to examine secular history in connection with the Bible.

**Dan. 9** records that in the 1st year of the reign of Darius the Median 'over the realm of the Chaldeans' the prophet Daniel understood the period of Jewish captivity would be 70 years. Then we find record of Daniel's prayer, supplication and confession in behalf of himself and the Jewish nation. Next, that the angel Gabriel was sent to Daniel, and record of what that angel said.

What may we learn by the angel's message to Daniel? We learn definitely when the Messiah should appear and when he should 'make reconciliation for iniquity'.

What is meant by different periods here mentioned? Seventy-2 weeks were decreed to pass 'from going forth of the command to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah'. Two weeks, or 14 years of that time, had passed when the angel said to Daniel 'seventy weeks are determined upon thy people' (see vs. 24, 25). Then, after the walls of Jerusalem had been built 'in troublous times', 62 weeks should pass before the Messiah (Christ) should be 'cut off', or put to death. Then we read of destruction of Jerusalem by those designated as 'the people of the prince that shall come'. The Roman general who commanded forces that prevailed against Jerusalem in the year 70 was meant by 'the prince that shall come', for it was declared of his 'people' that they 'shall destroy the city and the sanctuary'.

What of the last verse of this chapter? In the midst of the week 'the daily sacrifice' ceased' according to this prophecy, and that means it was 3 ½ years after that war began which ended in destruction of Jerusalem, that 'the daily sacrifice' of Jewish worship ceased. Secular history confirms this (see Josephus, book 4, chap. 2).

How did 'the prince' whose 'people' destroyed Jerusalem 'confirm the covenant'? By fulfilling prophecy in waging war against Jerusalem at and during the time mentioned in prophecy.

When did Daniel receive dates just mentioned? V. 1 informs it was in the 1st year of 'Darius the son of Ahasuerus'.

Was that the same Darius mentioned in last verse of chap. 5 of this book? No. Darius here mentioned is the one of whom we read in Ezra 6, who reigned after king Cyrus, spoken of in Ezra 1:1-4 as the one who made the decree to rebuild Jerusalem.

What length of time was indicated by 'seventy weeks'? According to Ezek. 4:6 'each day' was intended 'for a year'. On this principle 70 weeks must have been intended to mean 490 years.

What should we say of chronology 'B.C. 538' marked on margin of many copies of the Bible, by which figures Gabriel's revelation to Daniel is declared to have been 538 years before Christ? Such chronology's erroneous, and the error in this instance has probably resulted from supposing the Darius under whom Babylon was overthrown was the Darius mentioned in this chapter. But the Darius in chap. 5:81 reigned before Cyrus, and the Darius mentioned in 1st of this chapter reigned after Cyrus.

**Dan. 10** is account of revelation made to Daniel in 3rd year of Cyrus king of Persia, in course of which account mention is made of effect the presence of the one through whom the revelation was made produced in Daniel and men with him.

What may we learn by v. 13? Mentions a conflict and help in conflict; which together pertained to work of angels in obedience to Jehovah. Moreover, as 'Michael' is spoken of as Daniel's 'prince', we are impelled to conclude 'the prince of the kingdom of Persia' in v. 13 was another angel. But he seems to have been a bad angel because he withstood an angel of God sent to Daniel. This indicates angels obedient to, God are not entirely free from conflict

with those that are disobedient; and implies God's angels, as well as Christians, are subject to trials in efforts to obey the Divine will. Such trials will continue 'til Satan will be bound 1,000 years, and at end of those years will be renewed for a brief period, after which Satan will be overthrown forever (see Rev, 20).

**Dan. 11** tells that the one who addressed Daniel had 'in the 1st year of Darius the Mede. . . stood to confirm and strengthen him'. Next, the one who address Daniel informed him '3 kings of Persia' should yet reign, that the last of the 3 should be the richest, and that 'by his strength through his riches' he should 'stir up all against the realm of Grecia'. Then we read of 'a mighty king' who should 'do according to his will' but whose kingdom should be 'broken' and divided into 'four' parts; but 'not to his posterity'. All this indicates Alexander the Great was meant by 'mighty king'. Then we find prophecies concerning kings and kingdoms the Sacred Text does not enable us to designate 'til we come to v. 31. By aid of Mat. 24:15 we learn this verse referred to the army of pagan Rome which should destroy Jerusalem. The last of this chapter tells of Jews and Christians, also of a very presumptuous king, and of 2 other kings who should come against him; then success of 'the king of the north' is mentioned, after which his end is declared.

And what may we say of the other kings referred to? As their exploits were not directly connected with the Sacred Text we can only become acquainted with them by studying secular history of the centuries in which those exploits were done.

Were such prophecies of value to Jews? They might have been of great value if they had been seriously considered by them.

What is their value to us? We may learn Jehovah placed before mankind a record of events then future, as constant challenge for them to consider his foreknowledge and believe in him as the only true God when convinced he foreknew what would occur among the prominent nations.

**Dan. 12** tells concerning 'a time of trouble', resurrection of the dead, salvation of the righteous and condemnation of the wicked. Also of time for 'knowledge' to be 'increased', and time 'accomplished to scatter power of the holy people'. Then, the answer given Daniel when he wished to know the end of those things he had seen. Latter part of this chapter sets forth statements concerning the righteous and the wicked, also concerning ending the 'daily sacrifice' of Jewish worship, and of periods which should follow; and that those should be blest who would wait and come to the 2nd of those periods. Chapter ends with assurance to Daniel he should 'rest' and stand in his 'lot' at the 'end of the days'.

What may we conclude in regard to 'the time of trouble' mentioned in v. 1? Mat. 24:21 indicates it referred to destruction of Jerusalem.

And what should we conclude in regard to increase of 'knowledge' mentioned in v. 47 The world-wide mission of Christ is first suggested. Then by reading of the period mentioned in vs. 6, 7, and reading Rev. 12:6, 14, in regard to length of such a period, we may conclude reference was made to something which would occur 1260 years from destruction of Jerusalem.

What was that something? Translation of the Bible into languages of the common people

is the most important religious event of that period.

And what of the, period of 1290 years indicated by v. 11? That period indicates when Wycliffe's Version of the entire Sacred Text was made.

And What of the 1335 days of v. 12? The period indicated by those days will, by counting from destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70, bring the mind very near the date when the art of printing was invented. The prophecy that 'knowledge shall be increased' has been more certainly fulfilled by translations of the Bible into languages of the common people of many nations, and by discovery of the art of printing, than by any other events of modern times.

What of the style of the book of Daniel? Grand continuance of grandeur of the Old Testament. The Bible reader may ask, Whoever wrote law like Moses wrote, or sang songs like David sang, or set forth prophecies like Isaiah did, or uttered Lamentations like those of Jeremiah, or saw visions like those Ezekiel saw, or recorded dreams such as Daniel recorded? Grandeur of style in the book of Daniel, as well as truth therein set forth, confirms the declaration that the Bible proclaims its Divine origin.

**HOSEA 1** shows the Lord's word to the prophet Hosea first commanded him to take a wife of a low class of characters, then stated the reason for such command. We learn next the Lord commanded Hosea in, regard to the name he should give each of the 3 children his wife bore him, and in connection with each name we find explanation thereof. Chapter ends with prophet ties concerning number of children of Israel, union of Judah and Israel, also mention of whence they should come:, and a reason

In course of what other prophet's period of writing did the Lord's word come to Hosea? V. 1 of Isaiah's prophecy indicates he an' Hosea wrote about same era.

What is one prominent difference of Isaiah's prophecies from those of Hosea? The former prophet's writings in regard to Jews were chiefly concerning the kingdom of Judah, while the latter wrote chiefly in regard to the kingdom of Israel.

What is meant by 'the blood of Jezreel' in v. 4? 1 Kings 21 informs concerning blood of an innocent man, Naboth, a Jezreelite. V. 23 informs of the Divine sentence against the house of a king named Ahab, whose wife caused Naboth's blood to be shed. Then we read that because Ahab humbled himself before the Lord the sentence against his family would not be executed in his day. But 2 Kings 10 informs when that sentence was executed. Then v. 31 of that chapter declares king Jehu, through whom it was executed, 'departed not from sins of Jereboam, who made Israel to sin'. Because of this Jehovah determined to inflict vengeance on the house of Jehu as well as that of Ahab. This reveals shedding innocent blood was terrible in God's sight, and should warn against murder, in all Bible lands, even in the Gospel age.

What of the name Hosea was commanded to give each of his children? In each instance intended to signify an important event. 'Jezreel' means 'seed of God' and was commanded to be given to the 1st of Hosea's children because Jehovah would avenge the blood of Jezreel

on the house of Jehu. 'Loruhamah' means 'not having obtained mercy', because Jehovah would cease to have mercy on the kingdom of Israel. 'Loammi' means 'not my people', because Jehovah would reject the kingdom of Israel and scatter it among the heathen.

What was meant by 'for great shall be the day of Jezreel'? That great should be the day when prophecy involved in naming Hosea's 1st child should be fulfilled.

Anything appropriate in the command given Hosea to take a wife from a corrupt class of persons? Yes, it was appropriate because of corrupt condition of Israel as a nation.

What is meant by v. 10? Rom. 9:25-27 informs the verse we now consider referred to spiritual Israel, intended to consist of Christians among Jews and Gentiles.

What does v. 11 mean? That after return of Israel and Judah from captivity they should be no more separated into 2 kingdoms, but should be united (see also Ezek. 37:15-22).

**Hos. 2** tells command was given that certain ones named 'Ammi' (meaning 'my people') and 'Ruhamah' (meaning 'having obtained mercy') plead with their mother to return from her whoredoms in order to avoid vengeance of her husband. Mention of what that vengeance should consist, and what the harlot mother's misconduct was, then further statement of what vengeance on her should be. In connection with the declarations of vengeance was Divine command in regard to wrong use of a name. After this is account of God's purpose in regard to his people, to make 'a covenant for them' and 'make them lie down safely'. Then promises intended to extend to Gentiles, even as indicated in v. 10 of the previous chapter.

What did the Lord intend by his words to Hosea in regard to a lewd woman? To illustrate evil character of the kingdom of Israel, a foreshadow his purposes in regard to that kingdom.

What may we learn by vs. 16, 17? 'Baal' means 'master', 'lord', 'possessor', and was name of the chief male deity of certain ancient nations. There was nothing evil in the name as such, yet, as it was applied to heathen idol, Jehovah declared it should not be applied to him by Israelites. He said they should not call him Baali, which means 'my lord' or 'my master'; but they should call him 'Ishi', which means 'my husband'. Jehovah even declared to Israel that he would make the name 'Baalim', plural of Baal, 'out of her mouth' (referring to Israel as to a woman).

How did the Lord constrain Jews to reject idolatry? By captivity into which he sent both houses of Israel.

And what may we learn by considering favorable words concerning Jews in last of this chapter? That after they would be cleansed from all disposition for idolatry Jehovah intended to develop from among them the Gospel church, which should be extended among Gentiles; then he would call those his people who had not been his people (see Rom. 9:25, 26).

**Hos. 3** tells of Hosea receiving command to love another woman—one 'beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress'—and that he bought her to 'abide' for him 'many days'.

What was intended by what Hosea was commanded to do? The Lord intended to illustrate his 'love toward the children of Israel', also that they should 'abide many days



without a king' or any other ruler of their own people, also without the required worship or desired channel of revelation from Jehovah.

To what period of Israel's history did v. 4 refer? The period covered by the captivity. To this conclusion we are impelled by what is declared in v. 5 concerning Israel's return and devotion to the Lord 'in the latter days'.

What of Hosea's marriage relations as set forth in this and previous chapters? Intended for object lessons to people of Israel, and should have served as warnings to them.

**Hos. 4** tells of 'a controversy' the Lord had 'with inhabitants of the land' because 'truth', 'mercy' and 'knowledge of God' were not in the land. Then we read arraignment of people of Israel in which they were charged with 'swearing, lying, stealing and committing adultery'. Next, of results of such crimes, and further arraignment of the people in which it was stated they were 'destroyed for lack of knowledge', and that because they had 'rejected knowledge' God would 'reject' them. The prophet was also instructed to write 'like people like priest' should be true of them. 'Ephraim is joined to his idols; let him alone', is here recorded of Israelites among whom the tribe of Ephraim was chief.

What of v. 7? In chaps. 10:1 and 13:6 we find more on the subject. These scriptures inform that in proportion as Israelites were prospered they felt exalted, built altars to worship idols and thereby sinned.

Does that disposition of mankind assert itself in the Gospel age? Yes; it is outworking of human nature even in the Gospel age. With few exceptions mankind show they cannot enjoy prosperity and remain humble. In proportion as they are prospered they generally feel exalted and forget God.

What is meant by the expression 'backsliding heifer' in v. 16? The Hebrew word here translated 'slideth back' means 'to be rebellious, stubborn', and is applied to mankind and to beastkind. Therefore this verse should be translated: 'For Israel is stubborn as a stubborn heifer', or 'Israel is rebellious as a rebellious heifer'. Jews worked their heifers, and those that became stubborn and refused to work were in this verse referred to; and rebellious Jews were likened to them. Many persons even, in the Gospel age show disposition of stubborn animals.

**Hos. 5** shows Hosea declared to the 'priests' and to the 'house of Israel' that Divine 'judgment' was toward them, and declared the reason. Then we read description of Ephraim as the chief tribe of Israel, also description of iniquity of Israelites as a nation, and find the declaration that Judah also should 'fall with them' We read likewise that the Lord had 'withdrawn himself from them', and find further declarations against Ephraim and Judah. Chapter ends with further description of Ephraimites, and the statement that in their affliction they would seek the Lord 'early'.

What was meant by latter part of v. 11? 'After' also means 'another, other, different', and should be translated by a word of such meaning in order to be in harmony with former part of this verse, also with the context. 'Ephraim was oppressed and broken in judgment because he obeyed another commandment', or a 'different commandment'. He walked after the commandment of men—is the idea the connection requires the translation to set forth.

What is meant by v. 13? That Ephraim did what many religious bodies still do. When he saw something was wrong with him he did not appeal to the right source for help, but went in the wrong direction. Thus it was, thus it is, thus it will be. Religious denominations discovered they lacked influence among mankind; and instead of endeavoring to secure influence by practicing godliness they resorted to musical instruments, church fairs, suppers and various other entertainments. But those things cannot give them influence for good, and therefore cannot heal them. On the contrary, such things develop a spirit of worldliness in the church which will result in evil continually.

**Hos. 6** is exhortation to 'return to the Lord', followed by statements in regard to results of returning to him. Next we find address to Ephraim the representative tribe of Israel, also an address to Judah.

What is meant by latter part of v. 4? That 'goodness' of the tribe of Ephraim and Israel generally was transient, and soon passed 'away'.  
Is 'goodness' of professed Christians sometimes like that of ancient Ephraim? It is. Many only show signs of goodness while favorably surrounded.

What is meant by v. 5? Illustrates what Jehovah said in Jer. 1:10—'see, I have this day set thee over, the nations and over the kingdoms'; and in the verse before us he said 'I hewed them by the prophets'. This does not mean any of the later prophets ever used a literal sword, but the meaning is expressed in the same verse: 'I have slain them by words of my mouth'. That is to say, when Jehovah's words were fulfilled then certain nations were established and others overthrown.

What of v. 6? Reveals Jehovah's desire for 'mercy' and 'knowledge of God' in his people. Does He still desire the same? He does.

What effect should this have on Christians? Should make them Bible readers.

**Hos. 7** is account of why the Lord did not heal Israel. In that account is description of iniquity of the tribe of Ephraim.

What is meant by v. 8? Rhetorical description of what Ephraim had done and what he was like. He 'mixed himself among the people'; that is, had gone among wrong doers. He was 'a cake not turned'; that is, he was soft on one side. Thus with multitudes of professed Christians. They mix themselves among wrong doers, and have a soft side for things wrong. They are very impressible in contact with error, but not readily impressed in contact with truth.

What is meant by v. 9? The tribe of Ephraim is spoken of as a man of bad habits growing old prematurely; but does not recognize it. Multitudes of such men are now living.

And what of v. 11? The tribe of Ephraim is likened to 'a silly dove without heart', in that Ephraimites were disposed to place confidence in their enemies. Jehovah declared he would spread his 'net' over them and bring them down. 'Woe' and 'destruction' were then pronounced against them.

**Hos. 8** shows Hosea was commanded to 'set the trumpet' to his 'mouth', then we learn what

the Lord intended he should proclaim to the kingdom of Israel; likewise that Jehovah's judgments against Israel as a nation, and specially against Ephraim as the chief tribe of that nation, would be terrible. Chapter ends with declaration against Judah, in addition to what is recorded against Israel.

What of v. 7? Sets forth a saying sometimes quot' ed by persons who may not be aware of its 1st application. But the doctrine here mentioned is often exemplified. Multitudes 'sow the wind' and 'reap the whirlwind'. Gal. 6:7 is here suggested, for that scripture declares 'whatever a man soweth that shall he also reap'.

What is indicated by v. 8? Captivity and condition of Israel among the heathen.

And what of v. 12? Sets forth what is common among mankind in the Gospel age. 'Great things' of God's law are 'counted as a strange thing' to them.

What of Hosea's style of writing? Highly rhetorical yet by reason of its short sentences is easily understood. Strength of this prophet's style suggests perfection of human speech, with Divine precision chosen.

**Hos. 9** indicates Hosea was instructed to command Israel not to 'rejoice' 'as other people', and reasons for such command were plainly stated. Then we find prophecy concerning Ephraim going into Egypt and eating in Assyria. Remainder of the chapter sets forth further description of Israel and Ephraim in wickedness, and additional prophecies concerning their future destruction. Chapter ends with declaration they should be 'wanderers among the nations'.

**Hos. 10** begins with rhetorical declaration that 'Israel is an empty vine', and ends with prophecy—'in the morning shall the king of Israel utterly be cut off'. Between such beginning and ending we find many striking descriptions of wickedness of Israel.

What is meant by 'Israel is an empty vine'? Meaning set forth in these words—'he bringeth forth fruit unto himself'. Then we read—'according to multitude of his fruit he hath increased altars; according to goodness of the land they have made goodly images'.

Do we find similar disposition by anyone in the Gospel dispensation? Yes, multitudes of professed Christians build fine meeting houses, put fine musical instruments in them, hire fine preachers, fine singers and players, and do all this in proportion to their wealth. Like Israel in days of Hosea, 'their heart is divided. And many that oppose human devices in religion make a big show for themselves in proportion as their wealth is increased.

What may we learn by v. 12? Mention in rhetorical sentences plan of safety for Israel.

What is meant by 'fallow ground'? Reference to ground plowed and not seeded at once, but left for time in a plowed condition in order to destroy noxious weeds and other objectionable growth.

**Hos. 11** mentions the Lord's love for Israelites in an early period of their history, even when they were in Egypt; then gives account of their backslidings, ignorance, and evils they should suffer. Chapter ends with favorable mention of Judah.

What may we learn by v. 6? That as with Ephraim in ancient Israel so it is now with many religious people. They follow 'their own counsels' and, as result, the 'sword' of division shall 'abide' on them and 'consume' them. Indicates safety of mankind is found in following counsel of the Lord.

**Hos. 12** describes Ephraim's iniquity, followed by unfavorable mention of Judah; then Jacob is spoken of as a person, his distinctive dispositions named and shown on several occasions, even his general disposition to be a dishonest 'merchant'.

What is suggested by v. 17? Emptiness of all error. Because error lacks foundation in fact, and will shift from one position to another in order to accomplish its ends, therefore it is likened unto 'wind'.

**Hos. 13** began with declarations concerning Ephraim as chief of the 10 tribes which made up the kingdom of Israel as separated from Judah. Then, of Israel as a nation, and declared it had 'destroyed' itself. Chapter ends with statements concerning desolation, which should come on Samaria, capital district of the kingdom of Israel.

What is meant by v. 1? That 'before honor is humility' (Prov. 15:33), and that those who humble themselves shall be exalted (see Luke 14:11).

What of v. 9? 'Destroyed' is here used in relative or modified sense, even as in other scriptures. Israelites were still living though 'destroyed'. They were living in their own land as a nation, but were 'destroyed' by Divine judgments which would be inflicted on them soon after expressed in prophecy. Use of 'destroyed' shows error of materialists in declaring the expression 'everlasting destruction' in 2 Thess. 1:9 means annihilation. Mankind can be 'destroyed' in every sense in which they can have existence, whether physically, mentally, morally, socially, politically, financially or religiously and not be destroyed in all these particulars at once.

What may we learn by v. 11? Refers to sin of Israelites in demanding a king, and indicates Divine displeasure when God gave them a king. Under protest God commanded Samuel to anoint Saul, son of Cis, to be king; but Saul conducted himself during most of his reign according to impulse, jealousy, passion; and the Lord gave him into the hands of his enemies. An index to Divine displeasure in the Gospel age when professed Christians demand what the Lord has not authorized, and thereby imply he has not given to his people all things that pertain to life and godliness.

**Hos. 14** is exhortation to Israel, calling on him to return to the Lord, followed by mention of his iniquity. Next are words appropriate for Israel when led to repentance. Then Divine promises to Israel, special mention of Ephraim, and mention of the 'wise', the 'prudent', the 'just', and 'transgressors'.

When did 'words' here suggested for Jews to rise really become appropriate for them? When they returned from captivity they were cleansed from idolatry; then those words were appropriate.

What may be justly said of prophecies of Hosea when considered together? Their general bearing was against Israel as consisting of the 10 tribes which revolted soon after Solomon's

death; and their special bearing was against the tribe of Ephraim as chief of those 10 tribes which constituted the kingdom of Israel from the time they revolted 'til their captivity. In course of this book Jehovah's love for Israel is mentioned. Exhortations, reasonings, warnings, yearnings, expressed in this book, are valuable contribution to perfection of God's volume of revelation of himself to man and of mankind to themselves.

**JOEL 1** begins by calling on 'inhabitants of the land' specially the 'old men', to tell their children, to the 3rd generation, that there should be dearth in the land, inflicted by insects which would devour fruits of the earth. Then 'drunkards' were commanded to 'weep' and 'howl' because a destroying 'nation' would 'come up on the land'. What that nation would do was then stated as if already done,, and people were commanded to 'lament like a virgin girded with sackcloth for the husband of her youth'. Next we find description of desolate condition to which the land would be brot because of Divine judgments. A 'fast' and 'solemn-assembly' were next commanded to be held in order to 'cry unto the Lord' because of desolate condition of the land. Chapter ends with mention of seed rotting under the clods, of suffering of cattle and sheep be cause they would not have pasture, likewise of rivers drying up and fire destroying 'pastures of the wilderness'.

**Joel 2** shows command to 'blow the trumpet in Zion', and mentions what blowing the trumpet indicated.

What was indicated by prophecies in this chapter? Overthrow of Jewish people, then their return from captivity, next their favorable condition between return to their own land and beginning of the Gospel age, and finally beginning and ending of the Gospel age.

Where do we find best explanation of latter part of this chapter? In Acts 2:16-21, when prophecy here recorded concerning the, Spirit of God was declared fulfilled, and by which fulfillment the Gospel age was introduced.

What is meant by vs. 30, 31? They refer to wonders the Lord will show in or near ending of the Gospel age (see Rev. 6:12-17).

What of the statement that 'in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance'? This does not mean 'deliverance' shall be in Rome, in London, in Augsburg, in Heidelberg, in Philadelphia, nor in any other place where man-made creeds have been formulated; but it means 'deliverance' was Divinely intended to be offered to mankind by the doctrine sent from Jerusalem, clearly stated in Isa. 2:3 'for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the law from Jerusalem'. Thus it is written, and therefore all mankind in Bible lands should look to the Gospel first preached in Jerusalem, Palestine, for deliverance from sins; and not to human creeds elsewhere arranged.

**Joel 3** shows the Lord declared he would 'bring again captivity of Judah and Jerusalem', and then judge 'all nations' because of what had been inflicted by, those nations on Jewish people. Mention then of some of those inflictions, and next a statement of what the Lord intended to do in behalf of the Jews.

Is the Lord's purpose in their behalf set forth in this chapter only once? Seems recorded twice, or his purpose is set forth in 2-fold bearing,—once in regard to what should occur soon after the return from captivity among Babylonians and Persians, and again in regard to when he will gather them from among all nations near end of the Gospel age.

What is meant by 'the valley of Jehoshaphat'? The word 'Jehoshaphat' means 'judged of God', therefore 'valley of Jehoshaphat' means what is spoken of as 'the valley of decision'. In other words, when God's sentence on all nations that mistreated his people began to be, inflicted, those nations were spoken of as being gathered in the 'valley of decision', which meant they were decided against, or 'judged of God'. Some of those decisions began to be inflicted before Jews returned from captivity beyond the river Euphrates, and have continued since then against all nations which have mistreated Jews. Then Rev. 8, 9 inform concerning special judgments which will be inflicted against the heathen. The command, 'Put in the sickle for the harvest is ripe, v. 13, refers to what will be, inflicted near close of the Gospel age (see Rev. 14:15, 18). V. 15 here, considered in light of Rev. 6: 12-14, likewise indicates what shall 'take place near end of the Gospel age. We may therefore have hope for Jews, for they are still 'beloved for the fathers' sake' (Rom. 11:28).

**AMOS 1** sets forth prophecies against Syrians, Philistines, Tyrians, Edomites and Ammonites.

What peculiarity of style here? This writer stated there were 3, even 4, offenses charged against each of the 5 nations on whom he pronounced Divine judgments.

When did Amos write? In course of the time Isaiah and Hosea wrote, as we learn by considering beginning of writings of each of those prophets.

What was chief offense of each nation pronounced against in this chapter? Mistreatment of Jews.

**Amos 2** reads of Divine judgments against Moabites, the kingdom of Judah, also against the kingdom of Israel. Special mention of offenses charged against each nation. The fact that Jehovah brought Israelites out of Egypt, and had driven out Amorites from before them, is mentioned, likewise iniquities Jews had committed in the land he gave them. Chapter ends with intimations concerning certainty of overthrow of Israel as a nation.

**Amos 3** is statement of choice God made of Israel from among other nations, and that he would therefore punish people of Israel for their iniquities. Then saw oral illustrations set forth in form of questions, followed by declarations of Divine decisions against Israel.

What is meant by last part of v. 6? Connection shows 'evil' in this verse refers to Divine judgments in punishment for sins. In that sense God still inflicts 'evil' on persons and nations.

What is meant by v. 12? A shepherd who would act thus would be very careful; so the Lord would be careful that inhabitants of Samaria should be taken and punished.

**Amos 4** records that people of Samaria were spoken of as cattle of Bashan; then were described as having disposition of cattle that were very selfish. Next, informed concerning Divine judgments against those who had acted like selfish cattle. Then, description of 2-fold life people of Samaria were living, followed by statements concerning Divine judgments they had suffered because they would not repent, and of severer judgment which would be brought on them later.

Are there religious persons in the Gospel age who live 2-fold life such as mentioned in, vs. 4, 5? There are many. They will go to the meeting house and 'transgress'; will even 'multiply transgression' by engaging in mixed or doubtful worship. Then they'll make even free-will offerings and endeavor to cover their doubtful worship by liberality in monied offerings. When censured for having humanisms in worship and work they sometimes refer to their liberality as evidence of their goodness, which they seem to think will substitute for lack of devotion to the Divine will.

**Amos 5** is lamentation. Divine judgments against Israel are mentioned, in connection with which are statements of iniquities of people of Israel, likewise exhortation to repentance in order that the Lord might have mercy on them. Chapter ends with prophecy that Israel should go into captivity.

What may we learn by v. 10? Gives evidence that disposition of wrong doers was same in ancient Israel that it is now: 'they hate him that rebuketh in the gate, and abhor him that speaketh uprightly'. The 'gate' of ancient cities was a public place in which good men often sat and told people who came in and went out concerning truth and error—what was right and what was wrong. Such good men were then hated and even abhorred by many wrong doers. Good men of that class are generally hated and abhorred now.

What may we learn by last part of this chapter beginning with v. 21? That Jehovah did not accept offerings of Jews when they did not act right toward each other. Even in the Jewish age personal uprightness was required as condition of acceptable worship.

In harmony with that requirement David wrote 'if I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear me' (Psa. 66:18). On the same principle the Savior said 'blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God' (Mat. 5:8).

**Amos 6** sets forth 'woe' pronounced against those 'at ease in Zion' V. 1 mentions that 'woe', and remainder of the chapter explains bearing of the 'woe'.

What should we say to those who declare 'woe' here pronounced against those who invent to themselves instruments of music, like David invented, does not apply to persons under the Gospel age? We should say even when instruments of music were in harmony with God's will they were not acceptable when used by persons not right in character. But as instruments of music were by Divine arrangement left out of worship in the Gospel age, those who introduce them in this age become wrong characters in so doing. Even show themselves wrong in mind and heart when they seriously think of introducing them. Their love for 'the simplicity in Christ' must be defective before they can seriously consider propriety of using a headless, heartless, voiceless, soulless arrangement in connection with

worshipping God 'in spirit and in truth; Amos 7 records concerning a plague of 'grasshoppers', also Amos' prayer on account of them, and the Lord's answer. Then in regard to a devouring 'fire', also the prophet's prayer on account of it and the Lord's answer. Next, a 'plumb-line' and its meaning. Next regarding what 'Amaziah, priest of Bethel', said to king Jeroboam concerning Amos, and said to Amos in regard to where he should prophesy. Amos' answer is in last part of this chapter.

What of Amaziah's disposition? Indicated his human nature when under influence of religious error. He did not consider whether the prophet's words were true or false, but simply proposed to get rid of him.

Is such outworking of human nature common in the Gospel age? Very common when persons are under influence of religious error. Errorists as a rule wish to get rid of the one who reproves them, regardless of truth and righteousness.

**Amos 8** declares the Lord showed him 'a basket of summer fruit', then explained its meaning was that 'the end' had come on Israel as a nation. Amos then declared concerning certain sins of Israel and what the Lord would inflict on account of those sins.

What is meant, by v. 9? Chap. 5:18 indicates. The day of Divine judgments would bring 'darkness', and those judgments would come at a time in Israel's history which would be like the sun going 'down at noon' Amos 9 sets forth the prophet in a vision beholding the Lord standing 'on the altar' and commanding him to 'smite the lintel of the door' in order that the posts might shake; also that the Lord declared what he'd do to people of Israel that they might not escape. Then, that people of Israel were to the Lord as people of certain other nations, and that he would punish but 'not utterly destroy them'. Chapter ends with prophecy of blessing the Lord would fulfill in regard to Israel after punishment he had threatened would be inflicted.

What was v. 11 intended to mean? Acts 15:16, 17 is index to the meaning. After stating through Amos what his judgments against Israel would be Jehovah unsealed that prophet's vision, enabling him to behold spiritual blessings which should be developed through remnant of Israel and Judah after return from captivity. Those blessings were summed up in Christ; and when he was enthroned at God's right hand as head over spiritual Israel, then the tabernacle of David would be raised up, though it had 'fallen'. It fell in fleshly Israel but was raised up in spiritual Israel with Christ as its head.

What of the last verse? Conditional promise, as far as it referred to fleshly Israel in the land of Palestine after the captivity; but will be fully verified when fleshly Israel becomes part of spiritual Israel in the Millennial age. True Israelites will then all be 'in the camp of the saints and the beloved city' even until 'the earth and the heaven' shall pass away (see Rev. 20

What should we say to those who think Jews have been finally rejected? We should say in the words of Paul—'they are beloved for their fathers' sake' (Rom. 11:28).

**OBADIAH** consists of a declaration of 'the vision of Obadiah' against Edomites, and incidental mention of heathen generally.



Why did the Lord decide to overthrow Edomites utterly and forever? This chapter reveals the Lord's decision was because of their wrong treatment of Israel and Judah in time of their calamity.

Did the Lord make promises in behalf of his people? In the last of this chapter we find promises in behalf of Jews.

What deceived Edomites? V. 3 declares their 'pride' deceived them.

Does 'pride' deceive any of mankind in the Gospel age? Pride is common weakness of multitudes.

Is it not also common for persons to cherish hatred, and rejoice when an enemy, or even a supposed enemy, is overtaken by affliction? Yes, that is another common weakness; outgrowth of pride, not of humility

How should we conduct ourselves when an enemy is afflicted? Prov. 24:17, 18 informs.

**JONAH 1** shows the prophet was commanded to go to Nineveh, 'that great city', and 'cry against it' because of its 'wickedness'. But he arose to go to a place called 'Tarshish' instead of obeying the Divine command. He entered a ship and started in direction of Tarshish but the Lord sent 'a great wind into the sea' which brought a tempest. As a result there was inquiry on the ship about cause of the tempest, and lots were cast to find the one on whose account the tempest was sent. The lot indicated Jonah as the guilty one, and he, was thrown into the sea, after which the sea ceased her raging. Chapter ends with statement that "the Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah", and that 'Jonah was in the belly of the fish 3 days and 3 nights'.

How were lots cast in ancient times? There doesn't seem to be a record of the method.

Did the Lord recognize the lot as an appeal to him? Prov. 16:33 indicates he did.

Is the lot right in the Gospel age? We are not informed it was ever used by Christ's disciples after the Holy Spirit descended on the day of Pentecost mentioned in Acts 2, and we should not adopt it.

**Jonah 2** informs concerning the prayer Jonah prayed in the midst of the fish that swallowed him; also that the Lord spoke to the fish and it vomited out Jonah on dry land.

What of v. 8? A beautiful and forceful declaration of truth. It is still true, 'they that observe lying vanities forsake their own mercy'.

And is it still true 'salvation is of the Lord', as Jonah declared in v. 9? Yes, that is a truth of universal application.

**Jonah 3** shows 'the word of the Lord came to Jonah the second time' commanding him to go to Nineveh and preach against it; likewise that Jonah went to Nineveh and declared 'yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown'. We learn also, people of Nineveh repented, from the king even to the humblest. Chapter ends with declaration that God 'saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of evil he said he would do to them; and did it not'.

What reference is made in the New Testament to the Ninevites? Luke 11:32 informs 'men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment' and condemn people who heard the Savior preach but did not repent. Reason given for such condemnation is that Ninevites repented under preaching of one not as great as the Savior.

What should we learn by that teaching? That man kind are accountable in Heaven's sight according to light they are permitted to enjoy.

What is meant by 'God repented' of what he threatened against Ninevites? He changed his sentence (see Jer. 18:1-10).

**Jonah 4** sets forth that he was 'displeased' when he found God had changed his sentence and was 'merciful' to the city of Nineveh. Then he asked the Lord to take his life, also that the Lord asked if he did 'well to be angry'. Next, Jonah's experience with hot weather and a gourd vine, through which Jehovah endeavored to show him it was right to spare Nineveh.

What of Jonah's disposition? He was a fair specimen of impulsive men. When he preached against a city and a people, he desired his preaching be fulfilled to the very letter.

But what was the Lord's disposition? He was disposed to show mercy when penitence was manifested.

What Old Testament sayings most clearly set forth difference between impulsive man and his Maker? 'For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts' These sayings in Isa. 15:8, 9 briefly state difference, in disposition between the merciful Creator and the impulsive creature.

**MICAH 1** shows Micah the Morasthite received a message from the Lord 'concerning Samaria and Jerusalem', to which the 'earth and all that therein is' were commanded to 'hearken'. Also the Lord's word thru Micah was that Jehovah would come 'forth out of his place' on account of 'transgression of Jacob'. Then account of what 'transgression' of Jacob was, and what were, 'high places of Judah', after which is record of Jehovah's purposes against Samaria in connection with intimation of evil against Jerusalem.

What difference between Jerusalem and Samaria as cities? Samaria was capital city of the 10 tribes that revolted soon after Solomon's reign ended, and called themselves 'the kingdom of Israel'; while Jerusalem was capital city of the kingdom of Judah, consisting of

2 tribes—Judah and Benjamin.

What is meant by 'for her wound is incurable' in v. 9? The Lord saw people of Israel would not repent, therefore he stated in close of the chapter 'they are gone into captivity'. He meant his sentence had already been passed on them and in the Divine purpose they had already gone into captivity, though in fact they were still in their own land.

What of the style of the prophet Micah? As rhetorical and impressive as any other prophet. The chief event in a series was chosen to suggest all other events connected with it. For instance, in beginning the last verse we read 'make thee bold and poll thee for thy delicate children'. As delicate children are most to be pitied in time of calamity, therefore the prophet was instructed to 'poll', or cut, the hair, and even to make baldness as in grief, over 'delicate children' who would suffer by captivity.

**Micah 2** gives 'woe' against those who dealt unjustly; then a 'parable' and 'doleful lamentation' against 'the house of Jacob'.

What was meant by v. 11? The false prophet, who would tell of pleasant things, was the kind of prophet the kingdom of Israel desired, and which the Lord would give to people of that kingdom. As they would not accept what Jehovah offered, therefore he proposed to give them, to their own destruction, what they desired.

**Micah 3** gives an address to chief men of the kingdom of Israel, addressed as 'heads of Jacob' and 'princes of the house of Israel'. In that address is rhetorical delineation of character of those chief men, followed by statement that the Lord would 'hide his face from them' because they 'behaved themselves ill in their doings'. Next, description and denunciation of false prophets who promised 'peace'. Chapter ends with definite and terrible sentence against Jerusalem.

What may we learn by v. 11? Of 3 prominent classes of men and their wrong doing; also of their religious pretensions and false confidence.

Have we a right to suppose those prominent men were dishonest? No. Prov. 14:12 and Jer. 17:9 explain their condition.

Is it possible for persons in the Gospel age to be so self-deceived as to think they are right when they're seriously wrong? Mat. 7:22, 23 informs there is self-deception in the Gospel age so complete it will hold its victims even beyond death.

In view of this what may we say of so-called 'bright testimony' persons who have not obeyed the Gospel sometimes give when they come to die? Such testimony is not conclusive. Micah 4 sets forth prophecy concerning dignity and blessing which should be in 'the house of the Lord' 'in the last days' and, as a result, should be to 'many nations'. Then, prophecy concerning gathering of certain Sues, and that the Lord shall 'reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth even forever'. Next, the prophet was turned to behold the kingdom of Israel in captivity in Babylon; also nations that would be enemies to the chief city of Israel, and their ignorance of the Lord's purposes concerning Israel. Chapter ends with prophecy of

supremacy and glory of the Lord's people.

To what period does first part of this chapter certainly refer? 'In the last days' in v. 1 refers to the Gospel age. Evident when we consider meaning of that expression as explained in Acts 2:17.

What was meant by vs. 1-37 Referred to the Gospel and its effect on all who would accept it in the Gospel age, likewise of its final effect in the Millennial age. Individuals and nations cease to learn war in proportion as they are brought under Gospel influence, and when, according to Rev. 11. 15, 'kingdoms of this world become kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ',—then carnal warfare will end.

**Micah 5** gives Jehovah's sentence of a 'siege' against Israel; and then is recorded prophecy concerning whence a 'ruler for Israel should 'come forth'. Next, we read of that 'ruler'. Prophecy against Assyria is then recorded, also certain prophecies concerning blessing and strength of descendants of Jacob among Gentile nations; likewise that Jacob's enemies should be 'cut off'. Chapter ends with account of Jehovah purifying Jews, then mentions 'vengeance' he decided to execute on heathen.

Who was meant by 'ruler of Israel' in v. 2? Mat. 2: 4-6 informs reference was to the Savior.

What was meant by v. 3? That the Lord would give up Jews until time for the Jewish nation to bring forth the Savior; and then all who obeyed him would become the Savior's 'brethren' and, later, others would 'return' to those of the children of Israel who entered the first church as established at Jerusalem. Further indicated in v. 4.

What is meant by vs. 5, 6? The hope God gave Israelites was intended to be their 'peace' when times captivity would come, and at all other times. Hos. 6: 5 was concerning Jews, yet it indicates words Jehovah pronounced through his 'prophets' would 'waste the land of Assyria with the sword', when those words should be fulfilled. Vs. 7, 8 are index in same direction. They teach that Israelites, spoken of as 'Jacob.' because they were Jacob's descendants, should be a blessing and a curse among Gentile nations whither they would be scattered.

Is it still true Jews bless and curse nations? Yes, they bless nations that treat them right, and curse nations that mistreat them. They are still beloved for the fathers' sake' (Rom. 11:28).

**Micah 6** shows the Lord mentions contention and 'controversy' he had with his people, and declared he would 'plead with Israel'. Next, what he meant by his 'controversy' and purpose to 'plead'. Ending of the chapter declares because people of Israel walked in 'counsels' of certain bad kings who ruled over them therefore Jehovah would make them a 'desolation', also a 'hissing', and they should 'bear reproach' of his people.

What of v. 8? Clear statement of Jehovah's desires concerning his people, and to all who have read with care a book titled 'Age of Reason' this verse has peculiar significance. That

book was written by an infidel who denounced the entire Bible but said he believed in 'one God and no other'. Yet when that infidel made a statement of his religion he quoted in substance this verse, thereby showing he was indebted to the Bible he denounced for a statement of the religion he professed.

**Micah 7** shows he used 'woe' concerning himself; then indicated he was lonesome because there was 'none upright' of people around him, but they were wicked, and 'the best of them' was 'as a briar'. He indicated a man could not trust his friend nor even the wife of his bosom. But he said he would 'look to the Lord', and told his enemy not to 'rejoice' against him for the Lord would be 'a light' to him. Chapter ends with declaration of 'marvelous things' God would do because he 'delighteth in mercy'.

What may be safely said of the book of Micah as a document? Highly rhetorical; but terse and vigorous in its rhetoric, rather than delicate or lofty. In v. 1 we learn it was written in days of Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, who reigned over Judah through much of the period when Isaiah wrote. Micah wrote concerning both Israel and Judah, but chiefly in regard to Israel. His prophecies concerning Christ and the Gospel age, likewise his intimations with reference to the Millennial age, make the book of special value to New Testament students.

**NAHUM** consists chiefly of prophecies against Nineveh, capital of the Assyrian empire. And in **chap. 1** are declarations concerning Divine jealousy and other Divine attributes. That it is vain to 'imagine against the Lord', was declared, after which is mention of the Lord's evil purposes concerning Nineveh, also his good purposes concerning Judah.

What consolation may we cherish by reason of v. 3? As Divine attributes are always the same, we may cherish consolation God still has 'his way in the whirlwind and in the storm. As a result Christians may pray to Him in full assurance that, if they pray aright, neither 'whirlwind' nor 'storm' can do them harm except according to the Divine will. Christians may enjoy similar consolation in regard to all other forces or powers.

**Nahum 2** is continuance of what was said to Judah in last of the preceding chapter. This is rhetorical description of destruction of Nineveh and distress that threatened destruction would cause.

What is meant by v. 12? In rhetorical style the lion is spoken of to illustrate history of Nineveh in devouring nations brought under Assyrian power. But next verse declares what the Lord would do to Nineveh's lions.

**Nahum 3** shows Nineveh was called 'the bloody city' and declared to be 'full of lies and robbery'. Next, is rhetorical description of what should befall that city because of iniquities therein, spoken of as 'the multitude of whoredoms of the well-favored harlot'. Then, Jehovah declared himself 'against' that city, also what he would do in its overthrow, and that all who looked on it would say 'Nineveh is laid waste'. Next, mention of 'No', a city of upper Egypt,

and its overthrow, as example of what should befall Nineveh. Remainder of the chapter continues the prophet's rhetorical description of destruction which should come on Nineveh because its 'wickedness' had 'passed continually' on other nations.

Was the city of Nineveh actually overthrown? Yes, and never rebuilt. God's word was fulfilled in its destruction, and its ruins indicate Divine inspiration of prophets that foretold its destruction.

**HABAKKUK 1** tells 'the burden Habakkuk the prophet did see'; and first part of this chapter is a kind of complaint because the Lord had not heard the prophet's 'cry' though he beheld violence, and on that account cried to the Lord. Then we read that attention was called to 'the heathen', and specially to the fact that the Lord would 'raise up Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation', which should come on the land of the Jews; then further description of that 'hasty nation'. Next we read of offense that nation would commit against Jehovah. Chapter ends with address to Jehovah, followed by description of workers of iniquity he suffered to live 'and flourish, with intimation that Divine forbearance would not be 'continually' extended.

What is indicated in v. 11? Mistake the Chaldean king Nebuchadnezzar would make 'after overthrowing Jews'.

Have other nations made the same mistakes? They have. Even nations that have not worshipped idols have sometimes ascribed their success to their own wisdom and power.

What may we say of individuals who regarded their success as due to themselves, and have not acknowledged God's providence in their behalf? They always offended God in so doing. He desires to be acknowledged as the One in whom mankind live, move and have their being; likewise that he is author of every good and perfect gift.

**Hab. 2** reveals the prophet declared he would 'watch' and 'see' what the Lord would 'say' to him, and what he should 'answer' when 'reproved' by the Lord. Then we read of 'the vision' given the prophet, and assurance that what it indicated would 'surely come'. Bearing of that vision against Nebuchadnezzar because of his pride is clearly indicated, in connection with which several woes were recorded. Latter part of this chapter mentions knowledge of the Lord becoming extended, followed by record of 'woe' against him who would give 'his neighbor drink' to make him 'drunken'. Then we read of 'the graven image' as an unprofitable something, and of 'woe' Jehovah pronounced against him who would say 'Awake' to dumb idol. Chapter ends with declaration 'the Lord is in his holy temple', and command that 'all the earth' should 'keep silence before him'.

What of v. 4? Declares 'the soul lifted up is not upright', and this is as true under the Gospel age as in the Jewish age.

What of v. 12? Should cause officials of every nation, state and municipal government, which receives revenue from the intoxicating drink traffic, to tremble! Should likewise cause every citizen to tremble who endorses receiving such revenue! Two men were walking on

a nice pavement paid for by saloon license. 'See', said one, 'what good pavements saloons give us'. 'Yes', said the other, 'but I am afraid we are walking on food and clothing of poor women and children'. That answer was correct, though not as emphatic as it might have been (see vs. 15, 16 of this chap.

**Hab. 3** records 'a prayer' in which the prophet expressed himself 'afraid' of account of the Lord's 'speech', and requested He would 'remember mercy'. Then mentioned whence Jehovah had 'come', and spoke of his 'glory' and 'praise', his 'brightness' and 'power', declaring certain of his forces and doings, also that, 'his ways are everlasting'. The prophet then gave account of what he had seen, of what the Lord had done in behalf of his people, and that even in most unfavorable circumstances he would 'rejoice in the Lord'.

What may we say of 'everlasting mountains' and 'perpetual hills' in v. 6? Those expressions are relative or limited, and not absolute or unlimited. Because 'hills' and 'mountains' will endure 'til end of time they are spoken of as 'perpetual' and 'everlasting'. Such expressions are therefore accommodative, even as 'sunrise' and 'sunset' are accommodative.

What may we learn by last of v. 9? Implies rivers did not make themselves but are Divine arrangement.

What may we say of the prophet's confidence in last of this chapter? Grand,, beautifully expressed and worthy of imitation.

**ZEPHANIAH 1** shows the Lord's word to the prophet was directed against the kingdom of Judah and its chief city, Jerusalem.

In days of what king of Judah did this prophet write? In days of Josiah, a good king.

Why did the Lord cause a prophet to write against Jews in days of a good king, one of the best they ever had? 2 Kings 23:26 and 24:3, 4 inform in regard to this. Show Josiah's grandfather Manasseh had shed innocent blood 'which the Lord would not pardon'.

What is meant by v. 12? That the Lord would cause diligent search in Jerusalem for a certain class of men, indicated by reference to 'candles' because candles were used for light when diligent search was made in a house for anything.

What may we learn by the last verse? Implies wealth would not deliver wrong doers 'in the day of the Lord's wrath'. Same will be true in the day of final judgment.

**Zeph. 2** shows prophecies against a certain nation, Philistines. Moabites and Ammonites were next pronounced against, also Assyrians, and their chief city Nineveh was spoken of as doomed to 'desolation'.

What was Jehovah's special charge against Moabites and Ammonites in vs. 8, 10? That

which they had done against Jews, was the chief charge. As then, so it is now, and will be 'til end of time. God does not allow anyone to add to his punishment of Jews, and all guilty of adding to it do so at their peril.

**Zeph. 3** shows the prophet's attention was again called to Jews, and he was instructed to pronounce against them. Then we find prophecies concerning return of Jews from captivity, of their joy by reason of their return,, and finally is account of glories of spiritual Israel which began to exist among Jewish people. Gathering of Jews from Babylonish captivity and their final gathering from their present scattered condition are both indicated in this chapter.

**HAGGAI 1** states that to the Jews, after return to their own land from captivity, the prophet Haggai was instructed to deliver a message for purpose of moving them to build the temple at Jerusalem. We find also the prophet's words had effect the Lord intended they should have, and that the people 'came and did work in the house of the Lord of hosts'.

Why was not the temple built soon after Jews returned to their own land? Ezra 4 informs 'adversaries' of Jews prevented after they commenced it. Then in v. 2 we learn the Jews said 'the time is not come, the time the Lord's house should be built'. As result of such conclusion they turned to their own affairs and neglected to defend their cause against 'adversaries'. But they were not prospered in their affairs because their indifference concerning the Lord's house was not well pleasing to Him.

What may Christians learn by this chapter? They ought to consider all indifference on their part toward the church for which the Savior died is certainly displeasing to the Lord.

But suppose those indifferent to interests of the church have good crops and good health,—do such blessings indicate the Lord is pleased with them? No. In the Gospel age the Lord endeavors by his 'goodness' to lead mankind to repentance; and not by afflictions (see Rom. 2:4).

**Hag. 2** records what the prophet was commanded to speak to the 'governor of Judah, and to Joshua the high priest, and to the residue of the people', in regard to difference between the former temple and the one they were then building; also that they should the strong 'and work', for the Lord would be with them. He then promised that though 'glory' of the house they were building was 'as nothing' compared with 'glory' of the former house, yet he said 'the desire of all nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory'. Jehovah also declared 'glory of this latter, house shall be greater than the former'. Then we find argument in regard to what was 'holy' being made 'unholy', and what was 'clean' being made 'unclean'. Chapter ends with encouraging address to the governor of Judah.

Who was meant by 'desire of all nations' in v. 7? Indicates it referred to Christ, and Divine history confines us to that indication.

And how was 'glory' of the latter house to be greater than that of the former? When the



Savior appeared in the temple (which Zerubbabel had commenced to build, its glory became greater than glory of the temple Solomon built but which was destroyed.

What is meant by references to 'holy flesh' becoming 'unholy', and result if one 'unclean' touched what was 'clean'? Meaning is in v. 14, for there we learn Jews, in their indifference with reference to the Lord's house, were as an unclean people, and all they touched was unclean.

What should Christians learn from this? That we ought to be holy.

**ZECHARIAH 1** gives revelation the Lord made thru Zechariah in regard to Jews after they returned from captivity and were in their own land. This revelation mentions the Lord's displeasure toward a former generation of Jews, and His affliction of them, also of what the Lord would do to Jews if they returned to him. Next we read the prophet's vision of 'horses' and its meaning, also his vision of 'horns' and 'carpenters', and its meaning.

What was meaning of the horses Zechariah saw? That the Lord's messengers, engaged in his secret service, reported people of the heathen world were quiet and had 'rest'.

What was meant by the speech the angel who talked with Zechariah made to the Lord? That the angel felt impatient concerning the Lord's delay in regard to rebuilding Jerusalem.

What was meant by the vision of 'horns' and 'carpenters'? 'Horns' represented those Gentiles who scattered Jews, while 'carpenters' represented those who would drive Gentiles away and re-establish the Jews.

**Zech. 2** tells the prophet beheld a man with a 'measuring line' who went 'to measure Jerusalem', and that to him it was said Jerusalem should be inhabited and the Lord would be her defense. Next, a call for Jews to come out of the land of the North and to come from Babylon. Then, of Divine care for Jews. Chapter ends with statements concerning the Lord dwelling in Zion, other nations being joined to Jews, also that the Lord would dwell in Judah and 'all flesh' should be 'silent' 'before the Lord'.

What may we conclude by v. 8? That Jews were very dear to God when their iniquity was purged and forgiven. That verse suggests Jer. 30:11; which declares while the Lord would not leave the Jew unpunished, yet he would not make an end of them.

What of v 11? In a measure fulfilled when the temple was rebuilt by help received from Gentiles (see Ezra 1:2-4 and 6:1:10). Also fulfilled in the Gospel age in spiritual sense. All nations are indebted to Jews for the Bible, because the Lord made them the channel through which he gave the Bible to mankind.

**Zech. 3** sets forth account of Zechariah's vision in regard to Joshua the high priest, and the angel of the Lord, and of Satan, what Satan was present to do, and what the angel said to him. Then, of Joshua's garments and what the angel commanded concerning them. Next, of

the charge the angel of the Lord gave to Joshua, and promises he made to him after giving that charge.

What was intended as meaning of the vision? concerning the high priest, his 'filthy garments', and his change of raiment? Meaning indicated by the words 'I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee' in v. 4. Joshua as high priest was the religious representative of the Jewish nation, and what was done to him represented what was done to that nation.

What is meant by 'Branch' in v. 8? Isa. 11:1 and Jer. 23:5 and 33:15 and Zech. 6:12 indicate 'Branch' referred to Christ.

And what is meant by 'the stone' in v. 9? The expression 'seven eyes', viewed in light of chap. 4:10 and Rom. 5:6, indicates 'the stone' referred to Christ. The Jews had returned from captivity, and the period was introduced which should not end 'til Christ would come as Savior of mankind.

**Zech. 4** informs concerning Zechariah's interview with 'the angel that talked' with him.

What was meaning of the vision of a 'candlestick' and 'two olive trees'? V. 6 plainly declared meaning of that vision was indication of 'the word of the Lord to Zerubbabel', governor of Judah for a time after the captivity. 'Candlestick' indicated light, and 'olive trees' indicated oil to keep the light burning.

What is meant by vs. 9, 10? As Zerubbabel had commenced to rebuild the temple he should finish it, and 'the eyes of the Lord which run to and fro through the whole earth' were watching in behalf of Zerubbabel. Therefore he could not fail.

What may we learn by the last of this chapter? Olive trees produced fruit which furnished oil to burn and give light, and 'two olive trees' were spoken of as being 'two anointed ones that stand by the Lord of the whole earth'. In Rev. 11:3, 4 they are spoken of as 'two witnesses' who should 'prophesy'. Taking these scriptures together we learn those 'two olive trees' were 2 Divine 'witnesses' who stood before the Lord. This is all we should venture to say now.

**Zech. 5** shows Zechariah saw a 'flying roll', also an 'ephah' or measure, and a 'talent of lead' spoken of as a 'woman', then 'two women' are mentioned, also what those 'two women' did with the ephah or measure.

What was meant by the 'flying roll' the prophet saw? V. 3 informs it meant 'the curse that goeth forth over the face of the whole earth', then the record explains for what classes 'the curse' was intended and what would result.

What was meant by the measure called 'an ephah', also by 'a talent of lead', and 'the woman' that was represented by the lead and sat 'in the midst of the ephah'? V. 6 explains 'this is wickedness'.

What was meaning of the 'two women' taking the ephah to 'the land of Shinar' to build a house there and set it on its 'own base'? All this set forth in an object lesson that 'wickedness' was taken from among Jews over to Babylon in the land of Shinar (Gen. 11: 1-9), and there it was to be set, on its 'own base'. It was from Babylonians and other heathen the Jews learned 'wicked'; but after they returned to their own land the Divine intention was that Jews should be free from it.

Did they ever return to wickedness? They did not return to that form of wickedness called 'idolatry'-certainly not as a nation.

What should Christians do with all 'wickedness' they have learned from mystic Babylon? Take it back and leave it on its 'own base'. In Ezek. 16 we find the nation of Israel likened to one woman that did wickedly, and in Ezek. 23 the 2 houses of Israel were likened to 2 women, both of whom did wickedly. So we can understand why the prophet Zechariah was required to see a vision of one woman, then of 2 women, —all of whom represented wickedness.

**Zech. 6** shows in regard to 'four chariots' he beheld and of their meaning. Next, with reference to Joshua the high priest, also, of a glorious personage named 'The Branch' who should 'build the temple of the Lord' and be 'a priest on his throne'.

What was meant by the 'four chariots'? V. 5 in forms they were 'the four spirits of the heavens which go forth from standing before the Lord of all the earth'. Every human government has its secret service force, and the Divine government has such a force. Gen. 18, 19 indicate the Lord sent 2 angels of his force to inquire in regard to Sodom, though in that instance the angels assumed the form of men.

What is meant by last of v. 8? Ezra 6 indicates the spirit of Darius the Median was stirred in favor of Jews and rebuilding the temple.

What of vs. 12, 13? Indicate double reference: 1st, to rebuilding the literal temple for fleshly Israel and, 2nd, was to establishing spiritual Israel. The last verse referred simply to the literal temple.

**Zech. 7** records that in the 4th year of Darius the Lord's word came to him and caused him to reason with Jews in regard to their manner of fasting and mourning during their 'seventy years' captivity. Then we learn the Lord's word to the prophet was that Jews should do right to one another. Chapter ends with reference to perverseness of Jews before the captivity, by reason of which they were 'scattered' among heathen.

**Zech. 8** records what the Lord said to Zechariah about his 'fury' with reference to Jerusalem, and that he would return 'unto Zion' and 'dwell in midst of Jerusalem', and it should be called 'a city of truth'. Then is record of favorable circumstances which should be in and around Jerusalem because of the Lord's favor and blessing. He even stated that 'as the Jews were 'a curse among the heathen' Pie would make them 'a blessing'. But Pie stated, through this

prophet, that they should do right to each other and keep clear of a 'false oath'. Then we find directions in regard to fasts Jews were to keep, and assurances of favorable conditions which would be theirs if they obeyed Him. Chapter ends with declaration of prophecy that Jews should be highly esteemed among nations of the earth.

**Zech. 9** gives prophecies against certain heathen cities, and prophecies in favor of Jews, including prophecy concerning coming of their King in a manner by which he might be known by all who would see him. Then we find Jerusalem should not be great any more through power of war; yet her King should 'speak peace to the heathen', and his dominion should be 'from sea even to sea, and from the river even to ends of the earth'. Next we find an address to 'prisoners of hope', and indication of what Jews should be against other nations because the Lord would 'defend them' against those nations.

To whom did the prophet refer in v. 9? Mat. 21:4, 5 show reference was to Christ at time of his entry into Jerusalem.

What was the sign by which Jews were to know Christ when he would enter Jerusalem? That he would ride on 'an ass and on a colt the foal of an ass'. Mat. 21:1-7 informs that the Savior rode 'them', and not simply one, of them. For the prophet to say He would 'come' riding only one beast would not be a sign, for hundreds probably entered Jerusalem every day, except the sabbath, each riding one beast. On many occasions thousands would thus enter Jerusalem in a day. Therefore for Zion's king thus to enter that city would not be a sign concerning him. But for a prophet to say Zion's king should come riding 'an ass and a colt', and then for Jesus to have both beasts brought, and for him to sit on one and have his feet over the other, would have proved a clear index to those who had read that prophecy.

To what period did the, last part of this chapter refer? To the period between end of Old Testament prophecy and beginning of the New Testament era.

**Zech. 10** tells that the Lord told his people to ask 'rain' of him and he, would answer with 'showers of rain'. Then we read description of 'vanity' of idols, and what the Lord had done by way of punishing 'shepherds' and 'goats' of the heathen, and that he'd visited Judah. Next, a statement of Judah's greatness and what the Lord would do to 'strengthen' him; also that Ephraim should be 'like a mighty man'. Chapter ends with statements in regard to Jehovah's judgments against certain heathen nations, and declarations of his favors to Jews.

To whom or what was reference made in v. 4? Connection indicates the prophet referred to the tribe of Judah.

What is implied by mention of Ephraim in v. 7? As Ephraim represented the 10 tribes which revolted in days of Rehoboam, Solomon's son, v. 7 implies those 10 tribes were not lost. All else Scripture says on this subject is to the same effect.

**Zech. 11** gives an address to Mount Lebanon in which that mountain was commanded to Open its doors that fire might devour its 'cedars'. Then the 'fir tree' was commanded to 'howl' because 'the cedar' had fallen. Next, 'oaks of Bashan' were commanded to 'howl' because 'the forest of the vintage' had 'come down'. Then is declaration in regard to 'howling of the shepherds' because their glory was spoiled; also declaration in regard to 'roaring of young lions' because pride of Jordan was spoiled. Revelation then by the prophet concerning 'the flock of the slaughter', the 'poor of the flock', 'two staves' or staffs (breaking of one), then sale of a personage for thirty pieces of silver' (and breaking of the 'other staff'). Chapter ends with revelation concerning 'a foolish shepherd, and the idol shepherd'.

What is meant by the address to a certain mountain and by what was said to certain trees in v. 17 For the mountain to open its doors that its trees might be destroyed could not, in view of later history of Jews, have referred to anything else than wars the Jews were destined to have, specially with Romans; and desolations which would follow. Further indicated by what was stated in regard to 'shepherds' and 'lions' in v. 3; also by record of 'the flock of the slaughter'. The prophet foresaw the Jews would reject Christ, then He would reject that nation. History of destruction of Jerusalem, by Flavius Josephus, will assist the student to understand the first of this chapter. But if we read v. 6 in light of Mat. 23:37, 38 we shall secure clear idea of what was meant, without resort to secular history. Then if we read first part of v. 7 in light of Mat. 24:15-26, also Luke 21:20-24, we shall learn all we need to know on the subject. God's care for the 'poor of the flock', as it consisted of Jewish Christians, was clearly set forth.

What was meant by the 'two staffs' in this chapter? One, was named 'Beauty' and meant 'covenant'; the other was named 'Bands' and meant 'brotherhood'. Cutting in pieces of the staff named 'Beauty' means breaking of God's covenant 'with all the, people'; and cutting in pieces of the staff named 'Bands' means breaking of 'the brotherhood between Judah and Israel'. Then we find between breaking of the 2 staffs sale of someone for 'thirty pieces of silver' was to be made. Then when we read Mat. 26:15, also 27:5-7, we find the mentioned sale referred to Christ. This being understood we are, by historic limitation, compelled to regard breaking of the 'covenant' with 'all the people' as having taken place when Christ uttered his lamentations over Jerusalem, in Mat. 23:37, 38. Then we are also compelled, by historic limitation, to regard breaking of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel, here recorded, to consist of release of the Jewish nation, consisting of 'Judah and Israel', from bondage to the Law. Finally, what was said about 'a foolish shepherd' and 'the idol shepherd' indicated rulers and teachers the rebellious Jews have had among them since destruction of Jerusalem, and perhaps had before Jerusalem was destroyed.

**Zech. 12** sets forth 'the burden of the word of the Lord'. In that 'burden' 3 great works of Jehovah were spoken of, then destruction of Jerusalem, also, 'scattering of the Jewish nation. Followed by prophecy concerning gathering together of Jews, and their mourning over' their rejection of one of whom it was said 'they have pierced'.

What was meant by the one 'whom they have pierced'? In John 19:37 we learn reference was to Christ.

When will the Lord pour out 'the spirit of grace and supplication' on inhabitants of

Jerusalem? When 'the veil' now on the Jews' heart shall be taken away (see 2 Cor. 3:14-16). This chapter therefore was intended to indicate something of history of the Jewish nation in the Gospel age.

What of v. 1? Mentions 3 manifestations of God's power and wisdom last of which is forming man's spirit within him.

What does this imply concerning man? That is 'spirit' is distinct formation within him, therefore is not inseparably connected with the body. In Gen. 2: 7 we learn 'the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul'. Then it was the Lord formed 'the spirit of man within him'; and when an infant lives to breathe 'the breath of life', then Jehovah, as 'the Father of spirits', 'forms the spirit' within that infant.

What effect should these scriptures and statements of truth have on materialists commonly spoken of as 'soul-sleepers'? Should be convincing.

But what effect do scriptures and statements of truth, however applicable they may be, really have on materialists when brought to bear against them? They only furnish occasions for them to sin more and more by indicating to them that they must turn from materialism, or adopt more fallacies in trying to break force of the truth that is against them; and they nearly always adopt the fallacies. Such is the power of error, generally, in regard to religion.

**Zech. 13** tells of what should be done 'in the house of David' 'for sin and for uncleanness'; also what should be done with reference to 'the prophets and the unclean spirit', likewise that true prophets should cease and false prophets should be punished. Next we read of 'one' who should say 'I was wounded in the house, of my friends', likewise of the Lord's 'shepherd' who should be smitten and his sheep 'scattered'. Chapter ends with prophecies in regard to proportion of mankind which should be rejected, also proportion which should be 'tried' and be the Lord's 'people'.

What New Testament scripture indicates meaning of this chapter? Mat. 16:31 and Mark 14:27 show v. 7 of this chapter referred to Christ. That verse may therefore be taken as a central thought, and the entire chapter then becomes clear. V. 1 refers to Christ's death for man's sins. V. 2 refers to rejection of idolatrous names among God's people, also to ending of the period of inspired prophets. Reference therein to 'the unclean spirit' refers to the Lord's restriction on the devil in regard to a certain kind of 'spirit' which would be manifest in certain persons for a period (see Mat. 10:1).

What was meant by connecting 'the prophets' with 'the unclean spirit' in v. 2? The fact that when the Lord would cause the special gift of prophecy to cease (1 Cor. 13:8), then he would take away the power of Satan to send his 'unclean' spirits into persons against their will. Mark 7:25 informs a certain woman's 'young daughter had an unclean spirit'. Indicates such spirits could enter persons who weren't wicked. But the Lord declared such spirits should cease to enter persons in the same day prophetic gifts should cease.

Does the scripture just considered indicate evil spirits should not enter persons even if

specially invited? It does not thus indicate, but leaves that question to be considered in light of other scriptures.

What is meant by vs. 8, 9? Means that in the Gospel age a third of the human family will be saved and 2 thirds lost. When we consider that near or about a third of mankind die in infancy and early childhood, it is evident only a few adults will be saved. This conclusion agrees with Mat. 7:13, 14, in which we learn only a 'few' will 'find' the narrow way 'which leadeth unto life'. The last verse seems to imply a third of those old enough to call on the Lord will be saved; but even that number will be comparative 'few' in view of the Divine provision in behalf of mankind. Of this we may rest assured: the Lord's mercy will save all his justice will suffer to be saved; and with this result all Christians will be satisfied.

**Zech. 14** informs of destruction of Jerusalem and scattering of those Jews who would survive; likewise the Lord's warfare against nations by which the threatened destruction should be accomplished, Next we read of 'living waters' which should go forth from Jerusalem; and that the Lord should 'be king over all the earth', also the time would come when Jerusalem 'shall be safely inhabited'. Then mention of 'the plague wherewith the Lord shall smite all the people' who will have 'fought against Jerusalem'. Chapter ends with account of final glory of Jerusalem.

To what destruction of Jerusalem does first of this chapter refer: the one suffered by the Babylonian army, or the one suffered by Romans? Must have been the latter destruction; because when Zechariah wrote the city of Jerusalem had been destroyed by Babylonians over 70 years.

What is meant by last of v. 2 which declared 'the residue of the people' should not be cut off from the city? Means they should die there while the others should 'go forth into captivity'.

What was referred to in vs. 3, 4? Divine decisions against pagan Rome and all other nations that would fight against Jews, which will be consummated when the Lord will convert the Jews by a miracle, and take unto himself 'his great power' (of which we fill account in Rev. 11:11-17).

What is meant by vs. 6, 7? Should be considered in light of all that follows, even to close of v. 11. The expression 'at evening time it shall be light' implies when 'the Lord shall be king over all the earth', indicated in Rom. 11:15-17, then natural arrangements of day and night will be modified. Finally, all night will be ended (see Rom. 21:25 and 22:5). In a spiritual sense the period of the fulness of the Gospel after miracles ceased has been fulfillment of what is here said about, 'light'.

What shall we say of those who spiritualize last of v. 7 and use it as justification of a name for a religious body ('Evening Lights') found in modern times and in certain religious literature? They 'do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'.

What is meant by vs. 12, 13? Chaps. 8, 9 of the last book in the, Bible inform somewhat on this subject, and chaps. 16, 17 of that book give further information.

And what of last of this chapter beginning with v. 16? Sets forth future glory of Jerusalem and Jewish people after the miracle and conversion of Jews mentioned in Rom. 11:13.

But will Jews when converted to Christ worship according to the Jewish law? They will keep 'the feast of the tabernacles', a national celebration (see Lev. 23:33-43), in commemoration of the journey from Egypt to Canaan. All nations have commemorative institutions, and as a rule they may be observed by Christians in all nations without compromise of character. On this principle Paul's conduct in Acts 21 may be explained. He had so much right to keep a Jewish feast, as a national event, as he had to circumcise Timothy (Acts 16:1-3) and thereby impose on Timothy a national mark. Christians in certain modern countries observe certain national memorials.

What of the book of Zechariah as a document? Begins with mention of the Lord's displeasure concerning Jews, on account of which he gave them into the hands of the heathen; and it continues with prophecies in regard to rebuilding the temple. Followed by indications concerning the Jewish nation until beginning of the Gospel age. Then we find indications concerning the 2nd destruction of Jerusalem and overthrow of nations which would fight against Jerusalem. The book ends with indications in regard to glories of Jerusalem and Jewish people after their conversion to Christ. All this in fulfillment of Jer. 30:11-24.

**MALACHI 1** introduces controversy between the Lord and Israelites.

What was the first subject of controversy which Malachi mentioned? God's 'love' for Israel.

And how did Jehovah endeavor to prove he had loved Israel? He mentioned his love for Jacob and hatred for Esau.

But for what reason did the Lord finally overthrow descendants of Esau, the Edomites? In Ezek. 35:3-15 we learn it was because of hatred Edomites cherished and executed against Israelites.

What was the next subject of controversy between the Lord and Israel? 'Honor' was next considered. The Lord charged 'priests' of Israel did not honor him, and 'despised' his name by offering 'polluted bread' on his altar; also that they even offered, the 'blind', 'lame' and 'sick' for sacrifice.

What was next subject in regard to which the Lord censured Jewish priests? He censured them because they would not 'shut the doors' nor 'kindle fire' except for pay.

What did the Lord say he would do? Said he would not accept an offering from such persons; then declared his name should be great among Gentiles. Followed by the statement that Jewish priests 'profaned' His name by saying 'the table of the Lord is polluted' and 'his meat contemptible'; also they had spoken of God's service as 'a weariness' and 'snuffed at it'.



This was followed by pronouncing of a 'curse' on 'the deceiver' who had 'in his flock a male' but sacrificed unto the Lord 'a corrupt thing'.

Do any persons in the Gospel age act as did Jewish priests of whom Malachi wrote? Multitudes act on the same principle. Keep best of their wealth for themselves, and give to the Lord's cause what they 'can spare without feeling it'. Very common for mankind to give best of their lives to Satan's service; but when they cannot longer enjoy sin then they think of turning to the Lord. In so doing they withhold from him that which is good, but offer to him that which is corrupt. In such misconduct they show they despise the Lord's honor.

**Mal. 2** records continuance of the Lord's controversy with Jewish priests, in course of which mention was made that Judah 'dealt treacherously' and 'abomination' was 'committed in Israel'. Then we read the Lord would 'cut off' both 'master and scholar' who: thus acted. Next, mention of 'tears' Jewish priests shed because the Lord would not regard 'the offerings any more'. The Lord then told why he wouldn't regard their offerings, and chapter ends with declaration that the Lord had been 'wearied' by Jews who said 'every one that doeth evil is good in sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, Where is the God of judgment'?

What did the Lord say he would do to priests if they would 'not hear' and 'lay it to heart' 'to give glory' to the name of the Lord? He would 'send a curse on them' and 'curse' their 'blessings'. Said he had 'cursed them already'. The Lord then mentioned his 'commandment' to priests and his 'covenant' with Levi; also that Levi's descendants 'walked' with the Lord 'in peace and equity', and indicated such conduct on the part of Levites was in harmony with the character a priest should have. Then the Lord said to the priests through Malachi—'but ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi'. To this he added—'therefore have I made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as you have not kept my ways but have been partial in the law'.

What classes of men are now like priests Malachi described in vs. 8, 9? Sectarian preachers have been 'partial in the law' of Christ and are becoming 'contemptible and base before all the people'.

Are there any who now shed 'tears with weeping and crying out' because of anything they cannot accomplish? Yes, many express themselves thus because they are not able to deceive people as formerly, thus not able to excite them as in former generations.

Do such teachers think they are trying to deceive people whom they address? No. They may be very sincere. But they are self-deceived. Because they've been 'partial' in studying 'the law' of Christ, they don't understand the Gospel.

Do any persons now speak of those as good who are really evil? Yes, all do so who give confidence to characters that are bad religiously or irreligious.

**Mal. 3** records prophecy concerning God's 'messenger', and of another personage designated

as 'the messenger of the covenant'. Then we find prophecy of what he should do, and what God would do, and why Jacob's sons were not consumed. Then we find controversy the Lord held with the whole Jewish nation because it had 'robbed' him in withholding tithes and offerings. Chapter ends with statements concerning those that 'feared the Lord', and record of certain promises concerning them.

Who were meant by the 'messenger' and 'the messenger of the covenant' in v. 1? In, Mat. 11:7-10 we learn 'my messenger' referred to John the Baptist. Then as the one who is designated as 'the messenger of the covenant' is declared to be 'the Lord', who should 'suddenly come to his temple', it is evident reference must have been to Christ. Therefore v. 1 was prophecy concerning John the Baptist and the Savior.

To what periods do vs. 2-4 refer? To the ministry of John the Baptist, also to Christ's personal ministry, and finally to fullness of the Gospel age, even to the period of conversion of the Jews.

What is meant by v. 6? Means Jews are 'beloved for the fathers' sake', and that 'gifts and callings of God are without repentance'; that is, are not to be recalled or changed (see Rom. 11:28,29). God will not repent of his promises to the Jews.

And what may we say of robbery God charged against Jews? It was true they 'robbed' God by withholding what was due him as their Creator, Preserver and Benefactor. It is likewise true of multitudes in the Gospel age that they 'rob God' by withholding money and service due him. All disobedient ones rob God of what is due him.

Are there persons now on earth whose 'words' are 'stout' against the Lord, yet who imagine they have not 'spoken' against him? Multitudes of them. All religious errorists belong to that class.

What may we say of last of this chapter beginning with v. 16? First mentions character and employment of those 'that feared the Lord' in the past, of those that fear Him in the present, and of those who will fear Him in the future. Then we learn concerning the Lord's estimate of such, and what he will do for them, and of results even to Jews.

**Mal. 4** tells of certain days of Divine judgments against the wicked, which were in future when Malachi wrote; also of Divine assurances to those who would 'fear' the name of the Lord. Next, an exhortation in regard to 'the law of Moses'. Finally we read of the 'Elijah' whom the Lord would send before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord'. We read also of what the promised 'Elijah' would do. Chapter ends with conditional threatening of 'a curse'.

What is meant by v. 1? The last chapter of the apostle Peter's 2nd letter informs, specially v. 10 of that chapter, which declares 'the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night: in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth 'also and the works therein shall be burned up'. The wicked who have their treasures wholly in this world shall, have neither 'root nor branch' left.

Who is meant by 'the Sun of Righteousness' in v. 2? Words of Zacharias in Luke 1:76,

77, and all historic limitations, show reference was to Christ (see also Eph. 5:14 and 2 Peter 1:19 and Rev. 2:28).

What is meant by v. 3? 1 Cor. 6:1 informs 'the saints shall judge the world', which they will do on the principle mentioned in Luke 11:31, 32. On the same principle Christ will give to those that over' come 'power over the nations' to 'rule them with a rod of iron', and the nations 'shall be broken to shivers' by the words these persons will obey who will finally overcome.

Who was meant by the 'Elijah' in v. 5? Mark 9: 11-13 shows John the Baptist was meant.

Was John really the Elijah of the Old Testament? John 1:21 informs he was not.

In what sense was he called Elijah? Luke 1:17 informs John the Baptist should go before Christ 'in the spirit and power of Elias'; and what is recorded in that verse shows it was fulfillment of the last 2 verses of the Old Testament.

What may we say of those who declare John the Baptist was the Elijah of the Old Testament brought back to this world? They 'do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'.

What may we say of those who use v. 1 in favor of the doctrine of 'annihilation' or blotting out of the wicked? They 'do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'.

And what may we say of all other religious errorists? They 'do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God'. Even those religious errorists who are not sincere would, if they knew the Scriptures and the power of God, certainly discard their insincerity and try to be upright and honest before the Lord.

And now, before we leave the Old Testament prophecies, what may we safely say of them? They were the most difficult division of the Old Testament when we began to consider them, but our efforts to understand them have been richly rewarded. They exhibit every variety of excellence in rhetorical style. Figures of speech of every description are found in Old Testament prophecies. From the boldest of the picturesque to the most delicate imagery the student of those prophecies is sometimes required to pass in a single chapter, paragraph or sentence. As a result the reverential student is impressed with the inquiry whether Jehovah did not intend to exhaust possibilities of human language, chosen with Divine precision, in making known his relation to mankind. Styles of speech in the prophetic books are varied and wondrous. But the reverent student is most of all impressed with varied and wondrous thoughts set forth in those books. As the reverent student reads and considers he is impelled to exclaim—The Bible Proclaims Its Divine Origin.

\* \* \* \* \*

And so Daniel Sommer ended his Questions, Answer and Remarks on the Old Testament. This makes twice they've run in The Review (1st about 1898). His QAR on the New Testament also appeared in The Review; and in book form about 1914. Only one edition was printed and quickly sold... His interpretations of Sacred Writ were arrived at after much reading of others' attempts and much deliberation and prayer. Many changes have occurred

in world affairs and religions conclusions since he wrote. But we estimate his Answers and Remarks stand up very well even now. At least they're a valuable contribution to 'our brotherhood' literature for the reason that they've caused thousands to think in other than sectarian 'orthodox' grooves. For those desirous of becoming acquainted with Jewish history between end of the Old Testament and beginning of the New, this author recommended reading books of Josephus, 11-17 (price, \$7.60).