

EPIPHANY STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURES

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

SERIES I

GOD

12,000 Edition

"Great and Marvelous are Thy Works, Lord God, the Almighty; Righteous and True are Thy Ways, King of the Ages. Who shall not Reverence, O Lord, and Glorify Thy Name? For Thou only art Holy; for all the Nations shall Come and Worship before thee; for Thy Righteous Acts were Manifested" (Rev. 15: 3, 4).

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

To the King of Kings and Lord of Lords

IN THE INTEREST OF

HIS CONSECRATED SAINTS,

WAITING FOR THE ADOPTION,

—AND OF—

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

"THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH;"

—AND OF—

THE GROANING CREATION, TRAVAILING AND WAITING FOR

THE MANIFESTATION OF THE SONS OF GOD,

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED.

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

Eph. 3: 4, 5, 9; 1: 8-10.

COPYRIGHT 1938

BY PAUL S. L. JOHNSON

THE AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

DURING the Parousia the Lord gave us a series of six volumes under the general title, *Studies in the Scriptures*. Its author had expected to complete the series with a seventh volume, but passed beyond the veil before writing it. After his death two others wrote a volume that they intended to take the place of the one originally planned; and it was published as the seventh volume of the series; but, to say the least, it had quite a different spirit from that of the six volumes mentioned above, and was published fraudulently as this author's posthumous work. Now in the Epiphany another series of books of at least ten volumes is projected, and since these books are devoted to Scripture study, to differentiate them from the first-named series, it is proposed to publish them under the general title, **EPIPHANY STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURES**. This volume is the first of the second series. The author does not believe that this series is worthy of a place of equality, much less of rivalry, with the six volumes of the first series. Neither does the Bible give them such a rank, nor will the future ever assign them such a rank; for, generally speaking, their subjects and contents will be found inferior to those of the former series, since the Parousia message, centering specifically in the Christ class, is on a higher plane than the Epiphany message, which centers specifically in the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. Accordingly, the selection of a serial name for these volumes mainly like that of the former series is not intended to mean either an equality or a rivalry between the two. They will be found, broadly speaking, to be related to each other in the sense that the first series is made to furnish a foundation for the second; for the author of the second owes an incalculable debt to the author of the first series, as his teacher, whose views are the foundation of the second series. Thus the inter-relation of the two series justifies a similar title, a title that in the second distinctly implies its inferiority to the first series.

The first volume of the second series is a treatise on

God. The poet, Alexander Pope, declared that the greatest study of mankind is man. The author ventures to dissent from this thought; for he believes that the greatest study of men, angels and saints, yea, of the Son of God Himself, is God. A high theme, therefore, is that of this volume. And for this study the words of the angel to Moses are surely in place: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground" (Ex. 3:5). Throughout the writing of this book the author felt his inequality to the task. Yea, it is doubtful if anyone, except God Himself, could do full justice to the subject. Accordingly, the author knows that he has not done, nor can do it. All that he can plead for undertaking the task is his love for God and His people, which has made him aspire to honor the glorious God of the Bible before His people by offering them this book to help them better to know and to appreciate, better to love and to worship Him as He is, in His existence and attributes of being and character, and that in contrast with false views of Him entertained by many. It is with this aspiration that the author sends forth this book, accompanied with the prayer that God through it may thus honor Himself and bless His people.

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

Philadelphia, Pa., U. S. A.
September 12, 1937.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

A UNIVERSAL BELIEF GROUNDED IN THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS CONSTITUTION OF MAN. CAUSE AND EFFECT. ORDER AND THE REIGN OF LAW IN THE UNIVERSE. DESIGN EVERYWHERE APPARENT. MAN'S MENTAL, MORAL AND RELIGIOUS NATURE. DEMONSTRATION FROM EXPERIENCE. IMPOSSIBILITY OF DISPROVING GOD'S EXISTENCE. A SCIENTIST'S GOD.7

CHAPTER II.

GOD'S ATTRIBUTES OF BEING.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN ATTRIBUTES OF BEING AND OF CHARACTER. PERSONALITY. CORPOREALITY. SPIRITUALITY. SELF-EXISTENCE. ETERNITY. SELF-SUFFICIENCY. IMMORTALITY. INFLUENCE OF THESE SEVEN ATTRIBUTES ON THE DEVOUTLY STUDIOUS. INVISIBILITY. UNITY. OMNIPOTENCE. OMNISCIENCE. OMNIPRESENCE. SUPREMACY. UNFATHOMABLENESS. THEIR LESSONS TO US. 27

CHAPTER III.

THE ELEMENTS AND THE HIGHER PRIMARY GRACES OF GOD'S CHARACTER.

RIGHTEOUS ATTITUDE TOWARD EVIL. HOLY AFFECTIONS. THE GRACES. STRENGTH. DOMINANCE OF HIS HIGHER PRIMARY GRACES. BALANCE. CRYSTALLIZATION. THREE CLASSES OF GRACES. THE HIGHER PRIMARY GRACES. WISDOM. JUSTICE. CHARITY. LOVE. POWER. THE FUNCTION OF GOD'S HIGHER PRIMARY GRACES. 67

CHAPTER IV.

THE LOWER PRIMARY GRACES OF GOD'S CHARACTER.

THE NATURE OF THE PRIMARY GRACES. GOD'S AND MAN'S LOWER AFFECTION—ORGANS—SELFISH AND SOCIAL. GOD'S SELF-ESTEEM. APPROBATIVENESS. RESTFULNESS. VITATIVENESS. SELF-DEFENSIVENESS. AGGRESSIVENESS. CAREFULNESS. SECRETIVENESS. PROVIDENCE. INTELLIGENCE. AGREEABLENESS. CONJUGALITY. FATHERLINESS. KINGLINESS. 141

CHAPTER V.
THE SECONDARY GRACES OF GOD'S CHARACTER

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY GRACES.
MODESTY. INDUSTRIOUSNESS. LONGSUFFERING. FORBEARANCE.
FORGIVENESS. COURAGE. CANDOR. LIBERALITY.203

CHAPTER VI.
THE TERTIARY GRACES OF GOD'S CHARACTER

THE NATURE AND NAMES OF THE TERTIARY GRACES. MEEKNESS.
ZEAL. MODERATION. MAGNANIMITY OR GOODNESS.
FAITHFULNESS.283

CHAPTER VII.
INFIDELISTIC FALSE VIEWS OF GOD.

ATHEISM. AN ATHEIST'S DIFFICULTIES WITH THE BIBLE.
MATERIALISM. AGNOSTICISM. PANTHEISM. DEISM.335

CHAPTER VIII.
PAGANISTIC FALSE VIEWS OF GOD.

POLYTHEISM. TRITHEISM OR TRINITARIANISM. THE FATHER
ALONE THE SUPREME GOD. THE SON NOT COEQUAL NOT
COETERNAL, NOT CONSUBSTANTIAL WITH THE FATHER. THE
HOLY SPIRIT.455

CHAPTER I.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

A UNIVERSAL BELIEF GROUNDED IN THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS CONSTITUTION OF MAN. CAUSE AND EFFECT. ORDER AND THE REIGN OF LAW IN THE UNIVERSE. DESIGN EVERYWHERE APPARENT. MAN'S MENTAL, MORAL AND RELIGIOUS NATURE. DEMONSTRATION FROM EXPERIENCE. IMPOSSIBILITY OF DISPROVING GOD'S EXISTENCE. A SCIENTIST'S GOD.

BELIEF in God's existence is practically universal. While a few individuals have appeared who deny God's existence, and while a few others claim to be in doubt as to His existence, *i.e.*, that they do not know whether there is a God; yet these are so comparatively few as to warrant our statement that practically the entire human family believes that there is a Supreme Being—God. There has never been a nation found that does not believe in a God. This is true of the most as well as of the least cultured of the nations of all ages. Thus the belief in a Supreme Being is practically universal. The belief in God's existence may, therefore, be accepted as grounded in human nature—in the constitution of man—the few exceptions being explainable on the ground of mental aberration—perversion or degeneration—as the Scriptures teach: "The *fool* hath said in his heart, There is no God" (Ps. 14: 1).

We have just said that belief in a God is grounded in human nature—in man's constitution. This we see from the teachings of Psychology and Phrenology. Psychology teaches that it is a part of the soul's powers to believe in, venerate, worship and desire fellowship with God, just as it is a part of the soul's powers to love one's fellows and to desire fellowship with them. Phrenology goes a step further, even locating

the brain organs by which faith in, veneration for, and desire for fellowship with, God are exercised. It locates the faculty through which religious faith is exercised as just beyond the top of that part of the forehead which is above the eyes; and it locates the brain organ through which love and veneration for, and desire for fellowship with, God are exercised as in the middle of the top of the head. When the head is large or has "bumps" in these places, normal people readily believe in and venerate God. Where the head is small or has "valleys" in these places, people find it hard to believe in and venerate God. The average atheist has "valleys" in his skull in these places. Hundreds of thousands of heads have been examined, and from such examinations the above conclusions have been drawn. These "bumps" by exercising faith, etc., are enlarged, but by non-exercise they cease to grow. If they are exercised more than the other brain faculties, the skull there becomes warmer than in other places, because the blood by such exercise is brought into more frequent and powerful contact—impingement—with that part of the skull. Cases are on record of certain persons who degenerated from an active and warm religious life into atheism and whose pertinent "bumps" not only grew cold, but even shrank. This has particularly been the case with those of mental temperaments who have degenerated from a warm, active, religious life into religious indifference and disbelief, other temperaments not showing such marked recession in these "bumps" on suffering a religious relapse, the reason being that their less active mentality caused less, and less powerful, impingements on these parts of the skull by the brain, and the lack of such impingements made less pronounced recessions in the pertinent parts of the skull.

These facts prove that man is constituted by his brain make-up to believe in, and venerate a Supreme Being. And from this we draw the conclusion that the

existence of God is a necessary demand of human nature, just as man's desire for food, water, property, the sublime, the beautiful, knowledge, companions, etc., imply the existence of these. Thus we infer God's existence from the constitution and qualities of man's brain and soul life. Those who deny God's existence (atheists) or those who say they do not know that there is a God (agnostics), cannot explain this constitution of the brain and its resultant moral and religious sense of obligation Godward, grounded as they are in man's nature. We repeat the thought, the existence of God is a necessary postulate of man's moral and religious constitution—it is grounded in human nature, for human nature is so made as to be adapted to moral and religious obligations Godward.

From another standpoint we prove God's existence—from that of cause and effect. It is of universal experience that every event has a cause; therefore we reason that every event must have its cause; for we are forced to reason thus from our experience; for undoubtedly our experience is that every event has been produced by some cause. Therefore, reasoning back from many events to as many causes, we finally reach first events, which imply a first cause; and as such it must be causeless; hence is eternal. This first cause we call God, or as the Scriptures put it: "He that built [made] all things is God" (Heb. 3: 4). Therefore the origins of things are events that must have had causes. Take, for example, the origin of trees: We ask ourselves, Whence did their origin come? We answer, From seeds or branches. Whence came the origin of these? From other trees. Whence came the origin of these? From other seeds or branches. Whence came these? From other trees, we answer. Finally, in our reasoning, we come to the first kind of every tree, and ask ourselves, Whence came the origin of these? The answer must be, From the first seeds. Now we ask, Whence came the origin of

the first seeds from which came the first trees? Thus there was a cause back of the origin of their firsts. Let us in turn take up the origin of bushes, vegetables, grass—the rest of the vegetable kingdom, and our reasoning brings us to the origin of the first seeds from which came the first bushes, vegetables and grass. Whence came the origin of those seeds? If we take up creatures endowed with powers of locomotion: insects, fish, amphibians, fowl, reptiles and beasts, and apply the same kind of reasoning, we finally come to the first example of each species and are confronted with the same question, Whence came the origin of the first of each species? So with the race of mankind. Thus, reasoning from effect to cause, we reach the origin of the firsts of all kinds, and thus a multiplicity of origins of firsts confronts us. Whence came they? They could not have made themselves; for that would imply their existence before they existed. Who or what then made them? Our reasoning drives us to the conclusion that there is a first cause that is the cause of the origin of all firsts. If it is the first cause, it cannot be the effect of any other cause. It, therefore, must have been causeless and therefore eternal. We call this first cause, *God*; but materialists would call it an unconscious, blind force—matter. Which of these two views is right from the standpoint of reason, must be deduced from other considerations than from those of cause and effect.

Some have sought to evade this argument by claiming an infinite succession of causes, and thus they seek to deny a first cause. But this is sophistry; for an infinite series of second causes does not agree with the idea of cause, and cause is just what reason here demands. Those who assume an infinite series as against a first cause, really reject cause in its ultimate analysis; for the idea of cause, like every other idea, implies a first; but an infinite succession of causes would rest upon no cause, which is an absurdity. Hence there

can be no infinite series of causes. There must be a first cause. Our reason forces us to this conclusion, as we contemplate the universe of things in their origins. And those who resort to the supposition of an infinite series have been forced by different paths to an original ground of existence, variously terming it: matter, mind, or force, accordingly as their theories find most convenient. Taken off guard, those who deny a first cause are forced to admit it, as can be seen from an experience of Henry Ward Beecher and Robert Ingersoll. Strange to say, America's most eloquent preacher and most eloquent agnostic were friends and exchanged visits with one another. On the occasion of a certain visit that Mr. Ingersoll paid Mr. Beecher, the former greatly admired a finely executed globe that was in the latter's study. After a careful examination and unstinted admiration of the technique displayed in the carefully drawn continents, oceans, etc., of the globe, Mr. Ingersoll asked, "Who made it?" Quickly perceiving his opportunity, Mr. Beecher answered, "Nobody; it made itself!" Divining the intent of the remark, the noted agnostic, biting his lip, remained silent, and, crestfallen, shortly thereafter left Mr. Beecher's home.

Above we said that we cannot by the argument of cause and effect absolutely infer that the first cause is a personal God. Cause and effect alone considered, it must be conceded that it might be blind force. But other considerations that reason gives us prove that the first cause is not blind force, but a personal being—God. We will consider these in turn, remarking here that the conjoined force of all these arguments proves by *reason* that there is a God. We ask, then, is this first cause blind force or an intelligent being—God? Let us see what the facts manifest in the universe have to say to reason in this regard.

The order that we observe throughout nature is one point that proves that the first cause is not blind force,

but is an intelligent being who uses the forces of nature as means of expressing His will in His chosen order or things. Looking up on a clear night to the heavens, we see the suns of innumerable planetary systems, each revolving about its sun with each planet revolving on its axis and encircling its orbit, just as the planets of our solar system revolve on their axes and encircle their orbits—and with all of these planetary systems revolving about a common center—Alcyone, of the Pleiades, according to the latest scientific deductions. And every so often every planetary system in its various bodies reaches the same place in relation to every planet of every other planetary system—the precessional cycle. In each planet there is an order of day and night, seasons, years, etc., dependent on the size of each planet's orbit, its sun and its distance from its sun, except in the cases of those planets that have canopies. For these planetary systems to observe such order, each in its relations to its own parts and to all other such systems, implies an intelligence in their cause such as blind force, of course, does not have. From this marvelous order in the universe as consisting of planetary systems all moving in orderly procession, we infer that the first cause is intelligent, hence is not blind force, though its uses for its order the operation of force.

But order is observed in minute things as well as in the large things of the universe. Every blade of grass, every shrub, every bush, every tree, every vegetable, every plant, every blossom, every fruit, every flower, every insect, every creeping thing, every fish, every reptile, every fowl, every beast and every man is an example of the reign of law—order, and thus testifies to an intelligent first cause. Law reigns in things physical as well as in things moral. This implies an intelligent first cause as a law giver. The laws of gravity, attraction, repulsion, adhesion, centripetal and centrifugal forces, light, heat, motion, color, sound, etc.,

working harmoniously, display their activities in upholding the orderly course of nature, which proves an intelligent first cause as law executor. Moreover these laws balance one another and make harmony in the universe, which proves the first cause to be intelligently and marvelously efficient. They also work along the lines of mathematical formulas with utmost precision and in such detail that the greatest human mathematicians are unable to work out all their problems. This implies reasoning powers in the intelligent first cause of unapproachable ability. Every science manifests the reign of law—order. Astronomy declares it, Chemistry exemplifies it, Botany illustrates it, Geology proves it, Zoology shows it and Physics demonstrates it. These declare by the order that they manifest that the first cause is an intelligent being; for it is utterly incomprehensible that blind force could have made the universe in its almost infinity of orderly arrangements, adjustments, movements, harmonies and workings.

Those who deny that the first cause in an intelligent being who has marvelously ordered the universe in its vastness as well as in its minuteness are compelled to ascribe to matter and force powers that only a personal being could exercise; for they claim that originally matter existed as nebula and was acted upon by gravity and heat—force—that these two things (gravity and heat) working on the nebula started other forces into activity, which after an almost infinite number of changes gradually but blindly evolved the universe, so full of the evidence of a wisdom higher than man's. Yea, they even say that these forces finally in man produced mind—produced that which these forces themselves do not have! Apart from the utter unreasonableness of such views (for in ultimate analysis they mean that blind force working on matter produced the almost infinite marvels of intelligence that the universe displays), this view is forced to assume that the nebula was so arranged as to call gravity and

heat into activity, *i.e.*, that there was order in the nebula. Whence came that order which of itself already betrays intelligence? This the materialist cannot answer; for he has reached the rock bottom of materialism. Twist as he may, he is forced by his original premises to assume that which implies order—law, and at the same time to attribute powers to matter that are personal, since they imply intelligence and volition. Reason refuses to accept such a proposition, and finds it a thousand fold more logical to accept the only other alternative—that the first cause is an intelligent being, yea, of such great intelligence as can be equaled by no other known intelligence, because no other known intelligence could have produced the almost infinite marvels of order—law—in the universe. Reason thus forces us to believe that the order that everywhere prevails in the universe originated in the mind of a most extraordinarily intelligent being. Thus reason forces us to the conclusion that there is an intelligent Creator.

This conclusion is strengthened by the presence of design in the universe; for there are innumerable objects in nature that in their constitution betray design. There are things in nature that prove a prearranged fitness for certain future purposes. We are using the word *design* here in the sense of prearranged fitness for future purposes. These designs among other things are beneficent. If such designs exist in nature, they prove that they must have had a designer, *i.e.*, one who planned and made them for their intended ends. This would argue that the intelligent first cause in addition to having intelligence has wisdom, benevolence, volition and executiveness, and that of the highest order. Vast evidences of design are apparent (1) in inorganic nature, (2) in organic nature and (3) in the relations of inorganic nature and organic nature to one another. Notice, *e.g.*, design in the filtration of rain water through the soil. During this process the earth does not lose one particle of its nutritive matter needed

for vegetable growth—potash, silicic acid, ammonia, etc. On the contrary, the soil immediately absorbs more of these elements as they are contained in the rain, and thus increases its store of them for enlarged fertility. Furthermore, only such elements are entirely absorbed from the rain as are needed for vegetable growth. Thus the rain and the soil show adaptability to purpose—production of food for man and beast. Here is a *predestinated adaptability to realize a future purpose* in inorganic nature. Design is also manifest in the two gases, oxygen and hydrogen, combining in certain proportions to form water—so much needed for life. So, too, is design apparent in air, made by a combination of oxygen, nitrogen and argon—so much needed for life. In hundreds of ways design is manifest in light, heat and all other forces of nature—in their blending to preserve the universe and to make it habitable. What marvels of design are manifest in the rotation of the earth on its axis to produce day and night, with their purposes of growth, activity and rest, and in the circuit of its orbit in relation to the succession of seasons in themselves and variedly in the northern and southern hemispheres! Other facts of inorganic nature display design: Why is driftwood cast upon Greenland's shores—so much in need of it, and not upon England's and France's shores where it is not needed? Why have the planets nearest the sun no moons, while those further away, which need more light, have them? Why is iron, which is the most needed metal, the most abundant? Why do the trade winds frequently keep clouds away from certain parts of the earth where there is abundance of rain, and send them to yield rain in other parts that would otherwise be arid? Why do the warm ocean currents flow to the northern and southern portions of our sphere, while the cold ocean currents flow to the equatorial regions? In all these facts we see beneficent design. Thus, inorganic nature is replete with design, and this argues

an intelligent first cause of wisdom, benevolence, volition and executiveness.

If we look at organic nature, design everywhere confronts us. Why is it that the organs of the animal creation are all formed before there is any use for them? Is not this design—a predestinated fitness for future purposes? This is observed even in the vegetable kingdom. For instance, the leaf attached to the stamen of the lime blossom is useless until the pistil with the fruit breaks away from the bough, when its leafy wing carries it far away from the trunk on which it grew, to produce another growth. How came the eyes of fish to be constructed in harmony with the laws of light refracting in water? How came the palm of the hand and the sole of the foot to have thicker skin than the rest of the body? How came the structure of the hand to have such marvelous adaptability? How came the eye to have the fitness to light and accordant vision? How came the stomach and liver to be the most remarkable chemical laboratory on earth; the heart to exercise almost perpetual motion, as well as being a most marvelous pumping station; the blood to absorb oxygen for sustaining life, and to take up food elements and to distribute them throughout the body, and to replace depleted cells which it carries away; the kidneys to be the greatest filtration plant; the brain organs to think, perceive, remember, love, hate, etc., etc., etc.; the five senses to function for animal needs; the reproductive organs in male and female to be adapted to procreation and the bowels to be the greatest sewer system in existence? How? Do not all of these in their formation argue design—a prearranged fitness for certain future ends? Surely, design is manifest everywhere in organic nature.

So, too, is the presence of design manifest in the meeting ground between organic and inorganic nature. The lungs are adapted to the air and the air to the lungs; light is adapted to the eye and the eye to light;

the ear is adapted to sound and sound to the ear; scent is adapted to the nose and the nose to scent; taste is adapted to the tongue and the tongue to taste; and food to the stomach and the stomach to food. The sun, day and night, seasons, water and climate, are adapted to animal and vegetable life and animal and vegetable life to them—everywhere a predestinated fitness for future ends. Thus, design everywhere confronts us, and it everywhere argues a designer who worked on the principle of adaptation of means to ends and prepared them before the need of them set in. This proves an intelligent first cause who is wise, powerful, benevolent, volitional and beneficent in His executiveness! Thus cause and effect combined with order and design, prove that there is a wise, powerful, benevolent, volitional and beneficent God; while the constitution of man's brain mechanism necessitates—apart from perversion—his believing in and venerating God. These propositions are proven by reason, entirely apart from revelation. When rightly put, they have never been successfully assailed.

The existence of man's intellectual, moral and religious nature proves the existence of God. We find man capable of reasoning on deep and abstruse questions. We find him capable of inventing physical and mental objects. He is capable of acts of high morality, goodness and self-denial. He is endowed with the sense of obligation to right. He feels his dependence on a higher power. Therefore he is adapted to an intellectual, moral and religious life. These are facts of the inner life, and are as real as facts external to us. These facts cannot be denied, unless one denies the reality of human nature. Thus, we cannot deny the fact of the existence of the intellectual, moral and religious sense, and that man is actuated in his conduct by this threefold sense. These are facts at least as clear to him as external phenomena; for they are a part of himself—they are therefore as real as himself.

From the fact that man has intellectual powers, we conclude that the first cause who caused the first man also has intelligence; for He could not give what He did not have; for to make an intellect implies the possession of an intellect in the maker, on the Biblically announced principle, "He that made the eye, shall He not see?" Further, from the fact that man possesses moral and religious powers we infer that the maker of the first man must have moral and religious powers; for to make moral and religious powers implies their possession in their maker. Hence, man possessing mental, moral and religious faculties proves that the First Cause has them. Hence, we infer a wise, just and loving God as Creator, from the fact that man, a creature of His, has faculties for wisdom, justice and love. The existence of these powers in us implies from the standpoint of cause and effect that there is a God and that He is wise, just and loving.

We now present a sixth evidence of God's existence: the experience of those who come into harmony with Him—God's Spirit-begotten children. This argument is not conclusive to those who have not had this experience. To them at most it can have no more weight than what is grounded on the testimony of others. But to those who have this experience it is the most impressive and conclusive of all arguments on God's existence; for it brings one into direct touch with God as a being; not, it is true, by outward sense, but by the inner sense of the Spirit given them when begotten of the Spirit. They find by experience that at every step of faith in, and obedience toward God that they take, they have fulfilled to them His promises connected with that step. Thus, as they exercise repentance toward God, they find that He in harmony with His promise in such cases enables them to hate and to forsake sin and to love and to practice righteousness. As they exercise faith in Jesus as their Savior, they find the promised peace with God becoming

theirs. As they exercised obedience unto consecration, they received the promised begetting of the Spirit. That they received it is evidenced to them by their finding themselves to be in possession of new and enlarged powers—spiritual powers implanted in their hearts and minds, enabling them to understand and to appreciate spiritual things and to aspire to them as their life's ambition—things of which they were incapable before such begetting. They find that every faithful effort to grow in spiritual grace, knowledge and fruitfulness in service is rewarded by such growth. In exercising the privilege of prayer in harmony with the Divinely arranged conditions, they have the most mind and heart satisfying evidence of God's dealing with them in the answers that they receive to such prayers. In harmony with His promise, they find Him working all things for their good. So intimate does their union and communion with Him become that they learn to be one with Him by the contact with Him that they constantly experience and realize. In all life's affairs they clearly discern His activities toward them. So intimate does the relation become that they are constantly filled with the sense of His presence, favor and help. Thus they walk and talk with God and they live in Him. To them He is a living reality, as real as if He were visible. To them His constant dealing with them is the most impressive and conclusive evidence of His existence and of His main attributes—wisdom, power, justice and love. It is a misfortune to others that they do not have this experience—a misfortune due to their not having taken the steps necessary to its attainment; but their lack of experience in these things does not make unreal this experience, vouchsafed those who exercise the necessary repentance, faith and obedience; for to them the witness of the Spirit is the greatest and most conclusive proof of God's existence.

We now offer our seventh and final proof—a negative one—for God's existence: the impossibility of disproving His existence; for atheism is incapable of proof, for to prove atheism, one must himself be God—which would prove there is a God. The following considerations will prove this proposition: Before one can truly say that there is no God in the world, he must know and thoroughly understand every being, thing, principle, work, force, etc., past and present, in the universe; for if one of these should escape his knowledge and understanding, that one might be God; or to put it in other words, he himself must know everything—be omniscient. Before one can authoritatively say that there is no God, he must be everywhere in the universe, and that from all eternity to all eternity, and be cognizant of everything everywhere and at the same time; in other words, he must be omnipresent and eternal as well as omniscient. To be able to say conclusively that there is no God one must be omnipotent; for thus only could he be guaranteed as being proof against an omnipotent being who might desire to hide its existence from others by limiting the scope of his knowledge so as to make him never discover the former's existence. In order to declare absolutely that there is no God one must also be a spirit; for only spirits can see spirits; and since those who are not spirits are sure that they have not seen a spirit being, which God is, they can never with certainty affirm that there is no God. Thus to be able to prove that there is no God, one must himself be an eternal, omniscient, omnipresent and omnipotent spirit being, *i.e.*, must be himself God, and thus after all there would be one. Thus, it is impossible to disprove God's existence. Atheism, therefore, is incapable of proof; while theism—that there is a God who is separate from the universe and who created and sustains it—as our seven points show, is a proven thing. Truly, reason itself, apart from revelation, shows that the Bible is right in

at least two of its pertinent statements: "The *fool* hath said in his heart, There is no God" (Ps. 14: 1); and "The fear [reverence] of the Lord is the beginning [foundation] of knowledge" (Prov. 1: 7).

After finishing the above there came to our attention a pertinent interview on "A Scientist's God" in the Oct. 24, 1925, Collier's—The National Weekly—by Dr. Millikan, who is one of the greatest living scientists—one of the few scientists who have been awarded the Noble Prize for outstanding scientific work. We take pleasure in quoting a large part of his interview:

"I cannot explain why I am alive rather than dead. Physiologists can tell me a great deal about the mechanical and the chemical processes of my body, but they cannot say why I am alive. But would it not be utterly absurd for me to deny I am alive? Our scientific knowledge compared with what we knew a hundred years ago is very great, but compared with what there is to be known it is trivial. The map of the earth used to have on it many great, blank spaces marked "unexplored." Now there are very few of them. The map of science is still a great blank sheet with only here and there a dot to show what has been charted, and the more we investigate the more we see how far we are from any real comprehension of it all and the clearer we see that in the very admission of our ignorance and finiteness we recognize the existence of a Something, a Power, a Being in whom and because of whom we live and move and have our being—a Creator by whatever name we may call Him. I am not much concerned as to whether I agree precisely with you in my conception of that Creator or not, for "Canst thou by searching find out God?" Both your conception and mine must in the nature of the case be vague and indefinite.

"Least of all am I disposed to quarrel with the man who spiritualizes nature and says that God is to him the soul of the universe, for spirit, personality and all

these abstract conceptions which go with it, like love, duty and beauty, exist for you and for me just as much as do iron, wood and water. They are in every way as real for us as are the physical things which we handle. No man, therefore, can picture nature as devoid of these attributes which are a part of your experience and mine, and which you and I know are in nature. If you, then, in your conception identify God with nature, you must perforce attribute to Him consciousness and personality or, better, super consciousness and super personality. You cannot possibly synthesize nature and leave out its most outstanding attributes. Nor can you get these potentialities out of nature, no matter how far back you go in time. In other words, materialism, as commonly understood, is an altogether absurd and an utterly irrational philosophy, and is indeed so regarded by most thoughtful men.

"Without attempting, then, to go farther in defining what in the nature of the case is undefinable, let me reassert my conviction that although you may not believe in some particular conception of God which I may try to give expression to, and although it is unquestionably true that many of our conceptions are sometimes childishly anthropomorphic, everyone who is sufficiently in possession of his faculties to recognize his own inability to comprehend the problem of existence bows his head in the presence of the Nature, if you will—the God, I prefer to say—who is behind it all and whose attributes are partially revealed to us in it all, so that it pains me as much as it did Kelvin 'to hear crudely atheistic views expressed by men who have never known the deeper side of existence.' Let me, then, henceforth use the word God to describe that which is behind the mystery of existence and that which gives meaning to it. I think you will not misunderstand me, then, when I say that I have never known a thinking man who did not believe in God.

"How little we know about the ultimate nature of things is strikingly shown by the changes in our conceptions which have come about within the past thirty years. When I started my graduate work in 1893 we were very sure that the physical foundations of the world were built with some seventy unchangeable, indestructible elements. Also we made a sharp distinction between matter-physics and ether-physics. We believed in the conservation of energy, the conservation of mass, and the conservation of momentum, and we knew exactly how, with the aid of these principles, the universe managed to keep going. But we are much less certain about this now than we were then. In 1895 the X-ray came in as an absolutely new phenomenon and then came radio-activity, which has shown us that 'the elements' are not at all ultimate things, that atoms are continually undergoing change, and are not indestructible. It appears now that the electromagnetic laws no longer hold in the interaction of electrons within atoms. Einstein has concluded that mass and energy are interchangeable terms and we all now agree that the former distinctions between material, electrical and ethereal phenomena must be discarded. And so I am very chary about declaring that our present scientific conceptions and hypotheses are going to last forever, and I am a good deal more chary about making dogmatic denials or affirmations in the field of religion—a field which by general assent lies outside the region in which intellectual knowledge is possible.

"This much I can say with definiteness—namely, that there is no scientific basis for the denial of religion—nor is there in my judgment any excuse for a conflict between science and religion, for their fields are entirely different. Men who know very little of science and men who know very little of religion do indeed get to quarreling, and the onlookers imagine that there is a conflict between science and religion, whereas the conflict is only between two different species of ignorance.

The first important quarrel of this sort arose over the advancing by Copernicus of his theory that the earth, instead of being a flat plane and the center of the universe, was actually only one of a number of little planets, rotating once a day upon its axis and circling once a year about the sun. Copernicus was a priest—the canon of a cathedral—and he was primarily a religious rather than a scientific man. He knew that the foundations of real religion are not laid where scientific discoveries of any kind can disturb them. He was persecuted, not because he went against the teachings of religion but because under his theory man was not the center of the universe and this was most displeasing news to a number of egoists. ...

"We firmly believed for many years that the sun was merely a white-hot body gradually cooling off. Now we know that if it were merely that it would have cooled off long ago, and we are searching for the source of its continuous supply of heat and are inclined to the belief that it is due to some form of subatomic change. Our discoveries in this realm are as revolutionary as were those of Copernicus, but no one thinks of them as anti-religious. The impossibility of real science and real religion ever conflicting becomes evident when one examines the purpose of science and the purpose of religion. The purpose of science is to develop without prejudice or preconception of any kind, a knowledge of the facts, the laws and the processes of nature. The even more important task of religion, on the other hand, is to develop the consciences, the ideals and the aspirations of mankind.

"Many of our great scientists have actually been men of profound religious convictions and life. ... 'I believe that the more thoroughly science is studied the further does it take us from anything comparable to atheism.' And again: 'If you think strongly enough, you will be forced by science to the belief in God, which is the foundation of all religion. You will find

it not antagonistic but helpful to religion.' Take other great scientific leaders—Sir Isaac Newton, Michael Faraday, James Clerk-Maxwell, Louis Pasteur. All these men were not only religious men, but they were also faithful members of their communions. For the most important thing in the world is a belief in moral and spiritual values—a belief that there is a significance and a meaning to existence—a belief that we are going somewhere! These men could scarcely have been so great had they been lacking in this belief. ...

It is not beyond belief that we may some time be able to do in our laboratories what the sun is doing in its laboratory. Then it is conceivable that science could, if given the chance, transform this world within a generation. But to what end? Without the moral background of religion, without the spirit of service which is the essence of religion, our new powers will only be the means of our destruction.

There is a God—all Nature speaks,
Thro' earth, and air, and seas, and skies:
See! from the clouds His glory breaks,
When the first beams of morning rise.

The rising sun, serenely bright,
O'er the wide world's extended frame
Inscribes, in characters of light,
His mighty Maker's glorious name.

Ye curious minds, who roam abroad,
And trace creation's wonders o'er,
Confess the footsteps of your God,
And bow before Him, and adore.

There is an eye that never sleeps
Beneath the wing of night;
There is an ear that never shuts
When sink the beams of light.

There is an arm that never tires
When human strength gives way;
There is a love that never fails
When earthly loves decay.

O weary souls with cares oppressed,
Trust in His loving might
Whose eye is over all thy ways
Through all thy weary night;

Whose ear is open to thy cry;
Whose grace is full and free;
Whose comfort is forever nigh,
Whate'er thy sorrows be.

Draw near to Him in prayer and praise;
Rely on His sure word;
Acknowledge Him in all thy ways
Thy faithful, loving Lord.

CHAPTER II. GOD'S ATTRIBUTES OF BEING.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN ATTRIBUTES OF BEING AND OF CHARACTER. PERSONALITY. CORPOREALITY. SPIRITUALITY. SELF-EXISTENCE. ETERNITY. SELF-SUFFICIENCY. IMMORTALITY. INFLUENCE OF THESE SEVEN ATTRIBUTES ON THE DEVOUTLY STUDIOUS. INVISIBILITY. UNITY. OMNIPOTENCE. OMNISCIENCE. OMNIPRESENCE. SUPREMACY. UNFATHOMABLENESS. THEIR LESSONS TO US.

IN OUR first chapter we discussed the existence of God and showed from seven standpoints that there is a God. We mentioned, as implied in some of the proofs there presented, that God is a personal being, who has as His main heart characteristics the qualities of wisdom, power, justice and love. We made no attempt to give details on His attributes, apart from that of existence, which was our subject, because it is our thought to devote later several chapters to a discussion of His attributes. Usually His attributes are set forth from two standpoints—those of His being and those of His character. By His attributes of being are meant those of His qualities which inhere in His nature, like personality, spirituality, eternity, immortality, etc., while by His attributes of character are meant those of His qualities which inhere in His disposition, His heart and mind, like justice, love, mercy, faithfulness, etc. We now set forth in a series of chapters some of the salient features of His attributes: both of being and of character. In this chapter we will discuss His main attributes of being.

Naturally, the first attribute of God's being that strikes the mind of the average thoughtful man is that of God's personality. By personality we mean the quality of being by which one thinks, feels and wills; for personality lodges in the intellect, sensibilities and will. Anything without these does not have personality, and cannot be a person. God has the quality of personality which inheres in Him as a sentient being;

and He is a person. This quality of God's being immediately enables us to reject: Atheism, which denies God's existence altogether; Agnosticism, which doubts God's existence; Materialism, which denies personality to the first cause; and Pantheism, which confounds God with nature. While discussing the existence of God we proved from reason His personality. This was shown from the arguments drawn from order, design, man's intellectual, moral and religious constitution, our experience and the disproof of Atheism. God's intelligence, beneficence, justice and executiveness are manifest in such proofs of His existence, which therefore prove His personality.

The Scriptures are replete with proofs of God's personality; for they attribute to Him intellectuality, feeling and volition—the essential elements of personality. That He has knowledge is proven by passages like: Josh. 22: 22, "The Lord God of gods ... He *knoweth*"; Is. 44: 8, "Is there a God beside Me? Yea, there is no other God; I *know* not any"; Job 36: 4, "He is *perfect in knowledge*"; Ps. 44: 21, "He *knoweth* the secrets of the heart"; Matt. 6: 8, "Your Father *knoweth* what things ye have need of, before ye ask Him"; Luke 16: 15, "God *knoweth* your hearts"; Acts 15: 18, "*Known* unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world"; Rom. 8: 29, "Whom He did *foreknow*"; 2 Tim. 2: 19, "The Lord *knoweth* them that are His"; 1 John 3: 20, "God ... *knoweth* all things." That He has sensibilities is proven by passages like: Ps. 103: 13, "The Lord *pitieth* them that fear Him"; John 16: 27, "The Father Himself *loveth* you"; Ex. 34: 6, "The Lord God, *merciful* and *gracious*, *longsuffering* and *abundant in goodness*"; Heb. 11: 5, "He *pleased* God"; Ps. 30: 4, "Give thanks at the remembrance of His *holiness*"; Ex. 20: 5, "I ... and a *jealous* God"; Ps. 7: 9, "The *righteous* God trieth the heart and reins"; 1 Pet. 3: 20, "The *longsuffering* of God waited in the days of Noah"; John 3: 16, "God

so *loved* the world that He gave His only begotten Son"; Ps. 25: 6, "Remember, O Lord, Thy tender *mercies* and Thy *loving kindnesses*." That He exercises volition is evident from passages like Matt. 6: 10, "Thy *will* be done in earth"; Matt. 7: 21, "He that doeth the *will* of My Father"; Luke 22: 42, "Not My will, but *Thine* be done"; Acts 21: 14, "The *will* of the Lord be done"; Gal. 1: 4, "According to the will of God"; Eph. 1: 11, "All things after the counsel of His own *will*"; 1 Thes. 4: 3, "This is the *will* of God—your sanctification; 1 Cor. 12: 11, "Dividing to every man severally as He *will*"; Heb. 6: 17, "*Willing* more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel"; 2 Pet. 3: 9, "The Lord is ... not *willing* that any should perish."

Besides these and numerous other Scriptures which ascribe to God the essential elements of personality—intellectuality, sensibilities and will—there are numerous others that describe Him in terms of personality. Of these we will quote a few: "There is none other like unto the Lord our God" (Ex. 8: 10); "Who is like unto Thee, O Lord, among the gods? Who is like Thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" (Ex. 15: 11); "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me" (Ex. 20: 3; Deut. 5: 7); "Thou shalt worship no other god" (Ex. 34: 14); "The Lord, He is God; there is none else beside Him" (Deut. 4: 35); "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord" (Deut. 6: 4); "The Lord your God is God of gods and Lord of lords" (Deut. 10: 17); "There is none holy as the Lord" (1 Sam. 2: 2); "Prepare your hearts unto the Lord and serve Him" (1 Sam. 7: 3); "Him shall ye fear, and Him shall ye worship, and to Him shall ye do sacrifice" (2 Kings 17: 36); "Thou hast made heaven and earth" (2 Kings 19: 15); "To whom then will ye liken Me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One" (Is. 40: 25); "I am the First and I am the Last; and beside me there is no God" (Is. 44: 6); "There is

no God else beside Me, a just God and a Savior" (Is. 45: 21); "The Lord is the true God; He is the living God, and an everlasting King" (Jer. 10: 10); "I am the Lord, the God of all flesh; is there anything too hard for Me?" (Jer. 32: 27); "One is your Father, which is in heaven" (Matt. 23: 9); "This is life eternal that they might know Thee the only true God" (John 17: 3); "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" (Eph. 4: 6); "Who being the brightness of His glory, the express image of His person ... sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high."—Heb. 1: 3.

It is important from many standpoints for us to emphasize the personality of God, especially against the materialism of certain atheistical and agnostical so-called scientists and the pantheism of certain heathenizing philosophers, which would rob us of a personal God. Belief in, love for, and communion with a personal God are necessary for development of godlikeness. Rob us of a personal God and we are robbed of the Christian faith, hope, love, peace, joy, comfort, self-control, patience, longsuffering, forgiveness and every other Christlike characteristic. Give us a personal God of the characteristics of the Scriptural God, and we are given the power that, used, will create, develop and perfect Christian faith, hope, love, peace, joy, comfort, self-control, patience, longsuffering, forgiveness and every other element of Christlikeness. Sterile in these respects is the life of the denier of a personal God; fruitful in these respects is the life of a true worshiper of the God of the Bible—the personal Jehovah. Fundamental, therefore, for life and godliness is faith in a personal God. Therefore we have given the first place in God's attributes of being to His personality. Let us hold it at all odds as the prime essential of our religious life.

As the next attribute of God's being we would present that of corporeality. By this we mean that God

has a body. It is a great mistake to think of God as a great mind without a body. Neither reason nor Scripture gives us such a thought. It originated in the illusive abstractions and speculations of heathen philosophers, especially Greek philosophers, from whom it was borrowed and introduced into the creeds of the dark ages, and has become one of the means of stultifying and mystifying many of God's people in their reasonings on God's being. When we say that the Scriptures teach that God has more than a mind, that additionally He has a body, which implies His having an organism, we do not refer to those Scriptures that are undoubtedly anthropomorphic, *i.e.*, figuratively ascribe to God the form and parts of man. Rather we refer to statements that literally and definitely connect God with a body. When Jesus said that no man hath at any time seen God's "shape" (John 5: 37), He definitely implies that God has a body. The same thing is implied in God's statement that no man can see Him and live (Ex. 33: 20-23); for this Scripture implies that He can be seen by man, though only with fatal effects to such a beholder. If He can be seen, He must have more than a mind: He must have a body, which implies an organism. This fact is likewise implied in the statement, "God is a spirit" (John 4: 24); for St. Paul definitely tells us that spirit beings have bodies (1 Cor. 15: 44-49). All the Scriptures that speak of heaven as His abode imply the same thing (Ps. 73: 25; Matt. 5: 16, 45; 6: 9; etc., etc.). So, too, is this apparent from the Scripture (Heb. 1: 3) that tells us that Jesus now is the express image of the Father's person. These Scriptures undoubtedly imply that God has a body.

When we say that God has a body, we of course do not mean that it consists of matter; for such is not the substance of which His body consists. Nor, when we say that His body is an organism, do we mean that His body has all the same organs as ours. From the nature

of the case He would have no use for many of the organs that we have. Organs and parts adapted to food, respiration, wastes, blood, etc. (1 Cor. 15: 50), He, of course, does not have, because of His self-existence, these things implying dependence on external things for existence. Because literal Scriptures ascribe corresponding acts to Him, we may reasonably assume that He has organs adapted to sight, sound, smell, touch, work, locomotion; and doubtless He has some organs the like of which we do not have, though of what they consist and like what they are, we do not know, even as St. John assures us with respect to our Lord Jesus' body, which is exactly like God's (Heb. 1: 3): "It hath not yet appeared what we shall be; but when He [Jesus] shall appear we shall be like Him"; because our spiritual bodies will "be fashioned like unto His glorious body" (Phil. 3: 21). Our knowing so little about God's body, like our little knowledge of many other things respecting Him, is largely due on the one hand to His greatness, and, on the other hand, to our littleness; for our plane of being is so far beneath His that we cannot fully comprehend Him—the finite cannot fully grasp the Infinite.

The third attribute of God's being that we would consider is spirituality, *i.e.*, that God is a spirit. The Scriptures teach this by contrast with natural things (Acts 17: 29). Furthermore, they expressly assure us of this in so many words: "God is a spirit" (John 4: 24). And reason assents to the spirituality of the Being who created and preserves the universe and its creatures. God's mode of existence is not that of a being with a flesh and blood or any other kind of a material body; but His mode of existence is that of a spirit being with a spiritual body. When we speak of a spiritual body we mean one that consist of immaterial, spiritual substance or substances. There are material substances such as water, earth, iron, wood, etc., and there are spiritual substances such as vitality, fire,

light, heat, etc. When we say that God is a spirit we thereby deny that His body consists of material substances (1 Cor. 15: 50); and when we say that He is a spirit we affirm that His body consists of some spiritual substance (1 Cor. 15: 44-49). Seemingly, angels, who are spirits, have bodies that consist of fire (Heb. 1: 7, 14). Perhaps some of the higher orders of spirit beings, like cherubim and seraphim, have bodies that consist of other spiritual substances than fire. The Scriptures do not tell us of the exact nature of that substance of which God's body consists. This same remark applies to our Lord's present body and the bodies of the saints in the first resurrection.

The silence of the Scriptures on the nature of the substance of which God's body consists forbids our being positive on the subject, much more forbids our making a thought that we may have on the subject a doctrine of faith. Without in the least desiring to be understood as being dogmatic on this point, we might say that it would not be at all surprising, if it should turn out that God's body consists of life principle. Our reason for thinking this not unreasonable is the fact that the Bible teaches that God is immortal, *i.e.*, has "life in Himself" (John 5: 26). If His body consists of life principle, it would not like other bodies need life principle as another substance to animate it. He being incorruptible, there is no waste in His body, and of course no replenishment of life would be needed. Hence self-sustained life would be His, if His body consists of life principle. But since we know so little of the possibilities of spiritual substances, we would not be warranted in saying that immortality could not exist in another way than in having a body consisting of life principle. Perhaps it could, for all we know. On this subject, it must be humbly confessed: "We know in part," *i.e.*, our knowledge is piece-meal, partial. We must, therefore, recognize that the nature of the substance of which the Divine body consists is not

one of the revealed things. It is one of the secret things that God has kept to Himself. Hence we dare not be dogmatic on the subject. Nevertheless our uncertainty as to the exact kind of spiritual substance that makes up God's body does not make us uncertain that it does consist of some spiritual substance; for this fact flows from the fact that He is a spirit, which is taught in the Scriptures, notably in John 4: 24.

Self-existence is the next attribute of being in God that we desire to study. By God's self-existence we mean His independence from all beings, all conditions and all things for His being. It implies that He owes His existence to no one, that no one originated Him and that no one sustains Him. Nor does He owe His existence and continuance to any condition or thing. It is a part of His very nature to exist. In this He is totally different from any other being. All other beings have been dependent on some one else for their coming into existence. And even those of His creatures, like the saints, who have or yet will attain a condition of immortality, owe or will owe the conferring of this quality to God. All other beings have not only had to depend on Him for their coming into existence, but their continued existence as long as it will last depends on Him. Thus He is the only self-existent being in the universe. Reason recognizes this to be true when it demonstrates that He is the First Cause, and therefore causeless, self-existent.

But the Scriptures also teach this. God most solemnly announced His self-existence when He first revealed this characteristic, and that to Moses (Ex. 3: 14), by saying: "I AM THAT I AM; and He said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." Again Jehovah asserts this, in the words, "I lift up my hand to heaven, and say, I live forever" (Deut. 32: 40). His self-existence so far as man's righteousness or sin is concerned is stated clearly: "If thou sinnest, what doest thou against

Him? ... If thou be righteous, what givest thou Him? or what receiveth He of thy hand? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art; and thy righteousness may profit a son of man" (Job 35: 6-8). Jehovah asserts His self-existence when He says of Himself, "I am the first; and I am the last; and beside me there is no God" (Is. 44: 6). He is the first and the last in the sense that He is the only being who does not owe His existence to another. All others have depended on some one else for their coming into existence. He depended on no one else for existence; for He is self-existent. The expression, first and last, is equivalent to the expression, "the only one," *i.e.*, in the sense suggested by the connection in which it is used. Thus when Jesus uses of Himself this expression, "the first and the last" (Rev. 1: 11), He gives us the thought that He was *the only one* directly begotten by God. All others were indirectly made by God, *i.e.*, through Jesus (John 1: 3; Col. 1: 15-17). But the sense in which Jehovah is "the first and the last"—the only one—evidently is, among other things, that of self-existence. What a wonderful being He is by reason of His self-existence!

Closely related to His attribute of self-existence is another attribute of being in God—eternity. Some would have us think that there is no duration to eternity. They contrast it with time, as though it were timeless. Such a thought is distinctly unscriptural and is derived from heathen sources, especially from the heathen Greek philosophers, whose views were adopted and introduced into "the creeds of the dark ages." As the Scriptures teach it: Eternity is time without beginning and without ending. Thus duration is involved in the idea of eternity. Even reason is compelled to assent to the fact that time could have had no beginning and can have no end; for we cannot reason back to a time which was not preceded by time. If we reason back billions of years, we still can say that time

was before that. Again, if we reason back billions of years back of that, we still can say that time was before that; and thus we could go back an infinitude of billions of years, and still could say that there was time before that. Thus we are compelled to conclude that time had no beginning, that time has always been, *i.e.*, that there is a past to eternity. The same is true with reference to future time. It cannot end; it must go on forever. We cannot imagine a future time that will not have time after that time. Thus time is without beginning and without ending, always has been and always will be. This is eternity. Let us have done with the absurdity that eternity is a thing in which there is no time—no duration. There is, of course, a contrast between the transient and the eternal (2 Cor. 4: 18). But to contrast time and eternity, so as to make the former imply duration and the latter exclude it, is an unscriptural and an unreasonable thing—nonsense.

Both reason and Scripture teach that God is eternal—without beginning and without ending. That reason teaches this is evident from the fact that it teaches that God is the first cause, therefore causeless, and therefore eternal. Many are the testimonials of the Bible on this subject. A few of these we will quote: "The eternal God is thy refuge; and underneath are the everlasting arms" (Deut. 33: 27); "Neither can the number of His years be searched out" (Job 36: 26); "Blessed is the Lord God of Israel from everlasting to everlasting" (Ps. 41: 13); "Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations ... even from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God" (Ps. 90: 1, 2); "Thy throne is established of old; thou art from everlasting" (Ps. 93: 2); "Thy years shall have no end" (Ps. 102: 27); "The High and Lofty One that inhabiteth eternity" (Is. 57: 15); "He is the living God, and an everlasting King" (Jer. 10: 10); "Art Thou not from everlasting, O Lord my God?" (Hab. 1: 12); "The invisible things [attributes] of Him from the

creation of the world are clearly seen ... His eternal power and deity" (Rom. 1: 20); "Unto the King eternal ... the only God" (1 Tim. 1: 17, A. R. V.); "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come ... who liveth for ever and ever" (Rev. 4: 8, 9); "O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be" (Rev. 16: 5). Thus we see that the Scriptures teach that God is eternal—without beginning and without ending. It affords Him abundance of time for the display of His character and works throughout the universe. This is indeed a sublime characteristic in God as a being. It certainly calls for our appreciation, veneration, adoration and worship.

Somewhat related to God's self-existence is another attribute of His being—self-sufficiency. By God's self-sufficiency is meant His independence from every person, thing or condition, for His continued existence, happiness and well-being. God is dependent on nothing, but everything existing is dependent on Him for continued existence. He needs nothing to support His existence. He would have been happy and would have been in well-being, had He never created anyone or anything. He is thus in and of Himself sufficient for existence, happiness and well-being. His reason for bringing creation into existence was not His need of creation, but His desire to bless creatures. His pleasure in dispensing blessing, and not any need of others on His part was, therefore, His reason for His works of creation. St. Paul testifies to this feature of God's being: "Neither is He worshiped [served, prospered] with men's hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He giveth to all life and breath and all things" (Acts 17: 25). His independence from man is expressed in a passage already quoted which we will quote again because of its pertinency: "If thou sinnest, what doest thou against Him? ... If thou be righteous, what givest thou Him? or what receiveth He of thy hand? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as

thou art; and thy righteousness may profit a son of man" (Job 35: 6-8). These Scriptures prove God's independence from all persons, things and conditions. No person or combination of persons, no thing or combination of things, no condition or combination of conditions, can make Him dependent in any sense. He maintains His self-sufficiency with respect to all persons, things and conditions. Thus God is absolutely free from dependence. He is in the highest sense independent—He is self-sufficient. This does not make Him proud, haughty or overbearing; but it does give Him that freedom which is compatible with His nature, position and attributes, and leaves Him the freedom to do for others from favor and not from dependence, for their good and not for His personal gain, for their ennoblement and happiness and not from some need of His. This is, of course, what we should expect in a great God, and certainly draws out toward Him our devotion as we contemplate His greatness as displayed in His self-sufficiency.

An attribute of God's being somewhat related to His self-existence and self-sufficiency, is His immortality. Immortality is a death-proof condition—a condition in which death is impossible. It stands in contrast with mortality, which signifies a condition in which death is possible. Mortality does not mean a condition that must result in, death, but a condition in which one can die—a dieable condition. The fact that Adam died is surest proof that he was not immortal, but that he was mortal. But while mortal in His creation, he could have lived forever, which he would have done had he continued to eat of the life-preserving foods in Eden (Gen. 3: 22). So, too, Satan is mortal, because he is some day to die (Heb. 2: 14; Is. 27: 1; Gen. 3: 15; Rom. 16: 20). Hence we conclude that all angels are mortal. The restitution class, though having eternal life, will be mortal, as the human Jesus was. These considerations prove that mortal beings must not necessarily

die. As a matter of fact, only Divine beings are immortal (1 Tim. 6: 16). It is for this reason that the Church as heirs of the Divine nature (2 Pet. 1: 4) are promised immortality (1 Cor. 15: 53, 54). Jesus has given us a happy definition of immortality—"life in Himself" (John 5: 26). Life in one's self implies that one has a body that is dependent on nothing for sustenance, *i.e.*, a depository of an inexhaustible supply of life, which can live under any and every condition or under any and every combination of conditions, from which nothing can separate life and nothing can diminish life. God is the original depository of such a life, and promised it first of all to Jesus on condition of His faithfulness unto death (John 5: 26, 27); and has in Christ promised it to the overcoming Church (1 John 3: 1, 2; 1 Tim. 6: 16; Phil. 3: 2; 1 Cor. 15: 53, 54; Rom. 2: 7). But He has promised it to no one else.

That God is immortal several Scriptures prove. We will quote a few of these: "As the Father hath life in Himself" (John 5: 26); "Now to the King eternal, immortal ... the only God" (1 Tim. 1: 17). This means that God cannot die. We can die. It is rather easy to bring about the death of a human being. By drowning, choking, bleeding, crushing, striking, starving, burning, gassing, infecting, poisoning, etc—, death can be inflicted on man. But nothing can be done to God and nothing can be withheld from Him that could cause His death. He can without the least discomfort be in fire, under water, under the soil, outside of the atmosphere, in exploding TNT, in extreme cold, in a vacuum, or in any other condition. None of these things could diminish His life or separate it from His body. He is absolutely death-proof, and proof against the least diminution of life—He is immortal, has "life in Himself."

Thus far we have considered seven of God's attributes of being. The seven above discussed will surely help us better to understand what a wonderful and

great being God is. Their devout study greatly enhances our appreciation of Him, and leads us to venerate Him as worthy of the fullest adoration, praise and worship of our hearts. The greatness of these attributes of being are in varied details beyond our ability to grasp; but they all incite us to stand in reverence and awe before Him who is infinite and perfect in all His attributes. And the fact that this great Being condescends to offer to fellowship with us and to draw us to Him is the highest possible honor that could be conferred upon us, and surely should stir us up to reciprocate in the same spirit. "O come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord our Maker" (Ps. 95: 6); for it is comely so to do; and praise is fitting to the upright.

We continue our study on God's attributes of being with the discussion of God's invisibility, as an eighth quality of His being. Invisibility means sight-proof,—the quality by which it is impossible to be seen. When we say that God is invisible, we do not mean that He cannot be seen by any beings at all; for such a proposition would directly contradict the Scripture wherein Jesus says of the saints' guardian angels, "In heaven their angels do always *behold* the face of My Father" (Matt. 18: 10). From this Scripture we infer that all spirit beings can see God, who Himself is a spirit. Therefore He is not invisible to all beings, *i.e.*, He is not invisible in the absolute sense of the word. To what kind of creatures He is invisible we learn from a passage which teaches that our Lord in His glorified body is invisible. The passage in question is 1 Tim. 6: 16. In its pertinent part it reads as follows: "whom no man hath seen, nor can see." Hence God is invisible to animal beings, like man and the lower creation. But some may object that this passage treats of our Lord Jesus and not of God Himself, and that therefore we should not infer from it that God is invisible to animal beings including man. To this we reply that the Bible

teaches that our Lord's glorified body is the very image of the Father's person (literally *substance*). Therefore if the Son's body is invisible to all animal beings, certainly the body of which it is the very image must also be invisible to all animal beings, and thus to man.

Some, however, may object to our Lord's glorified body as being invisible to man, on the ground that He appeared to Saul of Tarsus on the way to Damascus. We agree that Jesus did appear to Saul of Tarsus on the way to Damascus, and by such appearance changed him from a persecutor to a believer and apostle; but we deny that Saul saw our Lord's glorified body. What he saw was a representation, a "vision," of our Lord's body; for this he himself said was the thing that he saw (Acts 26: 19). A vision is not the real thing, but a representation of it. Thus when St. Peter saw the sheet with all manners of beasts descending from heaven, he saw a representation of Jews (the clean animals of the vision) and Gentiles (the unclean animals of the vision), not Jews and Gentiles themselves as such. When St. Paul saw the man of Macedonia calling, "Come over and help us," he did not see a real Macedonian, but a representation of one. Thus, too, St. John in Revelation saw not real dragons, beasts, cities, etc., but representations of them—visions of them. Thus in visions not the real things, but representations of the real things are seen. Hence we conclude that since St. Paul calls what he saw on the way to Damascus a vision, he did not see our Lord's real body. This we know to be a fact, because he himself spoke thus of our glorified Lord: "whom no man hath seen, nor can see" (1 Tim. 6: 16). He could not truthfully have said this, had he actually seen our Lord's body. The thing that he actually saw was the glory light that shines out of our Lord's body as one of its inseparable qualities (Acts 26: 13-18); and this light would most fittingly represent our Lord's body, and therefore could be called Jesus with even greater

pertinency than we call the communion bread the Lord's body, because it represents His body. Thus the two objections urged by some against God's invisibility fall to the ground.

Accordingly we conclude that God, while not invisible to spirit beings, is invisible to animal beings. The reason for this is self-evident: natural eyes have not the qualities that would enable them to see a spirit being. It requires a special miracle on natural eyes even to enable them to see the light that shines out of a spirit body, as the case of Saul proves; and in the case of the highest order of spirit bodies—the Divine bodies—even despite a miracle, the eyes are blinded before they can penetrate through the dazzling light to the body from which the light comes, as Saul's experience proves. So great was Saul's consequent blindness that to restore him thereafter to even imperfect sight a miracle was necessary (Acts 9: 12, 17, 18). Paul's imperfect sight thereafter seems to have been his famous thorn in the flesh (2 Cor. 12: 7). Paul's experience in seeing the light shining out from our Lord's body, coupled with the remark of Jehovah, "no man can see Me [the light shining out of My body, representing Me] and live," implies that the light shining out of God's body is even brighter than that which shines out of our Lord's glorified body; for while the light of the Latter's body did not kill, but only blinded Saul, nobody could survive the sight of the light shining forth from God's body (Ex. 33: 18, 20, 23). Notice, please, how in Ex. 33: 18, 20, 23, the glory [the light shining out of God's body] of the Lord is spoken of as Himself and His face. This is because it is a representation of them. God's majesty and our littleness are manifest from the Bible doctrine of God's invisibility.

A brief consideration of a few other Scriptures treating on God's invisibility would be appropriate after the above explanations of it. God's invisibility is implied in the statement of Deut. 4: 15, "Ye [Israel]

saw no manner of similitude on the day that Jehovah spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire." Likewise His invisibility is implied in the statement of His dwellings in the thick darkness, in 1 Kings 8: 12: "The Lord said that He would dwell in the thick darkness." Clearly man's inability to see Him even while He is near man is set forth in Job 9: 11: "Lo, He goeth by me, and I see Him not; He passeth on also, but I perceive Him not." How realistically this quality in God is described in Job 23: 8, 9: "Behold, I go forward, but He is not seen; and backward, but I cannot perceive Him; on the left hand, where He doth work, but I cannot behold Him; He hideth Himself on the right hand, that I cannot see Him." This is poetically stated in Ps. 18: 11 and 97: 2: "He made darkness His secret place; His pavilion round about Him were dark waters and thick clouds of the skies." "Clouds and darkness are round about Him." John states it literally as a matter of man's universal experience (John 1: 18): "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared [revealed] Him [to our eyes of understanding by His teachings]." Jesus, also, first states it literally as a fact of Israel's universal experience (John 5: 37): "Ye have neither heard His voice at any time, nor *seen His shape*"; then He later states it as man's universal experience (John 6: 46): "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save He which is of God, He hath seen the Father." St. Paul uses the very term of God in several passages: Col. 1: 15—"who [Christ] is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature"; 1 Tim. 1: 17—"unto the King ... invisible, the only God [A.R.V.], be honor and glory for ever and ever"; Heb. 11: 27—"he [Moses] endured, as seeing Him who is invisible." These Scriptures one and all prove God to have invisibility to animal creatures as one of His attributes of being.

The next attribute of God's being that will engage our attention is His unity. By His unity we understand that quality of God whereby He is one being, one individual, and no more or less than one being. Though He has many qualities of being and character, though He has divers operations and manifestations, in each of them and in all of them He is but one being, one individual—not many or few, but only one. The Scriptures set forth this thought most explicitly, both by direct statement and by direct contrast, and also both positively and negatively. So pointed are their expressions in these respects that they leave no doubt in a sober and clear mind as to their teaching on His unity. The reason that God has so greatly stressed His unity of being, *i.e.*, that He is an individual, is the wide prevalence of polytheism in the world during and since the days of the Bible. The religions of the heathen world, ancient, medieval and modern, have all taught a plurality of gods, emphasizing as supreme among these three individuals, *e.g.*, among the Romans: Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto. Corresponding to these three under different names are found three supreme gods in the Egyptian, Babylonian, Indian, Chinese, Greek, Germanic, etc., religions. Desirous of preserving the Truth inviolate among His people on the doctrine of the Supreme Being's unity, God over and over again emphasizes the thought that He is but one individual, and that in the sense in which He is God there is no other. Thus God overthrows the heathen doctrine that there are three co-equal, co-eternal and consubstantial gods with a multitude of inferior gods.

Let us look at some of the most pointed of the Scriptures teaching God's unity: The classic passage of them all is Deut. 6: 4: "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord." The following is a still more literal translation, and states the thought still more clearly: "Hear, O Israel: Jehovah is our God; Jehovah is one." Certainly this is a sublimely simple statement

of the unity of God. Let us hold it up in pointed contradiction to heathen and heathenizing polytheism. How direct and pointed is 1 Kings 8: 60 in its assertion of Jehovah's sole deity: "That all the people of the earth may know that Jehovah is God, and that there is none else." How mighty is God's protest against polytheism as false, with its image representations of its deities, in Is. 42: 8: "I am Jehovah [the self-existent one]; that is My name; and My Glory [of supremacy] will I not give to another [god], neither my praise to graven images." In the following passage, John 17: 3, Jesus emphasizes with all-exclusive and contrasted terms God's sole deity and Himself as the supreme Messenger of this sole Deity: "This is [the purpose of] life eternal, that they might know Thee, the *only true* [genuine, real] God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." Notice, please, how in the following passage, 1 Cor. 8: 4-6, St. Paul stresses Jehovah's sole deity, and then how he contrasts on the one hand the *many* heathen gods with the *one* true God, and on the other hand the *many* heathen lords with the *one* true Lord: "There is *none other* God *but one*; for though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, as there be *gods many* and *lords many*; but to us there is but *one God*, the Father, ... and *one Lord*, Jesus Christ." Could we put the contrasts more pointedly and tersely than is done by the Apostle in this passage? Again the same Apostle stresses God's sole deity in Gal. 3: 20: "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one [*i.e.*, if there is only one person involved in a transaction, there can be no such a thing as a person acting as mediator; for a mediator implies that there are at least two other persons involved in a transaction, between whom he acts as a mediator]; but God is one [singular, not plural]." 1 Tim. 2: 5 is also to the point: "There is one God [hence not more than one], and one mediator between God and men." Here our Lord Jesus, who is the Mediator

of the New Covenant, is presented as the Mediator between the one God and sinful man. In the following passage, James 2: 19, we are commended, if we believe in the sole deity of God: "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well." Here also belong 1 Tim. 1: 17 (A. R. V.) and Jude 25 (A. R. V.). The contrast between the only God and one Lord Jesus is emphatic. The above Scriptures stress mightily the teaching that there is but one God—Jehovah supreme above all others, whom it is our privilege to make supreme in our lives. To do this we must approach Him by the only way of access to Him, Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, the Savior and Lord, by repentance toward God, faith in our Lord Jesus and entire consecration to His will. With those who so do, this only God enters into covenant relations on lines of the Oath-bound Covenant (Gen. 22: 16-18). And He gives them as one of their works the privilege of vindicating His sole deity as against all heathen and heathenizing beliefs in a plurality of Gods.

We are not to understand that the passages which call the saints gods (Ps. 82: 6; John 10: 34) and the good and bad angels gods (Ps. 8: 5; 97: 7; comp. Heb. 1: 6) contradict the thought of God's sole deity. This will be clear when we understand that the Hebrew word *elohim* and the Greek word *theoi*, translated gods, and meaning *mighty ones*, are applicable to any mighty one, be he man, angel, our Lord, or God Himself. Thus these words, used in their general sense, can apply to any mighty one; but when used in their specific sense they apply to Jehovah alone, *i.e.*, in the sense in which He as the Supreme Being is God no one else is God. Thus there is perfect harmony between the doctrine that Jehovah, the Supreme Being, alone is God and is but one, and the Scriptural teaching that there are many gods in the sense of mighty beings. It is for this reason that the deities of the heathen are Scripturally called gods, mighty ones, for they as the

demons, the fallen angels, are indeed mighty (Deut. 32: 16, 17; 1 Cor. 10: 20; 8: 5). Our investigation thus proves that God is one and not more than one being or individual. Him we delight to serve.

The next attribute of being in God to engage our attention is His omnipotence. Omnipotence has been defined as the ability to do *anything*. Such a definition is, we think, too broad; for the Scriptures clearly teach that there are some things that God cannot do, *e.g.*, He cannot lie (Heb. 6: 18); He cannot deny Himself (2 Tim. 2: 13); He cannot commit, nor favor, nor be tempted to sin (Hab. 1: 13; Jas. 1: 13). In a word, God cannot do anything contrary to His character. So also it would be untrue to say that God can unmake a past event, *i.e.*, make an accomplished fact unfactual; though He can prevent any event from occurring, or neutralize its effects after it has occurred, but once it has occurred, He cannot make it not a fact. These illustrations prove that it is wrong to define God's omnipotence as His ability to do anything. Nor do the Scriptures so define it. The nearest definition of God's omnipotence given us in the Bible is the following, found in Ps. 115: 3: "Our God is in the heavens; He hath done *whatsoever He hath pleased*" (See also Ps. 135: 6). This passage teaches that God can do anything that He desires. The reason that He cannot commit, nor favor, nor be tempted to sin, cannot lie and cannot deny Himself, is that He does not desire to do these things. His character so loves righteousness and hates wrong that he cannot desire to do these things. Knowing the end from the beginning, He would not wait until an undesired event had occurred, when it would be impossible to make it a nonevent; He would beforehand have prevented its occurrence, were it unwanted by Him. In view of these facts we would therefore define God's omnipotence as His ability to do anything that He desires to do. No power or combination of powers, be they ever so

strong, can prevent His carrying out His determinations, even as He has said: "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all My pleasure. I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it" (Is. 46: 10, 11; see also Job 23: 13, 14). "There is none that can deliver out of My hand; I will work, and who shall let [prevent] it?" (Is. 43: 13). In the light of the foregoing definitions, we are to understand the passages which say that God can do everything and that nothing is impossible with Him to imply the limitation expressed in the clause, "that He desires to do." Thus this clause should be understood as occurring in Job 42: 2 "Thou canst do everything [that Thou desirest]"; in Matt. 19: 26: "With God all things [that He desires to do] are possible"; and in Luke 1: 37: "For with God nothing [that He desires to do] is impossible."

Having seen what is meant by God's omnipotence or almightiness, let us look at some more passages that prove that this is one of His attributes of being, and that it is active in His marvelous works and ways. He calls Himself almighty in Gen. 17: 1: "I am the Almighty God." Gen. 18: 14 affirms that nothing that He desires to do is beyond His ability to do. "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" That He has had and will always have such power is affirmed in Is. 26: 4: "In the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength." So, too, is God's omnipotence, almightiness, expressly affirmed in Rev. 19: 6 and 21: 22. His power is not taxed in the least in His greatest conflicts with His enemies (Ex. 15: 6-12). It will never shrink to proportions disabling Him from accomplishing His ends (Num. 11: 23). No one can reverse His purpose (Num. 23: 20). It is greater by far than the combined power of all others (Deut. 3: 24). His might causes all to tremble (Deut. 7: 27). He has the power of life and death, from whom as such none can deliver, and who will undo all His enemies (Deut. 32: 39; 1 Sam. 2: 6, 7, 10).

His power is the support of His people (Deut. 33: 27). It will become manifest in due time as such to all people (Josh. 4: 24). It does not depend upon others for successful exercise (1 Sam. 14: 6; 2 Chro. 14: 11). His omnipotence extends to all His creatures (1 Chro. 29: 11, 12; Dan. 4: 35). It is backed by His knowledge, especially in its exercise on behalf of the good (2 Chro. 16: 9; Dan. 3: 17; 6: 27). None are able successfully to resist Him (2 Chro. 20: 6; Ps. 66: 3; Job 11: 10; 12: 14; Is. 27: 4; 31: 3). It is generally used to help and bless. (2 Chro. 25: 8, 9). It blesses the good and punishes the evil (Ezra 8: 22; Luke 1: 49-51). Its sphere of sway is as boundless as the universe (Jer. 32: 17, 27; 10: 12, 13; 5: 22; Is. 51: 10; 50: 2, 3; 48: 13; 40: 12, 22, 24, 26, 28; Prov. 30: 4; Ps. 148: 5, 8; 147: 5, 16, 18; 29: 3-6; 46: 6; 65: 6, 7; 68: 33; 74: 13, 15; 77: 14-18; Job 9: 4-7, 10, 12, 13). Man under the curse is impotent in His hand (Job 14: 20). He can make any change desired by Him, even if not understood by us (Job 26: 11, 14; 38: 8, 11; Ps. 104: 7, 9, 29-32; 78: 26; 89: 8, 9, 13; 97: 3-5). In power none are comparable with Him (Job 40: 9; 41: 10, 11). His own strength exalts and brings credit to Him (Ps. 21: 13; 106: 8; 118: 16; 145: 6; Is. 63: 12). His enemies are certain of ultimate defeat (Ps. 76: 6, 7; Nah. 1: 3-6; Joel 2: 11; 3: 16; Is. 17: 13; 19: 1; 23: 11; 33: 3, 13; Jer. 20: 11; Heb. 3: 6, 9-11, 15). His might brings to pass all His plans (Is. 14: 24, 27). He is able to destroy both soul and body (Matt. 10: 28; Jas. 4: 12). It prevails over demons (Luke 11: 20). It fulfils His promises (Rom. 4: 21). It has raised and will raise up the dead (1 Cor. 6: 14). It enables Christians to live aright (Eph. 1: 19, 20; 3: 20; 1 Pet. 1: 5). Surely God's power is marvelous in itself and in its works.

Let us pause awhile and meditate upon God's main works as expressions of His almighty power. One of His greatest works is the universe in its creation and

preservation. It is boundless in its stretch, and contains countless numbers of planetary systems, of which many billions have by the aid of the telescope been brought under man's survey; but in the illimitable realms of space there are doubtless many times more than those already discovered. Each of these planetary systems has its own sun; and if we should compute each of them as having as many planets and moons as our planetary system—the solar system—our minds would simply recoil upon themselves at the incomprehensible result! How do we know that there are such systems not yet brought into view by the most powerful telescopes? The infinity of the universe and the requirements of the laws of nature—gravity, attraction, repulsion, centrifugal and centripetal forces—presuppose their existence in the endless fields of space to keep the universe in order in its mighty procession of the solar systems and in the harmonious movements of each planet of each solar system. The creation and orderly preservation of the universe is therefore one of the sublimest expressions of God's almightiness, as well as one of its surest proofs. Most eloquently and sublimely do the Scriptures cite the universe in these features as expressions and proofs of God's omnipotence. Even if it took ages for its creation, and the laws of nature for its realization, it is no less an expression of omnipotence; because omnipotence used the laws of nature merely as its methods of operation. Animate nature, as well as inanimate nature, tells the same story. Certainly God's power is manifest in the creation and preservation of man as the king of the earth, as well as of the lower earthly creatures as the subjects of this king. Yea, higher orders of beings than the earthly beings, *i.e.*, the heavenly hosts—principalities and powers, thrones and dominions, cherubim and seraphim, angels and the Archangel Himself—are greater expressions of God's power than are the earthly creatures.

Many, too, are the expressions of God's power in the history of His plan, connected with the permission of evil among mankind in general and among His people in particular. Overruling the permission of evil for preparing His people in character development unto everlasting life and holy rulership, and for teaching the rest of mankind the hatefulness of sin and the desirability of hating and avoiding it, is from one standpoint an impressive display of God's power. Preserving the watery canopy intact until the time of Noah and then letting it drop under circumstances destructive to the wicked and preservative to the righteous display God's great power. Confusing the languages of mankind at Babel showed His power. Destroying the wicked and the cities of the plain, but in Lot and his family preserving the righteous, are further manifestations of God's omnipotence. Inflicting ten plagues upon Egypt, including the destruction of its firstborn of man and beast, overthrowing its army in the return of the cleft sea and sparing Israel's firstborn of man and beast, and then the whole nation in the cleft sea, are marked evidences of Jehovah's power, as were also His preserving Israel in the waste, howling wilderness by miraculous manna and water, and His drying up the Jordan for the passage of Israel into Canaan. The overthrow of the hosts of Midian and Assyria demonstrated afresh His almightiness. The carnation, resurrection and glorification of His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, again evidences the activities of His power. The begetting, development and preservation of His Church, amid Satanic attacks throughout the Gospel Age unto our day, bring again to our view the omnipotence of Jehovah.

But the Divine program is not yet finished. It involves through the Christ the future destruction of Satan's empire, including every oppressive government, false religious system, predatory aristocratic and capitalistic organization, as well as every other evil

and selfish institution, the complete binding of Satan and his fallen angels, their removal from earth's atmosphere and their imprisonment during the Millennium, the resurrection of all the just, the awakening of the unjust, the establishment of God's kingdom throughout the earth, the destruction of all conditions conducive to evil, the construction of conditions conducive to righteousness, turning the earth into Paradise, lifting up Adam's lost race through obedience to the original perfection, restitution, loosing Satan and the fallen angels for a final test of mankind, the preservation of the faithful in everlasting life on this earth, the destruction of Satan and wicked angels and men at the end of the little season following the Millennium, and the filling of the earth with the glory of God. Surely these marvelous features of God's plan still to be carried into fulfillment will one and all be, among other things, remarkable exhibitions of God's wonderful power—His omnipotence!

And what shall we say more? Shall God's power then become quiescent? Nay, verily! With the end of the Millennium His great rest day of 7000 years from Creation ends. Other creations are therefore to follow the completion of the earthly creation at the hands of the Christ in the Millennium, the last seventh of God's day of rest from His work of creation. So far as we know, the only heavenly bodies hitherto inhabited are God's and the angels' abode—Alcyone of the Pleiades—and this earth. If God will see to it that this earth in becoming the eternal and perfect abode of our perfected race will not have been created in vain, He will also likewise see to it that other planets will be inhabited by perfect creatures; for why should He have brought the many planetary systems into existence, unless they are to be inhabited? If to prevent the earth's being created in vain it was peopled, we should expect the other planets also to become inhabited, lest their creation should be in vain. The Christ will be God's

heirs (Rom. 8: 16, 17), and therefore will inherit the whole universe, even as Jesus, the Head of the Christ, inherited it at His glorification (Heb. 1: 2-4), and will at His Bride's glorification share His inheritance with her (Rom. 8: 16—18; Rev. 3: 21). After they perfect the earth and the human race as the first part of their inheritance so treated, we may feel certain that they will proceed to the development of the rest of their inheritance—the universe—as their eternal work; for it is written: "Of the *increase of His government* and of peace there shall be no end" (Is. 9: 7). This increase would seem to imply the bringing of new orders of beings into existence. Such creative work is implied in St. Paul's statement in Eph. 2: 7 as a part of God's great favor to the Church. That God loves diversity is manifest in His creatures. From this fact we may certainly assume that He will see to the creation of many different orders of beings. This would also be required by the varying climatic conditions, *e.g.*, in the various planets of our solar system; for the climate of its planets must greatly differ, depending on their distance from the sun. This would require organisms quite different from ours; for our bodies would burn up on some, and freeze on other planets of our solar system. Hence we may safely assume that the new creations will display great differences in their natures and qualities. To bring into existence and to perfection the inhabitants of countless planets, which will all be made perfect abodes for their inhabitants, would be an impressive demonstration of God's omnipotence, as well as of other attributes of God. Surely in His power God is a most marvelous Being; and by it He certainly calls forth our admiration, appreciation, worship and praise. Yea, unto Him be ascribed power omnipotent, eternal and beneficent!

In our discussion of God's attributes of being we now come to a consideration of His omniscience. Omniscience means knowledge of all things; therefore

when we speak of God's being omniscient, we mean that He knows all things. This implies three things: that perfectly and completely He perceives all things, remembers all things and reasons out all things. Man having been in his perfection, among other things, an intellectual image of God, and fallen man having all the mental faculties of perfect man, though impaired and imperfect, we can from our knowledge of man's mental powers infer what God's mental faculties are. Thus God's mentality in its perceptive powers has the aptitude to calculation, order, color, weight, size, form, detail, time, place, music, construction, beauty, sublimity, intuition, etc., with all their implications. As avenues of perceiving such things He has not only what corresponds to our five senses—sight, hearing, smelling, tasting and feeling; but what we do not have—intuitive knowledge. These powers enable Him to perceive everything past, present and future. Further, God's mentality in its reproductive powers has the aptitude of remembering all things that He has perceived. God's mentality in its reasoning powers has the aptitude of drawing inductions and deductions, *i.e.*, reasoning from some particulars to general conclusions and from general conclusions to the details, as it also has the powers of drawing conclusions as to contingencies. God's mentality in its imaginative powers, which result from the co-operation of the above three powers—perception, reproduction and reasoning, has the aptitude of inventing ideas realizable in plans and creations. And all of these intellectual powers are infinite in their capacities, infallible in their uses and perfect in their development. This is omniscience.

Man has gained knowledge in some intellectual departments, such as science, invention, philosophy, history, art, religion, philology, sociology, mathematics, etc. Each of these departments of knowledge in turn has many subdivisions, *e.g.*, science has, among others, the following branches: cosmology, astronomy, geology,

chemistry, medicine, physics, geography, botany, zoology, anthropology, etc. But even the most learned of men, or all of them combined, do not know all that is knowable in any one of the subdivisions of the above general departments of knowledge. Doubtless as time goes on, especially in the ages following the Millennium, man's knowledge will continue greatly to increase in all departments of learning. But never will he learn all the knowable in any of them. But God knows everything in every department of knowledge. Not only so, but He knows every probability and possibility in them. Not a thing, not a principle, not a possibility, not a probability, *e.g.*, in cosmology, astronomy, geology, geography, chemistry, physics, biology, sociology, physiology, etc., is unknown to Him. He is as familiar with what is in the ocean's depths and in the earth's center as on their surfaces. He knows as intimately the boundless universe as His own court. Nothing escapes His sight, nothing misses His attention, and nothing leaves or passes beyond His ken. The most difficult problems, conditions and secrets are an open book to Him. Every law of nature, every electron of matter, and every nook in space or substance He knows. "All things are naked [manifest, clear] in the sight of Him with whom we have to do."

It is His omniscience that enabled Him to plan the universe and all its creatures. His perfect knowledge of substances—both spiritual and material—enabled Him to arrange for a universe of such intricacy as is His. His knowledge of the laws of gravitation, adhesion, attraction, repulsion, relativity, centripetal and centrifugal forces, heat, cold, light, darkness, electricity, life, mathematics, etc., were used in the creation of the world and have been and are being used in its preservation and operation. Organic as well as inorganic nature, and material as well as spiritual nature, display His marvelous knowledge in inorganic matter and in the vegetable, animal and spiritual kingdoms.

The use of His knowledge in practical forms in making, preserving and operating His creatures in the inorganic, organic and spiritual kingdoms, displays intelligence that transcends our comprehension, in the presence of which we must bow down and adore. His knowledge of sin, evil, human and spiritual beings, moral and religious laws, diagnosis of, and remedy for fallen man and angels, are further remarkable displays of Jehovah's knowledge. There are secrets of knowledge hidden now from us that are by far greater than those open to us. When we consider the Biblical promise of further creations and developments in the universe, we are brought into the expectation of realms of knowledge transcending our greatest flights of imagination. And when we consider that all this future knowledge, as well as the knowledge of the past, present and future things, principles and beings, are in Jehovah's grasp, we see He is omniscient.

The Bible in very many of its passages points out God's knowledge—omniscience. It shows this from many standpoints. It states this as a fact in general, and then gives a great many particulars on it. Thus in a general way His knowledge, omniscience, is set forth apart from details (Job 12: 13, 22; 21: 22; 36: 4; 37 16; Ps. 147: 5; Is. 29: 15, 16; 40: 13, 14, 26-28; Jer. 10: 17; 23: 24; Rom. 11: 33; 1 Cor. 1: 25; 1 Tim. 1: 17; Heb. 4: 13; 1 John 3: 20). He knows all about His people, His enemies and all other people (Gen. 16: 13; Ex. 3: 7; Num. 14: 27; Deut. 2: 7; 2 Sam. 7: 20; 2 Kings 19: 27; Job 23: 10; 31: 4; Ps. 1: 6; 33: 13-15; 66: 7; 69: 19; Prov. 5: 21; Jer. 32: 19). He knows the minds and hearts of all people (Deut. 31: 21; 1 Sam. 2: 3; 16: 7; 1 Kings 8: 39; 1 Chro. 28: 9; 29: 17; Job 42: 2; Ps. 7: 9; 11: 4; 38: 9; 44: 21; 94: 11; 139: 1-4, 6, 12-16; Prov. 15: 3, 11; 16: 2; 17: 3; 24: 12; Is. 66: 18; Jer. 11: 20; 17: 10; 20: 12; Ezek. 11: 5; Amos 4: 13; Luke 16: 15; Acts 15: 8; Rom. 8: 27; 1 Thes. 2: 4). He especially knows those who are His (2 Chro. 16: 9;

Ps. 37: 18; 103: 14; 119: 168; 142: 3; Matt. 6: 4, 8, 18, 32; 10: 29, 30; 1 Cor. 8: 3; Eph. 1: 8; 2 Tim. 2: 19). He also knows the evils of the wicked (Neh. 9: 10; Job 11: 11; Amos 9: 2-4; 1 Cor. 3: 20). He sees every detail in heaven and earth (Job 28: 10, 24; Jer. 23: 24). His thoughts and works are deep and great (Ps. 92: 5; 104: 24; 136: 5; 147: 4; Prov. 3: 19, 20; Jer. 51: 15). His knowledge embraces the future (Job 24: 1; Is. 42: 9; 44: 7; 45: 4; 46: 10; 48: 5, 6; Dan. 2: 20, 22, 28; Matt. 24: 36; Acts 15: 18; Rom. 8: 29; 1 Pet. 1: 2). Thus we see that the Bible teaches God's omniscience in general and in particular terms. Summarizing, we would say that God's omniscience means that He knows everything that He desires to know.

The thought of His omniscience should teach us humility, as in contrast we see how little we know. It should teach us confidence in, and submission to His thoughts and works as infallible, as against ours which are fallible. It should teach us hope for Truth from Him who gives us as liberally of His knowledge as we will accept it. It should teach us appreciation of Him as knowing all things. And it should teach us adoration of Him as being so great in His knowledge.

God's omnipresence is the next of Jehovah's attributes of being to engage our attention. On this subject great misunderstanding reigns among not a few people. Some, those who consider God as simply a great mind and not as a Being having a body, think of God from the standpoint of omnipresence as a mind that is so spread out as to be in every locality, in every inch of space, yea, in every atom in the universe. Some, who consider Him as having both a mind and a body, hold that His body is so spread out as to be in every locality, in every inch of space, yea, in every atom of the universe,—which is their idea of God's omnipresence. Such views are certainly unbiblical and nonsensical. They contradict the many Scriptures that teach that God's abode is in heaven (1 Kings 8: 30, 32, 34,

36, 39, 43, 45)—seemingly in Alcyone, one of the Pleiades (Job 38: 31). There is nothing in the Scriptures that teaches directly or indirectly that God, as a mind, or in His body, is spread out throughout all space and substance. This view of His omnipresence is evidently an invention of Satan, palmed off to dupe the thoughtless, to perplex the devout and to repel the thoughtful. Not a little impetus has such a view of God's omnipresence given to atheism, pantheism, materialism and agnosticism. All the Scriptures that treat of God's omnipresence refer to the operation of His qualities throughout the universe, and not to a bodily presence of Himself pervading everything.

Let us see what is meant by God's omnipresence from the standpoint of the operation of His powers and qualities throughout the universe, both in its space and in its substances. We speak of everything that we see as being in our presence. Thus God's sight of all things brings them into His presence. Hence the boundless universe everywhere is in His presence, being embraced within the compass of His sight. Further, His power laying hold on everything in the universe, through operating toward it any law and force of nature that He desires, makes Him work everywhere. Again, God has such powers of hearing that every sound in the universe can be heard by Him as made in His presence. His sense of smelling is so delicate that every scent can be taken in by Him. So with His sense of feeling and tasting. Some of man's inventions help us to see the probability and reasonableness of these things. A powerful telescope brings into the range of our sight much of the universe. A powerful microscope makes molecules, but not atoms, visible to us. The radio enables us to hear voices from the other side of the world. Telephones enable us to carry on conversations across continents and oceans. Pressure on a button enables one by wire or cable to operate machines on the other side of the earth. The Millikan

ray—of fifty-fold greater potency than the X-ray—enables one to see through the most solid substances. God has in His eyes measurelessly greater powers of sight than the telescope, microscope and Millikan rays can give our eyes. God's ears and voice have infinitely greater powers than the radio and telephone can give our ears and voices. God's power and knowledge enable Him to operate the forces and laws of nature at infinitely greater distances than electricity brought under our control through proper means of contact enable us to do at a distance. Thus the vastly increased scope given to man's powers through inventions give us a faint idea of the infinite powers that God has inherently in His faculties, and thus enable us to see what the Scriptures mean when they speak of God's omnipresence. Thus God's powers and qualities enable Him to know and do throughout the universe just the same as though He were bodily present everywhere. Thus God's omnipresence means, not the stretching of Him as a mind or His body or both throughout every nook and corner of the universe and its substances, but the operation of His powers and qualities everywhere.

If we examine the Scriptures that treat of God's omnipresence, we will find that they teach such an omnipresence as we have described. Jacob, for instance, having in a dream at Bethel seen a ladder extending from heaven to earth, angels ascending and descending thereon and God standing at its top in heaven speaking to him, by his vision, sight and statement, "Surely the Lord is in this place and I knew it not" (Gen. 28: 16), shows that God was locally in heaven, for that is where Jacob in vision saw Him, but that by His voice and promise heard by Jacob He was at Bethel. Repeatedly the Bible teaches that God was not locally at a certain place, *e.g.*, in any of the three temples that the Jews built for Him (1 Kings 8: 27; Acts 7: 48, 49). The former one of these citations we will quote and briefly explain in brackets: "Will God

indeed dwell on earth? [the form of the question implies a negative answer, which disproves a bodily omnipresence.] Behold, the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee [Thou in the activities of Thy powers and qualities canst not be restricted to the heavens], how much less this house that I have builded [can be the total sphere of the activity of Thy powers and qualities]?" The entire passage shows that this earth is unfitted to be the home of so great a Being, whose powers and qualities could not be limited to the heavens themselves, let alone to the temple at Jerusalem. This passage certainly disproves a bodily omnipresence of God, but does teach an omnipresence of the operation of His powers and qualities. The real omnipresence of God as one consisting in the operation of His powers and qualities is beautifully brought out in Ps. 139: 3, 5, 7-10: "Thou compasses [by Thy powers working providentially on my behalf] my path and my lying down. Thou hast beset me behind and before [by Thy protection], and laid Thy hand [God's hand symbolizes His power] upon me. Whither shall I go from Thy spirit [power, qualities]? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence [sight]? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there [by Thy works of glorification]; if I make my bed in hell [sheol, oblivion], behold, Thou are there [by Thy power to deliver in the resurrection]. If I take the wings [beams] of the morning [the place of the rising sun, the east], and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea [the Mediterranean Sea was west of Palestine, the west; hence, if he would be anywhere on earth], even there shall Thy hand [power] lead me, and Thy right hand [chief power and favor] shall hold me [in safety]." In this passage the operation of God's powers and qualities on behalf of His people is most beautifully described, and shows that His omnipresence is one of powers and qualities, and not one of body or of a mind or both extended throughout space.

Another passage that proves the same thing is Jer. 23: 23, 24: "Am I a God [a powerful one; for the word God means a powerful one] at hand, and not a God [a powerful one] afar off? [Can I exercise My powers and qualities as a powerful one only near My body and not far off from it? This is a clear proof that God's body is limited to but one certain place at one time.] Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. [Even if I am in body limited to a certain one place at a time, I nevertheless have powers and qualities that enable me to see everyone and everything everywhere.] Do not I fill [with the operation of My powers and qualities] heaven and earth? saith the Lord." This passage clearly proves that God works not only near to Himself, but far away from Himself. Therefore it proves that He is not omnipresent in body, but in the operation of His powers and qualities; for if His body would be everywhere, everything would be at His hand—near Him—and nothing would be far away from Him. Another passage (Matt. 28: 20): "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the Age," gives us the viewpoint of God's being with His people, not locally, but sympathetically, helpfully, protectively, etc.; for Jesus was not on earth locally throughout the Gospel Age, but in heaven (Acts 3: 21). So God is with us not locally, but by the operation of His powers and qualities. This thought is very manifest from Acts 17: 24, 27, 28: "God, that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth [ruler of heaven and earth, which He rules not in bodily presence everywhere, even as earthly rulers do not so rule their dominions, but by His power, authority, etc., extending everywhere, even as earthly rulers govern their dominions by their power, authority, etc., extending throughout their dominions], dwelleth not in temples made with hands [but in His abode in heaven, hence is not present bodily everywhere]

... That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far [in spirit, not in body] from everyone of us; for in Him [the Greek here means *by*, not *in*, *i.e.*, by His power, kindness and love] we live, and move, and have our being." This passage denies an omnipresence of God's body or of Him as consisting of a great mind. Like all others it teaches His omnipresence in the operation of His powers and qualities.

Thus we have examined the Scriptures that teach God's omnipresence, and find that none of them teaches an omnipresence of God's body or of Him as a great mind; but of Him in the operation of His powers and qualities. Thus the Scriptures are self-harmonious on this subject and teach a reasonable view of the matter, even as within the scope of our limited observation we know it to be true as a matter of experience.

God's supremacy is another attribute of Jehovah's being. By God's supremacy we understand especially two things to be meant: (1) in person, character, plan and works He is incomparably superior to all other beings, not even excepting our Lord Jesus; and (2) all beings and things are, or ought to be and finally will be, subject to Him—whosoever finally refuses such subjection will ultimately be annihilated. God's supremacy, then, in the first place means that in person, character, plan and works, God is incomparably superior to all other beings, not even excepting our Lord Jesus. This implies that in existence He is the greatest, and in fact is the only being not created—having always been. Again, in attributes of being He is the greatest. Again, in all attributes of good character, especially in wisdom, power, justice and love, He is the greatest. Furthermore, His plans, embracing as they do all the universe and its creatures, past, present and future, are the greatest. Finally, His works—creative, providential, redemptive, instructional, justifying, sanctifying and delivering, are the greatest.

Thus God is supreme in His being, character, plans and works—incomparably superior to all other beings in these respects. Thus, too, He is supreme in the sense of having had or having or being about to have authority and power over all other beings. His supremacy was acknowledged by every creature in heaven, until Lucifer rebelled and later led off some of the angels from subjection to God. But even these must submit to the metes and bounds that God has appointed to them. So, too, mankind is also in rebellion against God, yet is subject to the metes and bounds placed by God upon it under the curse. Some of mankind and some of the fallen angels are now subjecting themselves willingly to God, thus in their lives acknowledging God's supremacy. Later those people who did not in this life have the opportunity of making God supreme in their lives will be given an opportunity to do so. Many will avail themselves fruitfully of that opportunity, and will in the Ages to come eternally make God supreme in their lives. All others—human and angelic—who refuse so to do will be annihilated, and as a result God's supremacy will be acknowledged in motive, thought, word and act, by every living being, those who never ceased therefrom, as well as those who ceased temporarily therefrom and later complied therewith.

God's supremacy in His person and attributes of being is manifest from the passages that we have quoted on these subjects thus far, in this chapter. His supremacy in person, character, plan and works will be seen in the Scriptures to be quoted when we treat of those subjects in other connections. Here we give only in general ways Scriptural proof of His supremacy. This is manifest from a variety of standpoints: (1) His ownership of everything (Gen. 14: 19; 1 Chro. 29: 11; Ps. 50: 10; Ezek. 18: 4; Rev. 4: 11); (2) His control of nature (Job 38: 33; Jer. 31: 35; 33: 25); (3) His giving laws to all (Ex. 20: 2; Is. 33: 22;

Matt. 4: 10; 22: 37); (4) His trying men (Deut. 13: 1; Job 2: 6; 1 Cor. 11: 19); (5) His bestowal of favor (Rom. 9: 22; 2 Tim. 2: 25); (6) His disposing of men's lives (Gen. 22: 2; 1 Sam. 16: 3); (7) His judging men, nations and angels (Dan. 4: 17; Rom. 12: 19; 1 Cor. 6: 3; Rev. 11: 18). The Scriptures prove that He is supreme even over our Lord Jesus (John 10: 20; 14: 28; 1 Cor. 3: 23; 11: 3; 15: 24, 27, 28; Phil. 2: 6; Eph. 1: 17; 1 Pet. 1: 3; Ps. 45: 6, 7, compare with Heb. 1: 8, 9). The Scriptures prove that ultimately God will be honored as supreme (1 Cor. 15: 28; Phil. 2: 9-11; Rev. 5: 12, 13; 19: 6; Deut. 10: 14, 17; Ps. 47: 2, 3, 7, 8; 83: 18; 97: 9; 145: 11-13; Rom. 14: 11). Thus Jehovah's supremacy is a Scriptural teaching.

The final attribute of God's being that we will consider is His unfathomableness. By this we mean that quality of God's being which makes Him impossible of being fully comprehended in all the details of His being, attributes, thoughts and works by any of His creatures. Of course God fully comprehends Himself in every detail of His being, attributes, thoughts and works. And those of His intelligent creatures who are in harmony with Him comprehend some of the things of His being, attributes, thoughts and works. For example, our study of his existence and attributes of His being have made clear some of their features to us. But other features of these we cannot fully grasp. Among other things this is manifest in the matter of His being without a beginning. While reasoning from second causes to the First Cause we saw that God has to be without beginning, because of His being uncaused; yet we cannot grasp how it can be so. The argument from effect to cause proves to our reason that it is a fact that He is without beginning; but neither it nor anything else explains to our reason how He can be without a beginning. It is our inability to reason out all things connected with His existence as

being without a beginning that makes Him unfathomable to us in certain respects of His existence. Thus His past eternity is not fully comprehensible to us. This same unfathomableness we find in almost all of His other attributes of being, His unity, supremacy and unfathomableness being perhaps the only exceptions. Thus while we see the reasonableness of His having a body, yet we cannot fully comprehend the kind of a body that He has. Nor can we fully comprehend His spirituality, self-existence, self-sufficiency, immortality, omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, invisibility, etc., though we are able to understand the fact of these qualities and comprehend some features of them. Our being images of God gives us the power partially to comprehend Him in His being, attributes, thoughts and works; but our being finite—limited—and His being infinite—unlimited—prevents us from fully comprehending God in all the details of His being, attributes, thoughts and works. Experience proves that the Scriptures are certainly true when they teach that none of God's creatures can fathom Him.

That there are some things in God unfathomable by us is taught in Biblical statements like the following: "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things that are revealed belong unto us" (Deut. 29: 29); "God ... doeth great things and unsearchable [unfathomable]" (Job 5: 8, 9); "Canst thou by searching find out [fully comprehend] God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" (Job 11: 7); "Lo, these are parts of His ways [we can comprehend some features of Him]; but how little a portion is heard [understood] of Him. But the thunder of His power who can understand?" (Job 26: 14); "Behold, God is great, and we know [fully comprehend] Him not; neither can the number of His years be searched out [His eternity cannot be fully comprehended by us]" (Job 36: 26); "Great things doeth He, which we cannot comprehend. ... Touching

the Almighty, we cannot [fully] find Him out" (Job 37: 5, 23); "Such knowledge [of Jehovah's secret things] is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it" (Ps. 139: 6); "His greatness is unsearchable" (Ps. 145: 3); "Thou knowest not [fully] the works of God who maketh all" (Eccl. 11: 5); "There is no searching [fathoming] of His understanding" (Is. 40: 28); "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable [unfathomable] are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known [fully comprehended] the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor?" (Rom. 11: 33, 34). These Scriptures, teaching our inability to fathom God, arouse us to appreciate, reverence, adore and worship the Unfathomable One.

And surely our consideration of the fourteen chief attributes of God's being should enhance Him in our appreciation and should prompt us to trust, reverence, love, adore and worship Him as altogether worthy. O! How great our God is in His attributes of being! Truly the acme of complete excellence meets perfectly and supremely in Him, and in Him alone, for which be ascribed unto Him all glory, praise and adoration!

The heav'ns declare Thy glory, Lord;
 Through all the realms of boundless space
 The soaring mind may roam abroad,
 And there Thy power and wisdom trace.

Author of Nature's wondrous laws,
 Preserver of its glorious grace,
 We hail Thee as the great First Cause,
 And here delight Thy ways to trace.

CHAPTER III.

THE ELEMENTS AND THE HIGHER PRIMARY GRACES OF GOD'S CHARACTER.

RIGHTEOUS ATTITUDE TOWARD EVIL. HOLY AFFECTIONS. THE GRACES. STRENGTH. DOMINANCE OF HIS HIGHER PRIMARY GRACES. BALANCE. CRYSTALLIZATION. THREE CLASSES OF GRACES. THE HIGHER PRIMARY GRACES. WISDOM. JUSTICE. CHARITY. LOVE. POWER. THE FUNCTION OF GOD'S HIGHER PRIMARY GRACES.

IN THE preceding chapter we have considered the attributes of God's being. As an initial feature to the study of His character it would be proper to study the elements of His character, *i.e.*, the general forms in which His character exists and acts, the general ingredients of which it consists. There are seven of these: (1) a righteous attitude toward evil; (2) holy affections; (3) the graces; (4) strength in every element of character; (5) domination over His lower primary affections and graces, and His secondary and tertiary graces by His higher primary graces properly blended; (6) balance of character; and (7) crystallization of character. In this discussion it is not our purpose to give details on these points; rather it is our purpose to give only generalities thereon, as details naturally will follow. The first element of God's character suggested above is that it sustains a righteous attitude toward evil. A righteous attitude toward evil, first of all, abhors it, hates it as an abomination, and God does this because He is righteous, and it is evil—evil in itself and evil in its effects. It is evil in itself because it is opposed to God's law, which is based on, is in harmony with, and flows out of His justice, and because it works harm in a moral order of affairs; for certainly it disrupts the fellowship relations between God and His sinning free

moral agents and does this to the relations of those creatures to one another, as well as harms these creatures. Accordingly, a righteous being's righteous attitude toward evil must be one of abhorrence. Therefore, God, as a righteous being, in the nature of the case, must abhor evil. The Bible gives us abundant evidence to this effect: "All His ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity; just and right is He" (Deut. 32: 4). "The Lord is upright: ... there is no unrighteousness in Him" (Ps. 92: 15). "What iniquity have your fathers found in Me, that they have gone far from Me?" (Jer. 2: 5). "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity" (Hab. 1: 13). Additionally, the following cited passages show that God abhors evil: Gen. 6: 6; Deut. 25: 16; Ps. 5: 4-6; Prov. 6: 16-19; 21: 27; Jer. 44: 4, 22; Zech. 8: 17; Luke 16: 13; Rev. 2: 6, 15. Thus the first feature of His righteous attitude toward evil is abhorrence, which we recognize is proper.

Out of such abhorrence God avoids evil. He will not practice it, because it is contrary to His character in its holiness and in its righteousness. He, being perfect in character, naturally must abhor it and, therefore, will not, nor can He, practice evil. The Scriptures are plain on this feature of His righteous attitude toward evil. We will quote a few pertinent Scriptures: "Far be it from God that He should do wickedness, and from the Almighty that He should commit iniquity. Yea, surely God will not do wickedly, neither will the Almighty pervert judgment" (Job 34: 10, 12). "Who can say, Thou has wrought iniquity?" (Job 36: 23). "To subvert a man in his cause, the Lord approveth not. ... Out of the mouth of the Most High proceedeth not evil." (Lam. 3: 36, 38). "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" (Gen. 18: 25). "There is no iniquity with the Lord, our God" (2 Chron. 19: 7). "Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid" (Rom. 9: 14).

"Neither is there respect of persons with Him" (Eph. 6: 9). "God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love" (Heb. 6: 10). Accordingly, we see that the Bible teaches that God avoids evil as a part of His righteous attitude toward sin. And from the same attitude of Him toward sin He opposes it. He opposes it by teaching against it, by warning against it, by punishing those who play with it, by setting up arrangements and movements against it. In the Bible are many teachings and examples of this feature of His righteous acts against evil. His teaching and warning of Cain, Pharaoh, Israel, Balaam, Saul, David, etc., are illustrations of certain forms of His opposition to evil; and His punishments of these and others are illustrations of still another form of opposing evil. The arrangements that He gave natural and spiritual Israel against it in its various forms constitute another way in which He has shown His opposition to evil. Furthermore the experience of the race under the curse, the Day of Vengeance and the Second Death are only some more illustrations of His opposing evil. The following citations bear this out: Gen. 3: 7-24; 4: 9-14; 6: 5-7; 1 Kings 13: 33, 34; Ps. 94: 23; Is. 50: 11; Jer. 5: 25; 21: 14; Ezek. 11: 21; Rom. 5: 12-21; Gal. 6: 7. Thus we see that God opposes evil. Accordingly, in His abhorring, abstaining from, and opposing evil, God shows that one of His character elements is a righteous attitude toward evil.

The second element of God's character is holy affections. This means that God's affections are holy in their nature, in the objects to which they attach themselves, and in the manner in which they express themselves. These affections are partly intellectual, partly artistic, partly religious, partly selfish (not sinfully selfish) and partly social. His intellectual affections are His love for knowing, love for remembering and love for reasoning. This form of His love is holy; it exercises itself in a holy manner and toward holy objects.

His artistic affections are His love for the beautiful, His love for the sublime, His love for the eloquent, His love for the humorous, His love for the pleasant and His love for the creative. This love is holy in itself: it exercises itself in holy ways and attaches itself to the holy in these things. His religious affections are His love for believing in, and relying upon the things of faith, His love for hoping for the things of hope, His love for firmness of the will, His love for perseverance of the will, His love for just veneration toward good principles, His love for just love for His creatures and His disinterested veneration for good principles and for His creatures. His religious love, His disinterested love, He exercises in a holy manner, it reaches out toward holy objects; and if certain objects, like the fallen angels and men, are not holy, He exercises this love toward making them holy.

Then God's selfish affections are holy. Selfish affections may be holy or unholy, dependent on their quality, their manner of exercise and the things to which they attach themselves. In God all His selfish affections are holy, for their qualities are holy: they work in a holy manner and attach themselves to holy things. Thus He has love for a proper self-esteem, others' esteem, ease, safety, life, self-defense, concealing, gaining and retaining, attacking and (spiritual) eating and drinking. God's social affections are holy. On these sentiments there must be some explanations made so as to clarify matters. *E.g.*, God loves His wives; but it must be explained that, as man understands the matter of wives, God has not had, does not have and will not have wives. But He has had, does have and will have symbolic wives. Is. 54: 1-17, compared with Gal. 4: 27, proves that the Sarah Covenant, *i.e.*, the oath-bound promises to the Christ, Head and Body, and the servants that apply them to the faithful new creatures, are God's (symbolic) wife. Gal. 4: 21-31 proves that also the Hagar Covenant, *i.e.*, the Law

promises to Israel and the servants that applied them to Israel, have likewise been a symbolic wife to God. The same will be true of the New Covenant, which is typed by Keturah, the third wife of Abraham, as we gather from the parallels of Sarah and Hagar and the allusion to Keturah's descendants as picturing those developed as children under the New or Millennial Covenant (Is. 60: 6). Hence we say that God has a love for wife, love for children, love for friends, love for home (His Paradise, Rev. 2: 7) and love for country (the universe). This love is holy, because holiness is its quality, because it is exercised in a holy way and goes out to holy objects. Accordingly, God's affections are the second element of His character.

The third element of God's character is His graces. Usually we speak of the main attributes of God's character as wisdom, power, justice and love. But, as St. Peter shows us in his famous addition problem (2 Pet. 1: 5-7), these are capable of being resolved into their parts as follows: Wisdom is a combination of faith, hope (which is the heart of fortitude) and knowledge. Power (will power as distinct from omnipotence, which is an attribute of being and not of character) is a combination of self-control and patience. Justice is a combination of piety (duty-love to God; in God's case this goes out to good principles, not to any person, which, if it did, would imply that God has a superior—an impossibility) and brotherly love (duty-love to the neighbor). St. Peter does not analyze love; he simply mentions it as charity. These seven graces we call the higher primary graces, because they are the graces that, acting through the religious affections as their qualities, are the chief and dominating graces. These graces in God are holy; they act in a holy manner and attach themselves to holy objects only. But in addition to the higher primary graces God has as parts of the third element of His character lower primary graces, secondary graces and tertiary graces.

God's lower primary graces are the qualities that act through His selfish and social affections, as their qualities. Thus God's self-confidence, self-satisfaction and self-respect are the graces that act through His self-esteem, as its qualities. God's approbateness is the grace that acts through His love of others' esteem, as its quality. God's peace is the grace that acts through His love of rest, or ease, as its quality. God's combativeness is the grace that acts through His love of self-defense, as its quality. God's self-preservativeness is the grace that acts through His love of life, as its quality. God's cautiousness is the grace that acts through His love of safety, as its quality. God's tactfulness is the grace that acts through His love of concealment, as its quality. God's aggressiveness and executiveness are the graces that act through His love of attacking injurious, opposing and difficult things, as its qualities. God's enterprisingness and providence are the graces that act through His love of gaining and retaining, as its qualities. God's appetitiveness (love for the Truth and its spirit) is the grace that works through His love for (spiritual) food and drink, as its quality. God's conjugality is the grace that acts through His love for His (symbolic) wives, as its quality. God's fatherliness is the grace that acts through His love for His children, as its quality. God's friendliness is the grace that acts through His love for friends, as its quality. And God's domesticity and patriotism are the graces that act through His love of home and country, as their qualities. Thus these graces—those that act through God's selfish and social affections—are His lower primary graces.

God's secondary graces do not have any affections through which they act. Rather, they act from the higher primary graces' suppressing the control of Himself by the selfish and social affections and their graces. Thus suppressing self-esteem's control, God exercises humility; suppressing the control of others' esteem,

God exercises reticence, modesty and simplicity; suppressing His love of ease, God exercises industry; suppressing the control of love for self-defense, God exercises longsuffering; suppressing the control of love for life, God exercises self-sacrificingness; suppressing the control of love for safety, God exercises bravery; suppressing the control of love for concealment, God exercises candor, frankness; suppressing the control of love for attacking, God exercises forbearance and forgiveness; suppressing the control of love for gaining and retaining, God exercises liberality, generosity; suppressing the control of love for spiritual food and drink, God exercises temperance. Thus He exercises His secondary graces as these are related to a proper control of the selfish affections. He exercises the secondary graces as these are related to the proper control of His social affections as follows: Suppressing the control of love for wife and children, God exercises family headshipliness; and suppressing the control of love for friends, home and country, God exercises impartiality. God's tertiary graces are mixed graces, *i.e.*, they are the graces in which there is a combination of higher primary with lower primary and secondary graces, in which combination the higher primary graces control. The following are God's main tertiary graces: Meekness, zeal, moderation, goodness, gentleness, joy, obedience, faithfulness. As we have shown elsewhere how various of the higher primary, the lower primary and the secondary graces combine in the exercise of these graces, we will not enter into that phase of the subject here. But it will be in place to remark that in God everyone of the primary, secondary and tertiary graces is a holy quality, acts in a holy manner and attaches itself to holy objects alone.

The fourth element of God's character is His strength of character in all the respects hitherto mentioned. His character is strong in its righteous attitude toward evil and never does He exercise the slightest

weakness in abhorring, avoiding and opposing evil. His character is strong in the exercise of His intellectual, artistic, religious, selfish and social affections. His character is strong in His exercise of the higher primary graces, of the lower primary graces, of the secondary graces and of the tertiary graces. Never does He show any weakness in the exercise of His intellectual, artistic, religious, selfish and social affections, His exercise of His higher and lower primary graces or of the exercise of His secondary and tertiary graces. And this strength that He has and exercises in all His attitudes and acts toward evil and in all of His affections and graces is a very important element in His character, as being a necessary part of its perfection.

The fifth element of God's character is the domination of His lower primary affections and graces and His secondary and tertiary graces by His higher primary graces properly blended. In God's varying relations, as proper principles will require, there always must be a varying blending in coordination, superordination or subordination among His higher primary graces, when they are the only ones of His graces called into activity by the needs and conditions of certain given actions. Furthermore, when His attitudes and works toward evil and His lower primary affections and graces and His secondary and tertiary graces act, these must act under the domination of the higher primary graces properly blended, since otherwise sin would set in—a thing that is impossible with God. This domination is exercised in two ways (1) In suppressing the control or, if the case require, even the activity of the lower primary graces and affections and the secondary and the tertiary graces. This prevents sin and keeps right-doing in activity. (2) In using the lower primary affections and graces and the secondary and tertiary graces as servants of righteousness and holiness. *E.g.*, when love for self-defense

and anger would be contrary to the control of the blended higher primary graces, God's higher primary graces suppress the activity of these. If longsuffering or zeal in God should be inclined to work and the higher primary graces forbid it, they will, as blended, suppress its activity. But if any of these or any other of their fellow affections or graces would further righteousness or holiness, God's higher primary graces would set them into exercise to make them servants of righteousness and holiness, *e.g.*, God's higher primary graces use His combativeness to overthrow the attacks of sin and error whereby He uses combativeness as a servant of righteousness and truth.

The sixth element in God's character is balance. By balance in God's character is meant the adjustment of His affections and graces in harmony with one another in such coordination, subordination and superordination as the principles of Divine wisdom, power, justice and love in their ordered relations to one another require. Balance in God's character, therefore, operates in all of the previously mentioned five elements of His character and adjusts all their details within each of them and in their relations with one another. It is due to this fact that balance in God's character is almost universal in His character activities; for it permeates all the preceding five elements of His character.

The final element in God's character is crystallization in the preceding six element of His disposition. By crystallization in God's character its unbreakableness in the six preceding elements is meant. This is the crowning perfection of God's character. It means that nothing can change God from His righteous attitude toward evil, in abhorring, avoiding and opposing it, nor change His affections from their holiness in their qualities, manner of working or objects, nor change His graces of all three kinds into the opposite disgraces, nor change His strength of character into weakness in any point, nor change the domination of

His blended higher primary graces over His lower primary affections and graces and over His secondary and tertiary graces, nor change His balance of character, nor change such crystallization in itself. No matter what the pressure on God may be, it cannot impair this crystallization in the slightest degree. Hence the climax of God's perfection of character is His crystallization therein. And when God invites us to be perfect as He is perfect, He means that we, after His example, are to have all seven of these character elements in our characters. But, among others, there is this difference: God has not had to develop any of these features of His character; for He has always had them, while we have to cultivate them as the chief thing in life.

All of God's attributes which are not qualities of character we call His attributes of being. Above, in the previous chapter, we treated on fourteen of God's attributes of being. There are other attributes of God's being than these fourteen, but those considered are the principal ones of that class of His characteristics, and their discussion will, we trust, suffice for our present study of that class of His attributes. We now turn to the discussion of His attributes of character, and believe their study will bless us even more than that of His attributes of being; for the former are in themselves more noble and appreciable, and in our relation to Him are fuller of joy, peace and satisfaction for us than the latter. Moreover, they occupy a larger place in God's Word and works than His attributes of being. In the study of them more especially do the words of the Lord to Moses apply, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." May we enter into this study with reverence, faith and love; so it will prove a very rich blessing indeed, such as all of us desire.

A few explanations on the classes of God's attributes of character should precede our study of our subject in order to its better understanding and appreciation.

God has three classes of character qualities, corresponding to our three classes of character attributes, a correspondence due to our being as new creatures mental, moral and religious images of God. These may be called primary, secondary and tertiary qualities or graces. Like ourselves God has a variety of affections, each one of which has its own separate organ of expression, *e.g.*, firmness, continuity, spirituality, combativeness, secretiveness, restfulness, self-esteem, etc. By our affection-organs *exercising themselves* we develop graces or attributes of character. Those qualities that are the direct effect of such exercise of our affection-organs are the primary graces. *E.g.*, by exercising our organ of spirituality we develop faith; by exercising our organ of firmness we cultivate self-control; by exercising our organ of continuity we produce patience, etc. The natural working of any affection-organ produces as its *primary effect* the quality that corresponds to that organ of affection. It is for this reason that we call that grace that is produced by the direct action of an affection-organ a primary grace. Hence we define the primary graces as the qualities produced by the direct exercise of the affection-organs.

The primary qualities are of two kinds—higher and lower. The higher primary attributes are those that should control all our other qualities, *i.e.*, the lower primary, the secondary and the tertiary graces. The higher primary graces are faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love and charity. The following are some of the lower primary graces: self-confidence, dignity, attractiveness, restfulness, defensiveness, aggressiveness, tactfulness, providence, etc. These lower primary graces must not be allowed to dominate us or they will produce the *disgraces*, *e.g.*, self-confidence controlling us produces self-sufficiency; dignity controlling us produces arrogance and self-exaltation; attractiveness controlling us produces ostentatiousness and vanity; restfulness controlling us produces

laziness; defensiveness controlling us produces contentiousness; aggressiveness controlling us produces cruelty; tactfulness controlling us produces hypocrisy; and providence controlling us produces covetousness. Controlled by the higher primary graces, the lower primary graces do much good. They are, therefore, not to be controllers, but to be controlled by the higher primary graces.

For the sake of clearness we will make a few explanations on the secondary and tertiary graces, qualities or attributes. The secondary graces individually do not have individual affection-organs by whose natural exercise they are developed. If they had, they would not be secondary, but primary graces or qualities. They are developed by the primary, especially the higher primary graces suppressing the efforts of the lower affection-organs to control us. Thus the higher primary graces suppressing the efforts of self-esteem to control us produce humility, suppressing the efforts of restfulness to control us develop industriousness, suppressing the efforts of combativeness to control us produce longsuffering, suppressing the efforts of destructiveness to control us cultivate forbearance, forgiveness, etc. Thus the secondary graces are more or less negative, for they are not produced by an affection-organ as its natural effect, but by other graces forcing the lower affection-organs to remain inactive so far as controllership is concerned.

The tertiary graces, attributes or qualities differ from the primary graces in this: that whereas the primary graces are the direct effect of the working of the higher affection-organs by themselves, or of the lower primary affection-organs by themselves, but never by combination of the higher and the lower ones to produce primary graces, each tertiary grace is the effect of one or more of the higher and lower affection-organs and secondary graces combined. *E.g.*, faith, a higher primary grace, is developed by the activity of

the affection-organ of spirituality; and tactfulness, a lower primary grace, is cultivated by the working of the affection-organ of secretiveness. While, as in the case of the higher primary graces of piety, brotherly love and charity, there is a combination of operation in higher affection-organs, the higher primary graces are not qualities produced by a combination in the workings of higher and lower affection-organs. But zeal, a tertiary grace, results from the combined working of the higher primary graces of faith, hope, piety, brotherly love and charity, the lower primary graces of aggressiveness and enterprisingness and the secondary graces of self-sacrifice, industriousness and bravery. Thus the tertiary graces are produced by a combination in the working of the higher and lower affection-organs and secondary graces. And therein consists their difference from both the primary graces and the secondary graces, the latter having no direct organs for their expression.

The above explanations on the three classes of graces, qualities or attributes of character in us as new creatures are made in order the better to enable us to understand and appreciate these three classes of character attributes in God. The reason why they are helpful toward these ends is that as new creatures we are becoming images of God in attributes of character. And if faithful, we will be perfect character images of Him. Hence the understanding and appreciation of our new creaturely qualities enable us better to understand and appreciate God's attributes of character. We are now ready to take up our subject for discussion.

The Scriptures stress as God's higher primary graces four attributes, which may be analyzed into seven. These four are wisdom, justice, love and power. There is no one literal passage in the Scriptures that expressly contains mention of all four of these Divine attributes, though there are several figurative ones that picture forth all four of them under the symbols of an

eagle (wisdom), a lion (power), an ox (bullock, used in the atonement sacrifice—justice) and a human face (love) (Ezek. 1: 5-14; Rev. 4: 6, 7). In Job 37: 23 all four of them are mentioned, two of them expressly and two of them by other terms: "He [the Almighty] is excellent in *power*, and in *judgment*, [discernment, *i.e.*, wisdom] and in plenty of justice, and He *will not* [willingly] *afflict* [love]." So in Jer. 9: 24 they are all indicated, either expressly or impliedly: "I am the Lord that *exerciseth* [a function of power] *lovingkindness* [love], *judgment* [wisdom] and *righteousness* [justice] in the earth; for in these things [power, love, wisdom and justice] I delight, saith the Lord." So, too, partly by implication and partly by expression these four attributes are set forth in Deut. 32: 4: "His work [the expression of His power] is perfect; all His ways are judgment [wisdom]; a God of truth [the basis of wisdom and love] without iniquity; just and right [justice] is He." There are, of course, many passages that treat of at least one or another of these Divine attributes. Thus, *e.g.*, wisdom as a Divine attribute is set forth in Rom. 11: 33, 34; Eph. 1: 8; 1 Tim. 1: 17. So, too, is power as a Divine attribute set forth in Gen. 17: 1; Ps. 115: 3; Matt. 19: 26; Luke 1: 37; Rev. 19: 6. Likewise this is true of justice as a Divine attribute in Ex. 20: 4; Ps. 89: 14; Jer. 50: 7. And, finally, this may be said of love as a Divine attribute in John 3: 16; Rom. 5: 8; Titus 3: 4; 1 John 4: 8-10, 19. Thus the Scriptures prove that these are Divine attributes.

In a celebrated passage where St. Peter tells of our call to glory and virtue, *i.e.*, to a character like God's, he analyzes these four attributes as they are to be developed in us into seven graces and a mental acquirement, *i.e.*, knowledge—2 Pet. 1: 3-7. By the words faith, fortitude [the heart of fortitude is hope of victory, hence here fortitude is used for hope, which, as one of the three chief graces (1 Cor. 13: 13), should

appear in a list of the seven chief ones] and knowledge (v. 5) he gives us the elements or ingredients of wisdom; by the words self-control [temperance] and patience (v. 6) he gives us the elements or ingredients of power as an attribute of character, but not as an attribute of being; by the words piety [godliness] and brotherly love [neighbor love, brotherly kindness] he gives us the elements or ingredients of justice; and by the word charity he gives us the synonym of love. Thus seven of these—faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love and charity—are graces, and one—knowledge—is a mental acquisition. It is certainly true that wisdom is a combination of faith, hope and knowledge; for confidence in our knowledge and the hope to effect good by it is exactly what wisdom is—the trustful and hopeful use of the Truth in making plans for securing good results. It is also true that self-control and patience [steadfastness, constancy] are the ingredients or elements of power as a character attribute, *i.e.*, will-power, as distinct from physical power or might; for will-power is firmness [self-control] and continuity [patience] in a good course. Justice certainly consists of supreme love to God [piety] and equal love to the neighbor [brotherly love]. Thus in this section St. Peter analyzes into their component parts what are the four attributes of God's character that must be developed in us as our higher primary graces.

Having given above a few general considerations on God's higher primary attributes of character, we will now discuss each one in turn, beginning with wisdom. Wisdom may be defined as the confident and hopeful use of true knowledge in planning practical things in harmony with power, justice and love. It will be noticed that in this definition a number of things are affirmed of wisdom. In the first place, it is shown what the ingredients or elements of wisdom are—faith, hope and knowledge (2 Pet. 1: 5). Second, the work of

wisdom is noted—planning practical things. Third, the sphere of wisdom's operation is presented—things harmonious with power, justice and love. Each one of these features of wisdom may well engage our attention. Among its ingredients—faith, hope and knowledge—the basal one is knowledge. But knowledge as the basis of wisdom is not every kind of knowledge. Sinful and erroneous knowledge is not the basis of wisdom. It is the basis of its opposite—folly. And if such knowledge is confidently and hopefully used, cunning, not wisdom, is the actor. Therefore true knowledge—the Truth—is the basis of wisdom. This is the reason that the Scriptures so frequently speak of wisdom and true knowledge connectedly, and not infrequently synonymously, when using wisdom in its narrow sense (Job 12: 12, 13; 28: 12-28; 32: 9; Prov. 1: 5, 7; 2: 1-10; 3: 13-23; 4: 4-13, 18-22; 7: 2-4; 8: 1-11; 9: 10; 14: 8; 22: 17; 23: 23; Acts 6: 10; 1 Cor. 2: 6-16). It weaves all its plans out of and in harmony with true knowledge—the Truth. This also shows the reasonableness for faith and hope as elements of wisdom acting in respect to such knowledge. Of course faith can rest upon it, and hope can desire and expect according to it. Assuredly faith can confidently use such knowledge in hope when planning practical things, and both faith and hope can act with it in planning things harmonious with power, justice and love. So God's wisdom acts. He confidently and hopefully uses His knowledge—the Truth—in every plan that He forms and makes such plans to secure practical purposes in harmony with power, justice and love. He never makes a plan by erroneous or sinful knowledge; for He could have no confidence and hope in such a plan. Nor do any of His plans—the product of wisdom—ever conflict with power, justice or love.

If we look at His plans in nature and grace as manifest in His works, we will always recognize in them that they are worked out of true knowledge, in

confidence and hope of attaining practical results, and are harmonious with power, justice and love. Contemplate for a moment God's creative works. All of them display the thought that true knowledge, confidently and hopefully used, wove the plans of which creation is the product. Creation, material and spiritual, is the marvelous product of a plan that confidently and hopefully made use of a knowledge embracing all things natural and spiritual, in all their qualities, relations, reactions, possibilities and potentialities, blended with the principles of power, justice and love. The providences that sustain such a creation are the product of similar plans similarly conceived. If we look at God's creative work as concerns man, we see here again Truth trustfully and hopefully used in forming a plan that blends in its every feature power, justice and love. In the creation of man fit for everlasting life, Divine wisdom had to solve the following problem with reference to which it was to make a practical plan, displaying the harmonious co-operation of power, justice and love: the creation of a race of free moral agents, who, from an intelligent appreciation of sin in its nature and effects and of righteousness in its nature and effects, would forever hate and avoid the former and forever love and practice the latter.

The creation of such a free moral agent implied certain conditions, *i.e.*, he could not be a machine; for that would destroy his free agency. Hence he had to be made a free agent who could choose sin, if he would, and could choose righteousness if he would. Therefore Divine wisdom had to plan for a being endowed with intellect, sensibilities and will, as well as with a physical organism. Power, justice and love demanded that he be planned as a sinless being in God's image, since it would be weak, unjust and loveless to make him sinful, and powerful, right and loving to make him good. Power, justice and love further required that he be made mortal, so that if he should sin, he could be destroyed.

Power, justice and love required that he should not live forever in sin; and they required that he should never live again unless a deliverance would be effected to the satisfaction of justice, and he would become perfectly in harmony with righteousness. Thus we see that Divine wisdom had to work out a plan for man's creation compatibly with man's free agency and God's power, justice and love. This, then, was the problem given to God's wisdom to solve. And in its solution God's foreknowledge, as well as other knowledge, supplied Him all the intelligence needed for this plan; and His faith in His knowledge and His hope to use it to plan good ends furnished Him with the planning power to work out what the Bible calls the Plan of the Ages, because its progressive development requires several ages for its full outworking.

To solve the problem, wisdom, after planning man's creation in God's image and likeness, first planned at the behest of power, justice and love that perfect man under test should prove whether he would choose good or evil. God's foreknowledge, showing wisdom, enabled Him to know that inexperienced, perfect man under a crucial test would fail and that thus, primarily at justice's demand and secondarily at power's and love's demand, man would have to give up the life that was his as a grant on condition of obedience. Wisdom, therefore, and that in harmony with power, justice and love, which variously required the death sentence, had to make a plan taking into consideration the fact and its implication that man because of sin must die. It evolved the following things as parts of this plan: (1) that man while dying for sin might, by experiencing its rigors in physical, mental, moral and religious evils, learn its hatefulness and the desirability of avoiding it; (2) that power, justice and love might by a ransom co-operate in giving man another life free from the sentence imposed for his original sin; (3) that man might be given in another life an opposite experience,

i.e., one with righteousness, from which by experience he might learn the desirability of practicing righteousness, through its healing the many physical, mental, moral and religious effects of his first experience, *i.e.*, with sin, and through its keeping him in that restored condition—perfection; (4) that man, having these two opposite experiences with their opposite effects, might be given a final trial to determine which he after this double training would choose; (5) that eternal destruction might be meted out to those who fail to practice righteousness after the double experience, and that eternal life might be given to those who would practice righteousness after these two experiences; (6) that thus sin and evil would be put eternally out of existence; and (7) that God would get what He started out to get—a perfect race of free moral agents who from an intelligent appreciation of the pertinent principles would hate and avoid sin, and would love and practice righteousness.

These were the general things that wisdom thought out to bring into existence a perfect race that from an intelligent appreciation of sin and righteousness would hate and avoid the former and love and practice the latter. The wisdom of this plan will become apparent on a little consideration. Since experience is the most thorough, though by no means the most gentle teacher, of course wisdom would arrange for its use to teach the sinful race the undesirability of sin, because of its terrible nature and fearful effects in physical, mental, moral and religious degradation. The principle herein displayed is that exemplified in the old saying, "the burnt child dreads the fire." Certainly the hatefulness of sin and the desirableness of avoiding it cannot better be inculcated than by the sinner's feeling the painful scourgings that it as a sore taskmaster gives him as its slave; especially so, if by a contrasted experience, *i.e.*, with righteousness, all the effects of the experience with sin be healed and the opposite blessing of physical,

mental, moral and religious elevation unto perfection be wrought; for after these two trainings—educations—the race, when put on final trial as to fitness for everlasting life, will be a thousandfold more likely to avoid sin and practice righteousness than was perfect Adam who had no such contrasted experiences as educators. And surely in this way more will be rendered fit to live forever in a moral universe in harmony with truth and righteousness than by any other method of which we can think. And thus by the method that Divine wisdom has suggested God will get a more numerous race to illustrate eternally the reign of moral law than by any other method of which we can think. Thus, as a general proposition, wisdom has arranged very wisely to permit but not to cause the existence of sin.

But, looked upon from the standpoint of general details, the quality of wisdom shines out in the reason for God's permitting sin. For its permission for a limited time and sphere wisely circumscribes its operation to a comparatively short time and to a comparatively few of the moral agents whose creation the Lord designed in the various Ages; for the example of fallen angels and men in their terrible experiences as a result of dabbling in sin will be sufficient as a teacher to keep back all future orders of beings from sin—a thing that we conclude from the fact that after the end of the Millennium sin never again will rear aloft its head. Again we see God's wondrous wisdom in permitting the race to fall in and by one man's offense (Rom. 5: 12-21), and sin and its effects to be transmitted from parents to children; since thereby the dreadful effects of parents' sin through heredity upon their unborn generations is exhibited as a thing that will make parents hate and avoid sin all the more because of its effects on their descendants, when once they come to the contrasted experiences with their pertinent teachings on the first experiences. Furthermore, the thought of the contagiousness of sin and its effects will in due

time help toward reformation in the contrasted experience. A still greater mark of wisdom is manifest in reducing the race's suffering to a minimum by making all fall into condemnation by one man's (Adam's) offense; for this paved the way for one, by death for the one, to save all from that condemnation by becoming an acceptable substitute to justice for the one sinner, even as justice requires a life for a life, and a perfect life for a perfect life; for if God had created as perfect human beings the estimated 20,000,000,000 humans who have lived and had put them all on trial for life individually, with no experimental or observational knowledge of sin, Adam being the example of what a perfect man under such circumstances would do, we see that all would, like him, have fallen into sin and thus incurred condemnation of their own accord. But such a contingency, in view of justice requiring a perfect life for a perfect life, would have required 20,000,000,000 perfect men as saviors to die for the 20,000,000,000 individually tried and fallen men. Thus by one master stroke wisdom saved 19,999,999,999 perfect lives and thus prevented the doubling of human sufferings by arranging for the condemning of all in one and for the redeeming of all by one, even as St. Paul in Rom. 5: 12-21 teaches. Wisdom had other objections to trying all individually and thereafter redeeming all by individual saviors; for some, yea many, of these would-be saviors might have failed. Thus not only those for whom they would have attempted to act as substitutes would not have been redeemed, but the failing ones would have needed saviors—all this increasing suffering beyond that provided for in the plan that Divine wisdom has formed. Moreover, all these saviors for their self-sacrifice would come in for as high a reward as was actually provided for our Lord in the plan. This would result in so many beings attaining to the Divine nature as would not only be too many for that plane, but also too many to make practical use of

in the future creative work of the Divine class. Wisdom, of course, forbade such a thing.

Moreover, Divine wisdom saw in the fact that the race would consist of believers and unbelievers that another practical benefit could be wrought out of the permission of sin among men. While the best that Divine wisdom could plan for the unbelief class is bringing a very large majority of them into fitness for everlasting perfect human life in earth through an experience with sin and a subsequent experience with righteousness as effective dissuaders from sin and effective persuaders to righteousness, it saw that the faith of the faith class could be so used amid the experience with evil as to develop them to such a high degree of character as would fit the very best of them for the Divine nature, and the rest of them for some spirit nature lower than the Divine. This consideration moved wisdom to plan for two salvations—a general one for the unbelief class and an elect one for the faith class. The reasonableness of this is apparent when we consider that the unbelief class cannot walk by faith—they cannot trust God out of sight—while the faith class lives out the saying, "though He slay me, yet will I trust Him." As a result the unbelief of the unbelief class makes them resort to all sorts of violations of Divine law to save themselves from acts and conditions which will bring them earthly harm or prevent their obtaining their desires, while the faith class will suffer all things rather than displease God, and endure all things in order to please Him.

Therefore Divine wisdom planned to let the former class now have its experience with evil and later its experience with good, because while evil is rampant in the world they could not stand the tests now necessary for developing the character fitted for the elective salvation; while it planned that the faith class now be tested for fitness for that salvation, since they can be loyal to God amid the most crucial tests. Faithfully

standing such tests, they can develop a much finer, stronger and fuller character than the unbelief class will be able to do as a result of their two experiences. These considerations prompted Divine wisdom to arrange for the elective feature of God's plan, whereby arrangement is made for four elect classes: the kings and priests—Jesus and the Church, and the nobles and Levites—the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. These standing trial in this life, before the world in the Millennium gets its experience with righteousness, will be fit to bless as Priests and Levites and to rule as kings and nobles the unbelief class in that experience with righteousness, unto their complete deliverance from the effects of sin, as they obey righteousness. Thus Divine wisdom planned to use the experience of evil in a second way—to develop the finest of characters in the faith class—characters that God will be able to depend on as faithful to Him and His principles under all circumstances, characters better than the unbelief class will be capable of developing through their two experiences. Accordingly, Divine wisdom has so arranged to use the experience with evil as to benefit the largest possible number and to develop each one to his highest capabilities and at the same time to destroy the incorrigible of both classes, thus insuring eventual annihilation of sin and the permanence of righteousness in the spirit and human planes of existence.

Divine wisdom planned these two salvations and their experiences as to sin and righteousness to progress in various stages through the three Worlds and the four Ages of God's plan, each World and each Age contributing its share to the plan as a whole. In *The Herald Of The Epiphany* we have traced these Worlds and Ages in a series of articles appearing from No. 21 to No. 31. A consideration of the things therein set forth shows how Divine wisdom acted in planning every feature of these Worlds and Ages. Wisdom

planned the first World to prove that fallen man, even under angelic care, could not recover from the fall or stay the corrupting influence of sin. In the second World wisdom planned to teach that fallen man left to his own resources could not stay the downward course of sin, nor free himself from the influence of evil angels. These two features of wisdom's plan proved themselves as well taken by the result. Wisdom planned the third World to prove that man's rescue can be brought about only by Divine power exercised by God's elect for the world's uplift. The Ages of the second World display especially the wisdom of God in the elective features of His plan—in dealing with an elect individual and his family on covenant basis in the Patriarchal Age, in dealing with an elect fleshly nation on covenant basis in the Jewish Age and in dealing with an elect spiritual nation on covenant basis in the Gospel Age. Mark the Divine wisdom in arranging for the carnation of the Logos, His sinless birth, His development to perfect manhood, so that He might stand as Adam's substitute, and thus rescue from the curse all condemned in Adam. Mark the wisdom of God in testing His new creature, and in perfecting it through suffering so that as a Divine Being God could depend upon Him unto the utmost to be merciful and faithful as His Vicegerent in all things. Mark the Divine wisdom in selecting for Him a Bride out of all nations, conditions and stations of men to assist Him mercifully and faithfully in carrying out all of God's designs. Mark the wisdom of God in developing and testing this class unto fitness for such a mission. Mark the varied experiences given to them as conducive to this purpose. Only in a less degree does the same wisdom show itself in selecting, developing and testing the Ancient and Youthful Worthies, and in developing and testing the Great Company. This wisdom manifests itself in working out all things for their good in fitting them for their present and future offices.

It enters into the minutest circumstances and smallest experiences and events of their lives, as well as in their general circumstances, experiences and events. Yea, indeed, wisdom devised every phase of the plan to save rebellious man and the faithful elect. And the success of the features of the plan already enacted, as well as the assured success of its as yet unfulfilled features, will forever stand sure as praise to the manifold wisdom of God.

Nor are we to think that God's wisdom will have exhausted itself in the plan for human redemption. In the numberless Ages of the future His wisdom will be ever framing plans for new creations of whose marvels we have yet but the faintest impressions. Forever will God's wisdom invent new plans and hand them to power to execute in line with justice and love. Thus endlessly will "the manifold wisdom of God" praise Him—reflect credit on Him. And let us who know His wisdom as displayed in His Plan of the Ages praise Him, the Fountain of all wisdom; for He is worthy of our highest praise!

Having in the preceding discussion in this chapter given a general description of God's attributes in their three kinds—primary, secondary and tertiary, as well as having given a general description of His higher primary attributes of character and a somewhat detailed description of the first of these, Wisdom, we now proceed to discuss the second of His higher primary attributes of character, justice. The idea of justice is closely related to that of law, which we may define as the principle that regulates the thoughts, motives, words and acts of moral agents in their relations to themselves and others. God is the ultimate Lawgiver (Jas. 3: 12) to all moral agents. And we find that He has two laws: (1) that of duty-love, justice, which applies to all His moral creatures, whether of the Elect or not; and (2) that of disinterested love, charity, which applies to Himself and to all the elect

classes and probably to all spirit beings. Accordingly, God has put all moral agents under the law of justice, and in addition to putting His Elect under it, He has also put them and likely all spirit beings under the law of love, *i.e.*, disinterested love. These two laws differ from one another as follows: the law of justice *obligates* to the good-will of *duty*; the law of love *suggests* to *disinterested* good-will. One binds all moral agents as subjects of it by their very existence to obedience; the other invites certain ones, the prospective Elect, to come under it as a privilege, without their being obligated so to do. The law of disinterested love is willingly assumed, without one's being obligated to assume it, and by its nature leads its acceptors to sacrifice their rights and privileges—a thing that the law of justice never does.

We are now ready to define justice: It is the love, the good will, that by right is owed to self and others. It is a matter of obligation, duty, to give it. To withhold such a love in thought, motive, word and act is sin; to give such a love in thought, motive, word and act is right. God's justice, therefore, is the love, goodwill, that by right He owes to Himself and others. This implies that God himself is subject to His law of justice. Justice is, therefore, impressed upon His heart as one of His attributes of character: He is not, however, subject to this in the same way as we are; for this law binds us to give Him duty-love with all the heart, mind, soul and strength, and to give our neighbor duty-love as to self. There is nobody whom God loves, or should love, with all His heart, mind, soul and strength; for such a love would make Him the subject of the one so loved; and God is not subject to anyone, since He is supreme over all. But God does love good principles with all His heart, mind, soul and strength; and this makes Him subject to good principles—He obeys His own law in its applications to Him. Nor has God any neighbor in the sense of an

equal, because He is supreme over all. His duty-love goes out to all others in the sense of their being His creatures—creations—and to perfect moral agents in the sense that they are His children. His justice did not obligate Him to make any creature; for creating beings is a work of grace on God's part, not of obligation. Nor is He obligated to make all creatures equal, He having the right to make some divine, others angelic, others human, others brute, others vegetable and still others inanimate (Rom. 9: 20, 21). But having once decided to make free moral agents, His justice, duty-love, does obligate Him to make them perfect, sinless and righteous (Gen. 18: 25); otherwise He would be the author of imperfection and sin, which He is not (Deut. 32: 4). Some angels and all men being now sinful, does not militate against this principle, since when they came from God's creative hand they were perfect, sinless and righteous (Eccl. 7: 29). Beings lower than man are not free moral agents, hence the Creator in making them saw that other principles than ethical ones should underlie their being—principles like utility and service to man and his habitat, after performing which, they pass away forever; nor is this cruel toward them, since not having a high mentality and a delicate nervous system they are incapable of appreciating, feeling and suffering acutely like man.

The justice of God, His duty-love, toward His perfect, sinless and righteous creatures, obligates Him to a second thing, and that is to put them under perfect, happifying, useful and prosperous conditions, so that they may have a perfect, happy, useful and prosperous existence. In harmony with this activity of God's justice He has put the heavenly hosts in their original perfection amid perfect, sinless, useful and prosperous conditions. So did He also do with the human family as represented in Adam and Eve; for the garden of Eden furnished just such conditions.

And when mankind attains restitution and the privilege of everlasting life, and when the repentant fallen angels shall be restored to God's favor, they will again find themselves amid perfect conditions. This feature of justice does not require that fallen men and angels be kept in such conditions, because another feature of God's justice requires another method of dealing.

This other feature of God's justice, or duty-love to His creatures, requires that in case they sin, they be deprived of life; because in a moral order of affairs, to give sinners everlasting life would injure them by keeping them alive in unhappiness forever, which the Creator's duty-love to them forbids, which would injure the righteous in their happiness, which God's justice will not permit, and which would be dishonoring to God, which God's justice to Himself and others will not permit. Hence the justice of God requires the death and forbids the eternal torment of the sinner (Gen. 2: 17; Rom. 1: 32; 5: 12, 15, 17; 6: 16, 21, 23; 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22, 56; Jas. 1: 15; 1 John 5: 16), and that out of duty-love to all concerned. Therefore justice punishes the wrong-doer to the intent that wrongdoing cease. It will be noted that in our definition of God's justice, as well as in our discussion of its three spheres of activity, we have held out the thought that God's justice is, and acts in harmony with, duty-love. Justice, neither in God nor in His moral agents, is a feelingless thing. It is a feelingful thing; for it has in it good-will, the good-will of duty. It is not simply duty. It is not simply a perfunctory external act. It is something hearty, but has not the heartiness of charity. It is duty-love, and not the loveless sense of duty or obligation simply, as some think. This is apparent when we note that the law of justice, binding on all God's moral agents, is supreme love to God and equal love to one's fellows.

God's justice, as one of His four higher primary attributes of character, has had a determining influence

on the various features of God's plan towards angels and men. It, therefore, required that, as these came from God's creative hand, they be perfect, sinless and righteous, and that they be given surroundings and works conducive to their lasting happiness, righteousness, usefulness and prosperity. Such were the conditions in heaven, the abode of the various orders of angels, and such were the conditions in Eden, the abode of sinless man. But God's justice required under test the proof of men's and angels' loyalty to Him; and that under such conditions as made it possible to be given. That is, God created both angels and men good (Gen. 1: 31), and thus strongly inclined to righteousness and strongly adverse to unrighteousness, so that if they would sin, it would be against the trend of their moral natures. They therefore were favorably created as to such a test. Again, the test was of such a character as they were able to bear up under. Furthermore, man was given clear instructions as to the nature of the test, obedience, the desirability of being faithful and the undesirability of being unfaithful thereunder, resulting in life for obedience and death for disobedience. Thus God's justice showed itself in the trial itself. A trial so justly conducted could in justice not be expected to end otherwise than God's justice demanded when disobedience set it—the sentence of death for man. Apart from Satan the fallen angels evidently sinned not, until deceived into assuming human bodies, marrying women and raising families in the hope of being thus enabled to extirpate sin from the human family. Hence, instead of being put under the death sentence, they were imprisoned within the atmosphere of this earth (Jude 6; 2 Pet. 2: 4; Eph. 2: 2) until the judgment day; but in their final trial the sentence will be of life or death. The justice of demanding death as the penalty of sin is evident from the following consideration: Since God offered moral agents life on condition of obedience, if the condition

is refused to be fulfilled by the conditional recipient, the conditional Giver has a perfect right to take back the conditional gift. And since He takes it back for the good of all concerned, He is just in sentencing the disobedient to death—to the withdrawal of the conditional gift. Thus God's justice in the sentence is vindicated.

So, too, is He just in letting come upon Adam's race by heredity Adam's condemnation (Rom. 5: 12, 15-19). Adam, having by his sin forfeited his right to life and its conjoined light-rights, no longer possessed them, and therefore could not transmit them to his posterity. He could transmit to his children only what he had—*forfeited life-rights and right to life*. That Divine justice did them no wrong therein is evident from the fact that He is not obligated to give perfection, sinlessness and happiness to that which is imperfect and sinful, since only to perfectly sinless and righteous beings does justice obligate Him to give perfection. Furthermore, they are not God's direct creation, being the progeny of sinful Adam; and thus God did not create them. Finally, they have no right to complain of injustice in their coming into existence imperfect, sinful and sentenced to death through Adam; for had they been in his place they would have done what he did; and since they get in the permission of evil certain advantages that they would not have gotten had they been individually tried and sentenced (*e.g.*, they suffer on the average much less than they would have done if they had directly forfeited life-rights and the right to life, even as perfect Adam suffered more than we do under the curse), no injustice has come to the race in its being condemned in Adam. Thus the death penalty transmitted by heredity is no injustice to man; but had the penalty been eternal torment, as the creeds of the dark ages teach, there would have been a violation of justice in placing a severer penalty on sin than justice requires. Thus God's penalty is just in its application to the whole race.

Some people have had more or less difficulty in harmonizing with the justice of God great calamities like the flood, the destruction of Sodom, etc., of the firstborn of Egypt, of Pharaoh's host, and God's charge to extirpate whole nations, like the nations of Canaan, the Amalekites, etc. The following considerations will show that there was no injustice in these things on God's part. In the first place, all of these being justly under the death sentence, it would make little difference whether they had been taken away suddenly in a calamity, or whether they had died by inches through disease. Usually their sufferings in such calamities have been less severe than those of such as died of lingering sickness. Hence they were in reality much more leniently dealt with than had they died the ordinary death of man. Moreover, such a calamitous death will, when they return for their opportunity for restitution, arouse them to greater hatred of sin and make them more amenable to righteousness. Further, their catastrophic end has been used by the Lord to work types of future events, which will make them result in ultimate blessing to their sufferers and to others. Then, too, in the case of the seven nations of Canaan, the Amalekites and others, archeological finds prove them to have been almost wholly afflicted with syphilis, which they were spreading to other nations; and to prevent this great evil from spreading to other nations, it was a mercy to all concerned to destroy them. Let us remember that for mankind in general evil has been permitted to teach them the hatefulness of sin in its nature and effects and the desirability of avoiding it, and to make them all the more appreciative of righteousness when by contrast with the terrible nature and awful effects of sin they learn by experience the blessed nature and effects of righteousness. This kept in mind will make clear to us not only the permission of evil in general, but of particular and great calamities,

and thus will vindicate God's justice in connection with their permission.

The justice of God was active in connection with the ransom for Adam and his race. As God was just in condemning Adam and his race for sin, *i.e.*, when Adam refused to fulfill the condition on which the grant of life might be continued with him, the Giver was right in taking it from him, so without a complete satisfaction of justice it could not allow him to receive it again. Sinful man could not give this satisfaction since he was himself unsatisfactory to God by reason of his sinfulness and the sentence resting upon him, and dead men could not give a ransom, because they can do nothing (Eccl. 9: 5, 6, 10); additionally they are under the sentence of death and hence unsatisfactory to justice. Therefore wisdom planned to transfer God's Son from the spirit to the human plane of being, and by arranging for this transfer from one nature to another the necessity of having a human father for our Lord was avoided. Such avoidance justice insisted upon, because the condemned life coming through the father, for Jesus to have had a human father would have brought Him under sin and condemnation—hence unsatisfactory to God's justice as a substitute—a ransom for Adam and his race (Matt. 20: 28; 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6). Justice did not require, but was satisfied for the pre-human Word to become flesh—human (John 1: 14), because justice does not demand sacrifice, but will accept it when the sacrificer willingly gives up his rights in devotion to the Lord, provided the sacrificer in the long run does not become the loser by such sacrificial devotion to the Lord. But in the carnation of the Logos—the Word—the Greek name for our pre-human Lord Jesus, justice did insist on two things: (1) that the Word in becoming flesh should not thereby become sinful; for it would have been wrong to make a sinless being sinful; and (2) that He as a human being should be an exact equivalent

or ransom—a corresponding price—for Adam and his race. Both of these conditions were fulfilled to the entire satisfaction of justice in the carnation of God's Son.

Let us pause awhile and see the exercise of Jehovah's justice in connection with the ransom, which word is the translation of the Greek word *anti-lutron*, literally *a price instead, i.e.*, a corresponding price. In the ransom, which is decidedly a commercial transaction, a number of things are implied: (1) a debt consisting of Adam's right to human life with its conjoined life-rights; (2) a debtor—Adam and the unborn race in his loins at the time of his sin; (3) a creditor—God; (4) the method of collecting the debt—the surrender of the debtor's all by death to the Creditor; (5) a friend of the debtor and the Creditor who agrees to buy the debtor from the Creditor by paying his debt; (6) the purchase-price, consisting of Jesus' right to human life and its conjoined life-rights; and (7) the method of making the purchase-price available for the purchase—Jesus' death, and the actual purchasing of Adam and his race by paying to Divine justice the price itself. In these seven points we see the operation of justice. By sin Adam forfeited for himself and his race the right to life and its conjoined life-rights, both of which were conditionally granted him by his Creator. Forfeiting by his sin to Divine justice all that he was and had, because such was his debt, the collection of the debt was made through the dying process thoroughly operated on him unto the death state. Thus Divine justice exacted and received the debt. Be it noted that the dying process was simply the way of collecting the debt, the debt being all Adam was and had—a perfect human being, with the right to life and its associated life-rights. In Adam's remaining in the death state justice has in its possession the debt payment. That debt payment justice, because of its very nature, cannot release, unless a substitute payment is

given in its stead. Divine love at the suggestion of Divine wisdom gave (John 3: 16) the Logos to become a perfect man, with the right to human life and its pertinent life-rights, and thus furnished an exact equivalent to the debt that involved Adam and his race before Divine justice. Therefore it could accept this equivalent for the debt, and thus cancel the latter so far as Adam and his race are concerned. Jesus' death was the way by which He divested Himself of His personal use of His perfect humanity with its right to life and life-rights, and thereby He made the ransom price available for the payment of Adam's debt. Instead of accepting the price for the whole race during the Gospel Age, God, on account of the elective features of His plan now working, accepts it by imputation for the elect ones' deliverance from the debt, and in the Millennium will accept it in payment for Adam and the non-elect members of his race. Thus the ransom in its relation to Divine justice is its perfect revelation.

In considering the exactness of justice in relation to the debt and the ransom therefrom, it is very necessary to keep in mind the nature of the ransom—a corresponding price—an exact equivalent. The law of justice pertinent to this subject is stated in the words, "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot" (Deut. 19: 21). That is, justice insists on an exact equivalent for a debt. If the debt be a perfect human being, with the right to human life and human life-rights, it cannot from justice's standpoint be paid for by less than a perfect human being with the right to human life and human life-rights. While love may not exact a full payment, justice must; hence no imperfect being, with cancelled right to life and its life-rights, could redeem Adam and his race (Ps. 49: 7, 8); for he would not be a corresponding price. Therefore the Redeemer could not derive His life from Adam; for so to have done would have made

Him a sinner and less than a ransom. Thus justice could not be satisfied by less than the corresponding price—the ransom. Love prevailed unto the satisfaction of justice by giving the pre-human Logos to become a perfect man born of a woman, but not begotten by a man. On the other hand, justice could not take as the Redeemer one more than a perfect man; with more than the human life-rights and right to life. Therefore the Logos had to cease being the mighty spirit being through whom all things were made, and become a man (John 1: 1-3, 14; 2 Cor. 8: 9; Phil. 2: 6-8; Heb. 2: 9, 14). Thus when the Logos became a human being He ceased being a spirit being—changed in nature, just as the water that became wine ceased being water—was changed in its nature into that of wine. For Him to have remained the mighty Logos would have made impossible the ransom; for in such a case the person offered as a ransom would have been more than a corresponding price to the debt, and justice would have rejected this just as completely as it rejected sacrifices less than that of a perfect man (Heb. 10: 4), they not being a corresponding price. Thus we see how the justice of God demanded that the Redeemer be no more and no less than a perfect man, with the right to life and its pertinent life-rights.

In the reward of glory, honor and immortality given the Redeemer for His faithful and loving sacrifice, God's justice was satisfied. His justice did not give Him this reward. It was His love that gave it; but His justice was satisfied for Him to have it: first, because no principle of justice was thereby violated, and, second, because the interests of justice could thereby be advanced. Had such a reward—the bestowal of the Divine nature and heirship of God, Vicegerency for God throughout the universe (Matt. 28: 18)—been given without His having been proven worthy to receive it, and without His having been demonstrated as proof against abusing it, justice would have interposed

objections to it, and it would not have been bestowed; for Divine love never works against Divine justice. Christ's present ministry for the Church is, and His future ministry for the world, to say nothing of what will come afterward, will be an everlasting honor to the operation of Divine justice. Thus we see in connection with Christ's personal reward for His sacrifice a manifestation of God's justice, though the principal actors therein were God's love and power.

In the use of the ransom-price for the deliverance of the Church now from the Adamic sentence, we further see the operation of Divine justice. The Church is not now actually, but only reckonedly bought by Christ from Divine justice, *i.e.*, instead of Jesus now actually buying the Church, He actually makes a reckoned purchase of her by the imputation on her behalf of the merit of the ransom-price, which at His death for this very purpose He deposited with the Father (Luke 23: 46). The following is the literal translation and sense of Luke 23: 46: "Father, into Thy hands [at Thy disposal] I deposit My spirit [right to life]." This deposit was made so that He could impute for all that come to God by Him during the Gospel Age His merit for a covering of their Adamic sentence and its effects. To impute in such a case means reckonedly to purchase. Thus Jesus having enough on deposit with Divine justice to cover the debt of the entire race, He can impute the merit of the ransom-price to anyone of the race for his deliverance from this debt. And so far as God's justice is concerned, this is as satisfactory as an outright purchase, since it holds the full price of the purchase in hand anyway; and thus it is satisfied to sell us to Jesus reckonedly, since that is about one and the same thing as an outright purchase, so long as justice holds in its power the full price. But why are we now purchased reckonedly as distinct from the world's being actually purchased in the Millennium? The right answer to this will show that only so could

the world later be purchased; for since the same debt is held against every member of the race individually as well as against the whole race collectively (for it is Adam's debt that is against all of us and every one of us), it takes as much to redeem one as a million, or a billion, or twenty billion, or the whole race. Consequently, had Jesus made an outright purchase of the Church during the Gospel Age, it would have exhausted the entire ransom-price and, as a result, no ransom-price would be available for the world in the Millennium, which would mean that there would be nothing with which to purchase them, and consequently they would never be redeemed; while an imputation of a deposit—a loan of credit—still leaves Jesus the owner of the deposit to be used otherwise after the entire Church's death, when the imputation is no more needed, and the deposit is released from it.

Thus to prevent the ransom-price from being made unavailable for the world, Divine wisdom devised the expedient of a reckoned purchase for the Church in the form of an imputation of the merit of the ransom-price for the Church, with the ransom-price deposited with the Creditor—God's justice—as a guarantee. This guarantee being the exact amount of the debt and being put into the power of justice, it is just as satisfied with all in whose interest it is imputed as though they were purchased outright. This imputation is to make the Church in her humanity acceptable to God as sacrifices through Jesus Christ (Rom. 12: 1; Heb. 13: 15; 1 Pet. 2: 5). Thereby is given us the privilege of undergoing, as the Elect, preparation for the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ, whereby we may as Christ's associates help the world to return to God in the Millennium. But one may ask, Why is this imputation made as a guarantee? We answer, Divine justice holds us as debtors unto death for Adam's sin. And that sentence must be exacted from us or from a substitute. In harmony with the Divine program,

which arranges for the death of the Church sacrificially, Jesus guarantees to Divine justice that He will keep the faithful acceptable while undergoing sacrifice unto death. To qualify her for such a death she must be reckoned perfect despite her actual imperfection. This reckoned perfection is attained by the reckoned purchase—the imputation of the merit of Christ's ransom-price to her; and at the same time it guarantees to God's justice that which it holds against us—our share in Adam's debt. Thus throughout our sacrificial course we are kept acceptable to God as sacrifices, and Divine justice is guaranteed as to the Adamic debt against us by the same ransom-merit. And the thing imputed for us being the exact equivalent of the debt, God's justice, having it in its possession, is as satisfied with a reckoned purchase as with an actual purchase, which if now made for the Church would destroy hope for the world. Surely in this feature of the Divine Plan we see the activity of justice; and His wisdom and love therein manifested make us praise, worship, adore, love and serve our God and Father, who has done all things so very well. No wonder that the ransom is the center of God's Plan! No wonder that in it more than in anything else God's Wisdom, Justice, Love and Power shine forth in resplendent glory!

"In the cross of Christ I glory,
Towering o'er the wrecks of time,
All the light of sacred story
Gathers 'round its head sublime."

There is another phase in the operation of justice toward the righteous,—in so far as God's arranging for their sufferings is concerned. Apart from our Lord Jesus, doubtless all the righteous, like the rest of mankind, suffer more or less for their faults, which all will at once recognize as just; for every transgression should receive a just recompense of reward. But the righteous also suffer for their righteousness, *e. g.*,

Jesus, the Apostles and all other godly servants of God (Matt. 5: 10-12; Acts 14: 22; 2 Tim. 3: 12). In Jesus' case we have seen that justice did not demand that He suffer for others, but accepted His willingness to suffer for them. So it was Himself who freely gave up His personal rights and willingly suffered for others. Thus justice did Him no wrong in permitting Him to suffer for righteousness in the interests of the race. But how about the other righteous? Does not justice wrong them in permitting them to suffer for righteousness? We answer, No, because like Jesus they freely offer themselves to God as sacrifices in the interests of righteousness, counting it a privilege so to suffer (1 Pet. 2: 19-24; 4: 12-14, 16, 19). God does not any more demand of them that they suffer for righteousness than He demanded of Jesus that He so suffer. In both cases a voluntary and joyful sacrifice was offered to God. Hence the Bible speaks of us as suffering with Jesus and drinking of His cup—as being His associates and partners in suffering (Rom. 6: 3-11; 8: 17; 2 Cor. 1: 5; Gal. 2: 20; Col. 1: 24; 2 Tim. 2: 10-12; Mark 12: 35-39). Covered with His righteousness (Rom 10: 4), we are acceptable sacrifices with Him (Rom. 12: 1; 1 Pet. 2: 5). We deem it a joy and a privilege so to suffer, and would consider it a supreme calamity, if refused the opportunity so to do. Therefore justice does not wrong us in arranging for our suffering for righteousness, but does what we desire to have, and it is pleased to accept such sufferings as a sweet-smelling savor (2 Cor. 2: 14-17; Phil. 4: 18). Accordingly God's justice is vindicated in His arranging for the righteous to suffer for righteousness.

The great tribulation with which the Jewish Age ended, and the still greater tribulation with which this Age is ending (beginning with the World War, shortly to progress through the World Revolution and to culminate in the World Anarchy and Jacob's Trouble, famines and pestilences accompanying all stages of

this trouble) are spheres in which God's justice acted and is acting. One may ask, How could justice inflict such exemplary punishments? We answer: While Jesus' death provides for the cancellation of the Adamic sin for those in whose interests it is used—for the Church now and for the world in the Millennium—it does not cleanse from the willfulness of any sin, apart from Adam's. Wholly willful sin brings eternal destruction on its committers, who can be those only on whose behalf the ransom merit has been used—the Church now, and the world in the Millennium (Heb. 10: 26-29). But there are mixed sins—sins that are partly due to Adamic weakness and partly due to willfulness. The weakness in such sins is taken care of through the ransom, but their willfulness is not. The latter must be expiated by stripes (Luke 12: 47). Justice requires the punishment of such willfulness, and that in the interests of all concerned—such striping being reformatory in its purpose. The Jews at the end of their Age were very willful in much of their wickedness; therefore wrath—punishment—came to them unto the uttermost (1 Thes. 2: 16). When those Jews come back in the Millennium and recognize the character of their punishment, they will be thereby helped to reform. The same is true in principle of our generation. Never did any generation have so much light, privilege and opportunity to do good as ours; yet the vast majority go on with a large measure of willfulness in evil doing, *e.g.*, undoubtedly the wrongs against better knowledge wrought by the European nations against one another brought about the World War, by which all of them were severely punished. When the present tribulation will be ended, those remaining alive will by it be humbled into yielding obedience to the Kingdom; while those who die in it will, on their return by an understanding of it be helped to reform. Thus the tribulation will beat out of their characters the willfulness that they developed, and thus

justice will be satisfied and they will be benefited. So is God's justice vindicated in its dealings with Jews and Christians who have sinned in measurable willfulness against the light and privilege of their respective Dispensations or Ages.

Some have difficulty in seeing that God is just in inflicting the Adamic death upon the race since Jesus' death, whereby He has provided the ransom-price. Why, they ask, has Adamic death not ceased since He died, if He died as a ransom for all? To this we reply: It is one thing to provide the ransom-price, which Jesus did by His death; it is another thing to pay over that price in the purchase of the race. Jesus' resurrection as a spirit being put Him into a position where He no more needed His perfect humanity, with its right to life and its life-rights, for Himself. He therefore could from that time on use them as an asset in the interests of others. Thus He could from that time on use them to buy Adam and Adam's race. But instead of using them in that way, though He is the propitiation for the world's sins as well as for the Church's (1 John 2: 2), He has during the Gospel Age been reckonedly buying only the Church (Heb. 9: 24), for whom only He has appeared in God's presence; just as Aaron's first typical appearance with the typical blood was for the types of the Church only—the priests and Levites (Lev. 16: 6). Hence the world, not yet being purchased, is under the Adamic sentence, and thus is dying for Adam's sin at the demand of justice. They are to be purchased in the Millennium, when Christ will appear the second time in the presence of God with His merit, just as at Aaron's second typical appearing in the Holy of Holies with the typical blood for the types of the world—all the people of Israel—the atonement was made for the people, as distinct from priests and Levites (Lev. 16: 15). The two appearances of Aaron in the Holy of Holies for the two classes in Israel were furnished by

God to type the two appearances of Christ in heaven for the two classes in the human family, the time of Aaron's first appearing typing the Gospel Age, when Christ appears before God for the Church, and the time of his second appearing typing the Millennium, when Christ will appear before God for the world and ransom—buy—them. Thus there is justice in God's exacting the Adamic sentence from the world, since the world is not yet purchased from the Adamic death. But, some object, why does the Church die the Adamic death in spite of its being reckonedly purchased? We answer: The Church does not die the Adamic death; for by the imputation of the merit of the ransom-price the Church has been justified from that death by justice itself (Heb. 10: 14); hence it does not exact that death from the Church. The death which the Church is dying is the sacrificial death, as we showed above, which is not exacted by justice, but is freely and gladly undergone by the Church with Christ, in sacrifice for the world.

The next stage for the play of justice will be its release of the deposited purchase-price from the embargo that the reckoned purchase of the Church placed upon it; for as long as it has against it the claims of the reckoned purchase, justice holds it, as it were, mortgaged for the Church, and therefore will not let it go for the purchase of the world until these mortgage claims are removed from it. When the humanity of all who have had this reckoned purchase made for them is dead, they will no more need the imputed merit to free them from the Adamic death, since when they return they will return from death as spirit beings. Thus at the death of each of these the imputed purchase is no longer needed for him, and thus the embargo is lifted from his share of the purchase-price. Consequently when all of these are dead, the embargo on the deposited ransom-price is entirely lifted; for then there are no more imputations outstanding. Hence

the deposited ransom-price will be Christ's, without any claim against it for what He has done for the Church. It will then be free from all claims against it, and as such can be used by Christ in actually purchasing from justice Adam and his race. This will be done at Christ's second—the Millennial—appearing in heaven, and that for the world, whose propitiation He is, as well as that of the Church (1 John 2: 2). On receiving the price, justice will hand over the world to Christ as His purchased possession, free from the Adamic sentence. As a result, the Adamic death sentence being cancelled, Jesus will raise mankind out of death, free from the death sentence. And His ownership of the world Jesus will use to give the world the Millennial opportunities of restitution. And whoever faithfully obeys Christ will be restored to the original perfection of Adam. Those who will not even outwardly obey will by Jesus, acting as the Agent of justice, be put to death, and that eternally, after 100 years' opportunity (Is. 65: 20). Those who obey only externally, and not from the heart, will be destroyed by God's justice, when after a final trial at the end of the Millennium, they openly sin under Satan's lead (Rev. 20: 7-9). This is just in the case of both of these classes of sinners; for they alike will refuse to use life upon the condition on which justice, its giver, will require it to be used; it will also save them from eternal unhappiness, and prevent their making the righteous eternally unhappy. Therefore, justly will it withdraw the conditional gift. But the obedient of the Millennium will be granted everlasting life in the perfected earth by justice, because they will have fulfilled the condition upon which its continuance is granted; and because they will use their privileges for mutual good and God's honor.

Thus the entire plan of God is in harmony with, and marvelously displays, His justice. And as we look over the operation of Divine justice, as presented

above, from the creation of Adam until God's plan has reached its complete fulfillment in the eternal annihilation of the incorrigible and in the everlasting bliss of the obedient, we may well cry out in wonder, praise and adoration: "Just and true are all Thy ways, thou King of Ages" (Rev. 15: 3)! We may also be sure that in the plans that He will work out for His future creations in the universe about this earth, there will be in them a similar harmony with, and display of, His justice, His throne's foundation (Ps. 89: 14).

We now proceed to the study of the third of God's higher primary graces, *i.e.*, charity, or as we usually call it in more modern speech, love. It is regrettable that the word *charity* has suffered a degradation in meaning from that prevalent formerly; for instead of its being usually employed in the noble sense of former times, it is now used mostly to represent alms and alm-deeds. The reason we regret the almost entire disuse of the word *charity* in its noble sense and the substitution of the noun *love* in its place, is because love is a broader term than charity, which is only one kind of love. The noun *love* is in both the Authorized and Revised Versions used for the love of justice and also for the love of charity. The original Greek uses two different nouns for these two forms of love—*philia* for the love of justice, and *agape* for the love of charity. But since we have in English only the one verb to express the action of loving in justice and in charity, we will in our article treat of the attribute of *charity*, under the term *love*. For clearness' sake we will define its two forms. The love of justice is duty-love, the love of charity is disinterested love. By duty-love the love that is by right owed to others is meant; and by disinterested love the love that, apart from obligation, is given out of a delight in good principles is meant. In a preceding portion of this chapter we treated of the former, now we propose to treat of the latter. Disinterested love, therefore, is the sense in

which we use the word *love* as God's third higher primary character attribute.

What is love in its wider sense? We answer that it is good-will. This definition fits both the love of justice and the love of charity. The reason that we define love as good-will is because it is the only quality that never disappears from the idea or expression of love. Therefore it must be its essence. Love may express itself in a variety of forms each one of which may exclude all other forms, but never is the idea of goodwill excluded from it. Thus a father desiring to benefit a wayward child may give him a severe beating. Hence from the father's act, gentleness, leniency, longsuffering, forbearance and forgiveness—various manifestations of love—are absent, but good-will is present. A man refusing alms to a proven unworthy subject in order to reform him is not expressing liberality, but is expressing good-will. The parent sending an oft disobedient child to bed early and supperless so as to better its conduct is not expressing kindness, but is expressing good-will. Jesus' rebuking the Pharisees and driving out the defilers of the temple did not show politeness, but did show good-will. Thus there are many expressions of love in which this, that or the other grace is lacking; but never can there be an expression of love without good-will. This being the case, love must be good-will. Disinterested love—charity—is therefore disinterested good-will, and duty-love—justice—is duty-good-will. What, then, is disinterested love or good-will? We once asked this question of a member of a Bible class, and were told that it is the love or good-will in which we have no interest in another. On our asking how we could love at all, if not interested in others, the error in the answer became apparent. The answerer was looking at the wrong party for the one in whom no interest was had. It is the actor who is disinterested in self, but is interested unselfishly, from love of good principles, in others,

when exercising disinterested love. Disinterested love is an unselfish love that goes out to others in good-will, regardless of consequences or sacrifices brought upon self thereby. In duty-love there is always an element of natural, but not sinful, selfishness. Thus in duty-love we love God *for the good He has done us*, and we love our neighbor *as we would have him love us*; but in disinterested love we love God and others, because we delight in good principles, and that apart from any selfish consideration. This is the quality in God that we understand to be meant by the third attribute among His higher primary graces. Such a love in God is referred to in many Scriptures, *e.g.*, John 3: 16; 14: 21, 23; 17: 23, 26; Rom. 5: 8; 2 Cor. 9: 7; Eph. 2: 4; Tit. 3: 4; 1 John 3: 1; 4: 8-10, 12, 16, 19; Jude 21.

God's disinterested love, like ours, is based on a delight in good principles (Jer. 9: 24; Ps. 1: 2; 40: 8; 45: 7). Therefore the first element in God's love is delight in, or appreciation of, good principles. He delights in, *i.e.*, appreciates, them because they are good. Therefore He abhors and is grieved at bad principles in themselves and in action (Gen. 6: 6). Based upon this delight in good principles is a second element in God's love—delight in, *i.e.*, appreciation of, those who are in harmony with good principles (Ps. 146: 8; Prov. 15: 8, 9; 11: 2; 12: 22; John 14: 21, 23). Hence He abhors totally wicked persons proven irreformable after full opportunity (Lev. 26: 30; Ps. 5: 6). Based upon this delight in good principles is also a third element in God's love—sympathy with the righteous and pity for the unrighteous. This sympathy with the righteous first of all feels at one with them, *i.e.*, is in heart unison with them (John 17: 11, 21, 23, 26). Then it feels with them when they are treated by others out of harmony with good principles (Is. 63: 9; Rev. 6: 9-11). And, finally, it feels for them in whatever disharmony with good principles they may have (Ps. 103: 13-18). It also pities the unrighteous in their disharmonies

with good principles, in their resultant sufferings and in their being treated out of harmony with good principles (Ex. 34: 6, 7; Judges 10: 16; 2 Kings 13: 23; Ps. 78: 38, 39; Is. 63: 9; Lam. 3: 22; Jas. 5: 11). As a final and fourth element of love, it delights, from the above described appreciation and sympathy or pity, to sacrifice in order to further good principles in and for others, thereby seeking to bring them into harmony with good principles, and to oppose wrong principles for the rescue of others from their evil nature and effect. From this analysis of love into its four component parts, we recognize that it is not gush or sentimentality, but is one of the noblest, yea, the very noblest of all good qualities. "The greatest of these is charity"—love. Love in God's character is of the highest possible kind. It adorns His character more than any other of His character attributes.

All of God's acts, some more, some less, manifest His love in one or more of its four elements. This will appear from a consideration of His acts. His creative acts are all more or less expressions of love; for in ultimate analysis creation exists as a product of, and a sphere for the activity of God's love in the blessing of beings in harmony with good principles. Yea, He made all things for His pleasure, *i.e.*, the pleasure of doing good (Rev. 4: 11). Do we look above us at the starry heavens? In them we see worlds that God is preparing for the abode of holy beings whom it will be His pleasure to make in order to exemplify forever the reign of good principles. Do we look at our own planet? In it we see a future home for a sin-rescued and holy race forever one with God along lines of good principles. Do we behold His providences? They are working together for good now for the Church and later for the world. Does He give sunshine to the good and the evil, and does He send rain upon the just and the unjust? It is to help them on toward harmony with good principles. Yea, all His creative and

providential works in nature display as well as flow out of His love, even if not exclusively so.

This is also manifest in man's original creation. His delight in good principles prompted Him to make man very good—in His image and likeness (Gen. 1: 26-28, 31). It was a loving thing in God to make man good in all his faculties of body, mind and heart, and thus endowed with happiness. It was a loving thing in God to surround man with everything that ministered to his well being and happiness. Flower and fruit, light and warmth, air and water, earth and sky, vegetable and animal, man and woman, life and health, perfection of being and fellowship with God, were one and all gifts of love to man from His loving Creator. God's intention in all this was to advance man in harmony with good principles. Thus love shines out in God's creative work in and for man. This is also apparent in God's work toward man on trial. It was disinterested love that sought by man's trial to advance him unto crystallization of character and thus to fitness for everlasting manifestation of harmony with good principles. Love saw to it that the conditions of the trial were such as would have contributed to this end, had man remained faithful in the trial; and when man failed, love agreed to the death sentence as a means to prevent man's living forever in suffering and sin, which would have meant eternal torment and eternal existence of sin—things that of course God's love would not permit.

We see Divine love in the permission of evil. Ardently desiring good principles forever to reign, and being informed by Divine wisdom that the reign of evil would educate man as to the hatefulness of sin and the desirability of avoiding it, by teaching him through experience its terrible nature and effects, Divine love was willing to consent to the permission of evil, if ultimately God could effect good from it. All the more so was Divine love willing to consent to it when apprized by Divine wisdom that Divine love would, after

man's experience with evil, be given the opportunity to favor man with an experience with righteousness, which would heal him, as he would obey, from all the effects of the experience with evil and restore him to God's image and likeness. Since Divine love delights to spread good principles, it was of course delighted to consent to man's experience with evil, seeing that by the two above experiences it could be used to advance good in man.

In the meantime Divine love compatibly with the rights of justice was glad to draw into fellowship with God, and thus to advance good principles, those who, while evil prevailed in the world, felt after God and longed for fellowship with Him. Thus it delighted to help Abel into fellowship with God, Enoch to walk with God, and Noah, a preacher of righteousness, to witness for God amid a crooked and perverse generation. It was glad to bring the latter and his family safely through the flood to make a new start toward righteousness for mankind under the second dispensation. It took pleasure in drawing Abraham to the Lord until he became the trusted friend of God. It was glad to bless him and his descendants with covenant relations with God, inasmuch as this would not only keep some truth and righteousness alive, but would prepare the faithful of these as Ancient Worthies for participation in the great work of deliverance. Thus Divine love labored with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph unto this end. Moreover God's love acted toward Israel in making a covenant with them—the Mosaic Covenant. Not that it gave them life thereby, but that it gave them thereby further revelations fruitful in the spread of truth and righteousness among them, gave them a knowledge of their sins and sinfulness, brought the faithful among them to see that by their own best endeavors they were unable to save themselves, worked in them an intense longing for the promised Savior, prepared them to receive Him, helped the faithful

among them to qualify for Ancient Worthies and helped the measurably faithful among them to be fit for the first place among the world of mankind in the Restitution Age. Further, Divine love, so far as this was in harmony with justice, to whose demands it must ever defer, forgave sinning and backsliding Israel whenever it would repent, aroused movements conducive to repentance, blessed them with new revelations and ministries of the prophets and blessed their experiences and chastisements unto the furtherance of good principles. Thus throughout the Jewish Age, in which justice was the chief actor toward Israel, love wrought many a thing conducive to the spread of good principles. Love was delighted with the loyalty to faith and righteousness manifested therein. Hence Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Daniel and many others were highly esteemed by God, and His appreciation, sympathy and services toward them were abundant. Hebrews 11 shows how His disinterested love acted toward these. Then, too, God's love in its form of sympathy repeatedly had compassion on His people under oppression, *e.g.*, by the Egyptians, Midianites, Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, Syrians, etc., and out of such sympathy effected their deliverance. Furthermore it showed itself in His sending faithful prophets to remonstrate against the wickedness of Israelites and to call them to repentance and renewed fellowship with God. The missions of Elijah, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah and John the Baptist are illustrative of this. Beautifully is His love on this head, described in Jeremiah in the language, "rising early and sending them"—the prophets.

As the Jewish Age was ending Jehovah exercised the greatest expression of love ever manifested—making His only begotten Son human and giving Him up to the most shameful and painful death on behalf of His enemies (John 1: 14; 3: 16, 17; Rom. 5: 6-10). Only a good, loyal father who has an only and very

well beloved and promising son, if called upon to give him up to degradation and a shameful and painful death on behalf of enemies, could come to the nearest realization of what this meant to Jehovah. God's power to love is greater than we can imagine. His only begotten Son was His delight (Prov. 8: 30; Matt. 3: 17). In Him were the Father's ambitions centered. His companionship and co-operation gave the Father the most intense pleasure. He was continually making plans and entrusting them to the Son to execute, which He always did faithfully and efficiently. No wonder that the Father loved and favored chiefly His only begotten Son, who above all others had proven His faithfulness, trustworthiness and efficiency. No wonder that the Father greatly appreciated the Son, who brought all creation, animate and inanimate, earthly and heavenly, into existence and efficiently and faithfully superintended their preservation and activities. The love, appreciation and confidence of the Father toward such a Son was great.

On the other hand, those for whom the Father gave His Son had no claim on God. His justice had properly cast them off from His favor and sentenced them to death. The bulk of them cared nothing for Him. Yea, the bulk of them became confederate at a price—self-gratification—with the enemy of His person, character, word and work, to displease Him, to violate His laws, to seek to overthrow His cause, to pervert His subjects from loyalty to Him and to defy His authority. In a word, they became His enemies. But their sad estate of enslavement to sin, error and death, despite their indifference, callousness and enmity, deeply stirred up His compassion for them. He longed to deliver them from their bondage and bring them back into harmony with Him and good principles; and when justice at wisdom's suggestion offered to release these for a return to such a blessed estate on condition of His degrading His only begotten and well beloved Son

from the next highest nature to the lowest nature of free moral agents—humanity—and further suggested that in this degraded condition His Son be given up by Him to a death of the most disgraceful and painful kind, it suggested that love make the greatest possible sacrifice. And, marvelous to think, God's love was equal to this sacrifice; for God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son [to degradation to the lowest free agent nature and to death in supreme shame and excruciating pain] that whosoever believeth on Him might not perish, but have everlasting life. God's love felt the degradation, shame, pain and death of His Son more deeply than His Son, Himself, felt them, even as in the type of this, Abraham felt the sorrows of Isaac's offering up more than Isaac did. But Divine love triumphed. It made the supreme sacrifice, and that in order that sin, error and death might be annihilated and righteousness, truth and life might forever prevail. Thus His delight in good principles and persons, His sympathy with the prospective Elect and pity for the world, enabled Him to offer the costliest sacrifice of all time and beings.

This is love's general sacrifice; but within its ample folds are various features of disinterested love. In offering His Son in sacrifice, not only love for the world actuated Him, but also love for that Son wrought mightily in Him unto His successfully giving up that Son. He saw in the circumstances of the case the possibility of exalting His Son in character, nature and office. He saw that the Son's co-operating with Him heartily in the sacrifice would develop in the Son a character even finer and stronger than the character He already had, and this desire of working in His Son such an improved character was delightful to Him in His love of advancing good principles. We are not to think that there was anything imperfect in the Son's prehuman character and in His human character; for there was no blemish of any kind in these. But the

character of the prehuman Logos, though perfect for the nature that He then had, was not of so high a quality as the Divine nature needs; much less was His perfect human character of so high a quality as is fitted for the Divine nature. But God saw that through the sufferings that His Son would undergo He could be developed into a character fitted for the highest created possibilities of the Divine nature; and His great love for His Son, desiring such a nobler character for Him, was willing to sacrifice Him that it might be attained. Moreover, knowing that such exaltation in character and nature would fit Him for higher uses than His prehuman nature could attain—the office of executing all God's future purposes as His vicegerental Son throughout the Universe, God in love for that Son was willing to endure the hardships incidental to the preparation of the Son for such an exalted career. This was love indeed, from which a loving parent might well shrink back, but to which God was able to measure up. Yea, the love that God exercised when He gave His Son to be made perfect in character for the Divine nature and office of Jehovah's vicegerent, was love of the highest quality, of the greatest sublimity and of the most worthy kind.

There is still another feature of love that was in God's heart, prompting Him to give His Son unto degradation, disgrace, pain and death, *i.e.*, for the Elect, who through that death were to be most highly benefited. For, knowing that through our Lord's carnation and death He could lift up the four faith classes to much higher grades and qualities of character than that to which the world could be elevated in their Millennial experience with righteousness, God in His disinterested love gave up His Son to carnation and death to secure these blessed results for the four faith classes, who constitute the four elect classes—the Little Flock, the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. Thus disinterested love, delighting to

advance good principles, sacrificed the Son in order to develop these four classes in character fitting them for spiritual existence—the Little Flock in the Divine nature as having the highest form of character among these four classes, and the other three classes in some spiritual nature lower than the Divine—perhaps in the nature that the Logos had before, and left at the time of His carnation. The Son, willingly submitting to His Father's sacrificing Him in such disinterested love, co-operated with the Father's love to secure the glorious ends in view as to the four elect classes.

Foregoing we have shown how in relation to the world, to His only begotten Son and to the four elect classes, God's love acted and manifested itself in giving up His Son in carnation and in death. We now will trace the activity of God's love to the Gospel-Age Elect and to the world.

God's love in its delight to do good to the world has been using up some of the human all of His Gospel-Age children in their measurably correcting the world as to its sin and their measurably instructing it as to righteousness, as well as in witnessing to it of the coming kingdom—the judgment to come—all of which has been intended to curb sin, spread righteousness and prepare the world for their place in the Millennium. But such activity on the part of Divine love has been sacrificial, for it means that God has been giving up to pain, weariness, sorrow, persecution and death, His well beloved children in order to do the world the good that giving them refutations as to sin, and instructions as to righteousness and the coming kingdom, has done and will do them. God loves His children, if not with the same degree, yet with the same kind of love as that which He gave His Son Jesus while the latter was in the flesh (John 17: 23, 26). As Jehovah felt with His Son Jesus while the latter was being sacrificed, so He feels with His many other sons as they have been sacrificed to give the world the Scripturally marked reproofs

as to sin and instructions as to righteousness and witness as to the judgment to come. Yet His love was willing and able to bear this out of His desire to give the world the benefit of such reproof, instruction and witness. Additionally was God's love active in giving up these sons to a sacrificial death amid much weariness, pain, disgrace, persecution and death, often of a martyr kind, in co-suffering with Jesus that the blessing of restitution might be offered the world in the Millennium. When we realize "the great love wherewith He loved us," we can come to something of a realization of how strong must be the Divine love for the world in order to endure the hardships incidental to sacrificing His many spirit—begotten sons for them. Surely God's love for the world, as manifest from the two above standpoints, is great and good. It is surely disinterested—unselfish—love, like that manifested in giving His only begotten Son for the world.

Further, His disinterested love acts toward the Church during the Gospel Age; for He is giving up those whom He specially loves to sufferings in order to perfect them in character, nature and office. Not only the consideration that their sufferings will bless the world, now measurably and in the Millennium very greatly, moves His love to bear the hardship of sacrificing them for the world, but the consideration that their sufferings will perfect them, if faithful, in a Divine character. Such a character is high, noble and good, and therefore the most desirable thing to have. And so greatly does God in disinterested love prize such characters that He is in disinterested love willing and able to do all the work and to bear all the hardships incidental to their sufferings, whereby such characters are developed and perfected in them. His love perseveres further in this course, because He sees that He can raise those faithful amid such sufferings to the Divine nature and offices, whereby they will be able

with the greatest efficiency and faithfulness to spread the reign of good principles, and thus lift up and bless others. Thus His disinterested love shines out in His sacrificing the Little Flock.

But some whom He is giving up to suffering on behalf of the world fail faithfully to co-operate in those sufferings. These do not attain the heights of character, nature and office given to the Little Flock of more than overcomers. But if they, under the Lord's corrective teachings and providences, wash their robes from their spots and then co-operate with the Lord in faithful service unto death amid sufferings, they will be enabled to develop characters fit for a spiritual nature and office subordinate to the Little Flock's. These also God loves; and He also loves so much the good to which they may attain that He has been willing to endure the hardships incidental to their cleansing and sufferings that they may attain the intended good. Thus disinterested love is active in God's dealings with the Great Company. The same love of God acts toward the Youthful Worthies, who, though not now children of God, like the Little Flock and the Great Company, are now friends and servants of God. Later—in the Millennium—they, with the Ancient Worthies, will become sons of God. They, like the latter, belong to the faith-elect-classes, and as such their loyalty to God greatly delights Him. But His delight—the appreciation of disinterested love—in them does not keep Him back from letting them suffer pain, sorrow, persecution and death, in the course of their advancing truth and righteousness in and about them. On the contrary, to develop in them an overcoming character fitting them for perfect human nature and earthly princeship throughout the Millennium, both for the good they now will do and get and the good they in the Millennium will do and get from such sufferings, His love, to gain these good results, endures the hardship of seeing them suffer incidentally to His obtaining

these good results. Thus Divine love acts toward the Youthful Worthies now, because of the good results for them and the world unto God's honor now and later. Thus we see that God's love delights to advance all the elect classes despite the incidental sufferings, in order to make truth and righteousness prevail in them and through them towards others. We will not get a right focus on the Divine love in its Gospel-Age activities unless we view it as the love-testing activity of giving up His beloved Elect for their own development and for the blessing of the world.

There is still another sphere in which Divine love acts towards the Elect—their faults. God's disinterested love is pained whenever these fail to do good, or whenever they do evil. This is so because disinterested love delights in good. Hence it must be pained at evil. Yet His love, despite its pain, does not give them up. Intent on their reformation it works faithfully, sympathetically and sacrificially to rescue them. It is His love that instructs them as to the evil character of these wrongs of omission and commission. It is His love that stripes them for their cleansing (1 John 1: 9), whenever they show any willfulness. His love in some cases even withdraws His smile of favor, *i.e.*, if there is much willfulness in them. It nevertheless follows them in its delight to reform and reinstate them into His favor. How freely His love forgives them when they are repentant! How He manifests in many ways His delight when He wins them back to the right way! What a great love this is on His part so faithfully and patiently to seek them for truth and righteousness! Yea, how great is that love that for nearly 19 centuries has labored for their reformation and character perfection.

Midway between the lost world and the elect is another class to whom God has shown much love in this Age, *i.e.*, the faith justified. We do not here refer to those of the faith justified who proceed to consecration,

but to those who do not so do. While the real purpose of the Gospel-Age faith justification has been to prepare responsive persons for consecration and election, yet many—yea, the vast majority—fail to use it for these purposes. Nevertheless, God's disinterested love has acted toward these. Yea, even before their justification it acted toward them individually; for it pitied them in their lost, undone and alienated condition to such a degree as to use some of the humanity of His sons and servants to preach repentance to them, and by the Word aroused them to hate and forsake sin and to love and practice righteousness. Of course such an action on God's part was one of disinterested love. Furthermore, on their exercising repentance He aroused some of His sons and servants to help them further by the Word to accept Jesus as their Savior, and through faith in His merit to come into justification and consequent peace with God. In this action we recognize His love acting. So, too, has He been using the humanity of His sons and servants to help these to more knowledge of His Truth, to further cleansing from filthiness of the flesh and spirit and to greater practice of righteousness. Surely such activities of His have been expressions of disinterested love. To do this unweariedly for many centuries is a still greater manifestation of love, and to continue doing it, despite the backsliding of many and the half-hearted responsiveness of others, in the interests of truth and righteousness is a high expression of His love. O, how great has been the love of God in the Gospel Age!

Even in the great tribulation which began with the World War, which will proceed with the World Revolution, and which will end with the World Anarchy and Jacob's Trouble, all accompanied with famines and pestilences, we can see Divine love active, though of course Divine power and justice chiefly act therein. Nevertheless there is love in the wrath—the love that can use wrath for reformatory purposes when nothing

else can prove effective. God's love has for nearly 1900 years been calling the world to repentance, but apart from a comparatively few the world has not repented. This call to repentance has been a marvelous exhibition of longsuffering and patient love toward the sinful race; for it has been accompanied with many blessings, which are all the greater expressions of love when the fact that they were bestowed on enemies is considered. Moral suasion accompanied with much and long-drawn-out kindness failing, there is no other recourse for the love that earnestly longs for man's deliverance from sin, error and death, than to resort to the rod with only that degree of severity necessary to put man into a salvable condition by humbling him and thus fitting him obediently to receive the only means that will deliver him—the Kingdom of God. Thus we can see Divine love in the greatest wrath.

The organization of God's kingdom with perfect adaptation for man's deliverance from evil and uplift into perfection will be another exhibition of Divine love. The establishment of Christ and the Church as the controlling power in the kingdom is an action of love, because they will have characters adorned with all the mercy necessary to make allowance for human weakness and ignorance, with all the faithfulness necessary to apply unto a completion the varied means for man's reformation, with all the knowledge necessary to apply these means efficiently and with all the will power necessary to persevere in the good work unto the end, as they will be clothed with God's authority and power to inaugurate and to control completely every Millennial condition. Certainly Divine love is apparent in such an organization of the controlling part of the kingdom. So, too, Divine love is manifest in the organization of the three subordinate parts of the kingdom—the Ancient Worthies to act as the main visible representatives of the invisible Christ in establishing and operating the main visible agencies and means for

ruling and blessing mankind, the Youthful Worthies to act as the less important visible representatives of the invisible Christ in establishing and operating the less important visible agencies and means for ruling and blessing man, and the Great Company as the invisible and subordinate agents of the invisible Christ in supporting the two visible parts of the kingdom and in executing the disciplinary orders of the Christ Class. Such an organization of the kingdom will be just the thing to suppress every feature of the curse, introduce its opposite good features and bring the willing and obedient into sympathetic oneness and cooperation with the kingdom arrangements, whereby they will be delivered from every part of the curse, be given all the blessings of restitution and be prepared for the paradisiac earth. When we think of the lavish abundance of goodness that will be ministered through this arrangement in its healing, uplifting and perfecting effects, we must recognize the love of God as acting in the Millennial arrangements for man's uplift.

So, too, will the love of God be manifest in the final test at the end of the Millennium, because this test will be for the purpose of establishing truth and righteousness eternally in the restored human family. God's delight in good principles and His delight to preserve them forever—features of disinterested love—of course, in the nature of the case, will operate in that final test.

The sentence to, and the execution of eternal destruction on those who chose evil under that final test, while primarily matters of Divine power and justice, will nevertheless be accompanied by love; for love will be willing to have them blotted out in order to destroy all sin, to prevent the wicked from suffering eternally and to keep eternally the good from mental suffering, and thus will God secure the undisturbed permanence of good. And as these results could not be attained so

long as sinners exist, love in its delight to support good, will co-operate in the destruction of the wicked.

Of course Divine love will be exercised in rewarding those found faithful in the final trial. It will take delight in blessing them with every good pleasure, possession, condition and progress. Before they call He will answer, and while they are yet speaking He will hear. With lavish profusion will Jehovah gratify their every desire; and this will eternally draw out their love, appreciation, hope, faith and obedience. Thus Divine love will triumph in blessing with every good thing those who will use their blessings to their own and others' profit and happiness and to God's credit and pleasure. Surely all of the considerations presented in this article prove that God is love. And His great love calls out our love; for we love Him, because He first loved us.

In our discussion of God's higher primary attributes of character we now come to the fourth and last—power. We have in the preceding chapter discussed God's power as an attribute of His being, and will not treat of it in that sense in this chapter. Rather, as our subject implies, we desire in this chapter to study power as an attribute of character. One may ask, What is the difference between power as an attribute of God's being and power as an attribute of God's character? We answer, The former is an attribute of God's body, whereby He can by His strength do whatever He wills; the latter is an attribute of God's heart and mind, whereby He rules Himself in well doing and perseveres therein with cheerful endurance in spite of obstacles. Thus the external work of the creation and preservation of the universe and of the execution of His Plan are examples of His power as an attribute of His being, while the internal *strength of will* necessary to rule Himself in well doing and to persevere in well doing with cheerful endurance in spite of any obstacle arising in the course of His

works of creation and providence and of the execution of His Plan, are examples of His power as an attribute of character. When under the symbol of a lion in Rev. 4 and Ezek. 1 God's attribute of power is represented, we are to understand that God's power is there set forth in the sense of an attribute both of His being and character. But having already discussed power as an attribute of His being, we will here study power as an attribute of His character.

Power, then, as an attribute of character means strength of the disposition and will—the mind and heart—primarily along the lines of wisdom, justice and love, and secondarily along the lines of other mind and heart qualities. It is a universal grace, yea, we may call it *the* universal grace, because it is the only one which, when properly functioning, rules and reinforces every other grace. Its function, therefore, is primarily executory, for it makes all the other qualities act. Other graces supply the proper motives for action; this one makes them execute the action. It puts its strength back of the motives that prompt to action and by the instructions of wisdom makes them work in the performance of the action. Thus power is related to wisdom, justice and love. The relation is this: Wisdom supplies a tactful plan for an action in harmony with justice and love; then justice and love supply the main motives for the action, and power takes this plan and puts back of justice and love its strength to make them carry out the plan. This is precisely the way the four higher primary Divine attributes acted in making, and are acting in carrying out, the Divine Plan of the Ages. It is necessary for us to see this primary function of power properly, if we would be in a position to understand power as an attribute of God's character. In a word, its function is primarily executory—it executes wisdom's plans, harmonized with and propelled by justice and love. In exercising this executive function

power suppresses the activity of non-pertinent qualities and uses other pertinent qualities than justice and love to support these as motives. Thus in support of justice and love, acting in the execution of wisdom's plans, power, as the needs of the case demand, will use secretiveness, combativeness, aggressiveness, self-esteem, friendship, patriotism, etc. This suppressing and supporting function of power may be called its secondary function. And the result of such functional activities of power in us is an increased strengthening of power as an attribute of character and an increased strengthening of our other good qualities—a result, of course, which it cannot have in God, since He is and always was infinite in power as an attribute of character.

Power as an attribute of character, both in God and in us, consists of two elements—self-control and patience. Self-control alone rules the heart and mind in God and us amid ordinary experiences and situations. But when obstacles present themselves self-control, both in God and us, is reinforced for purposes of self-rule, by patience. Self-control works through the faculty of firmness; patience works through the faculty of continuity. There is a very widespread error as to the nature of patience. Most people regard it as synonymous with longsuffering. This is a mistake, as a definition of these two qualities will show. Longsuffering—the opposite of anger—is a calm and unresentful carriage of oneself amid naturally exasperating circumstances; while patience—the opposite of inconstancy—is joyfully enduring perseverance, continuity, stick-to-itiveness, steadfastness in well-doing despite obstacles. When we therefore speak of power as an attribute of Jehovah's character we mean His strength of self-control and perseverance. These two qualities have been constantly manifesting themselves in connection with Jehovah's activities. Let us look at the salient features of God's

Plan and observe how these two qualities have characterized Jehovah in the outworking of His Plan.

When God's foresight apprized Him of the fall of man and of some angels, His self-control sustained Him to make a plan suitable for their needs as to deliverance, and His patience persevered unto a complete making of that plan. God's self-control ruled Him in making men and angels and His patience persevered in that work until it was completed. Self-control and patience backed justice and love in putting man and angels on trial, as they have supported these in executing the sentence for disobedience under that trial. For upward of 6,000 years God has permitted evil in man and fallen angels and therein has manifested great self-control and patience from the standpoint of His purpose in its permission. How great has been God's self-control and patience in relation to the persecutions and sufferings of His people, inflicted by the wicked! The course of Cain toward Abel, of the antediluvians toward Noah, of Laban toward Jacob, of Jacob's sons toward him and Joseph, of Pharaoh and the Egyptians toward Israel, Moses and Aaron, of the Israelites toward Moses and the prophets and of the oppressive nations toward Israel throughout the Jewish Age, required and was attended by self-control and patience on the part of Jehovah.

Even a more marked exercise of power—self-control and patience—on God's part is manifest in His attitude and acts connected with the sufferings of Jesus and His faithful followers. The mental sufferings that Jesus underwent, especially in Gethsemane and on Calvary, required the exercise of self-control and patience in Jehovah to permit them. To see His beloved Son endure the contradiction of sinners against Himself, in the murmurings, disputings, harassings, accusations and revilings of the scribes, Pharisees and priests, in the buffetings, mockings and torturings of the soldiers, and in the rejections, execrations

and derisions of the mobs, called for Jehovah to exercise self-control and patience in carrying out a sacrificial feature of His Plan amid such circumstances. To hear Himself blasphemed, His character and Plan misrepresented, and His righteous laws and gracious favors set at naught, certainly demanded self-control and patience on His part, in order to carry out His arrangements in the presence of such conditions. How often did the persecutions, the misrepresentations and the cruelties exercised against the Gospel messengers and people in the Harvest of the Jewish Age require Jehovah to exercise self-control and patience in carrying forward the purposes of that Harvest! Certainly the rise of false teachers among the brethren at that time, the development of the great apostasy immediately afterward, the rise of the clergy class among God's people, the development of a hierarchy out of the clergy class, and of the papacy out of the hierarchy, the crushing of the Truth, the union of Church and State, the perversion of the mission of the Gospel-Age Church, the persecution and overpowering of the saints, particularly of their leaders, the exaltation of the unfaithful, the tortures of the Inquisition, the oppression and degradation of the laity by the clergy, the proscription of the Bible and other Truth writings, the violence of wars, massacres, exilings, the devastations of homes and countries, against Truth and righteousness, and the distress of His oppressed children, as expressions of Antichrist's wrath against the Lord, His cause and His people, must have greatly required the exercise of self-control and patience in God.

Emerging out of the Dark Ages God's faithful people have had to suffer in the Reformation period a double set of injuries. On the one hand, the papacy kept up its terrible opposition of them, and on the other hand, later reformers and their supporters had to endure the opposition of the previously existing

Protestant sects. The Presbyterians persecuted the Baptist and Servetian reforming brethren. The Episcopalians and Presbyterians persecuted the Congregational and Quaker reforming brethren. The Episcopalians more mildly persecuted the Methodists. All of these in still milder forms persecuted the Christians and Adventists. And the Harvesters were persecuted by Catholics and Protestants of all sects. As God viewed His people, crying out by their sufferings, but not by their words, "How long, O Lord?" we may be sure that His self-control and patience had to be active to keep right on in the carrying out of His Plan despite the incidental sufferings to which His people have been exposed through Catholic autocracy and Protestant sectarianism. Nor are these all the sufferings through which God's Elect have had to pass and yet must pass. The late war brought considerable sufferings upon the Little Flock, Great Company and Youthful Worthies. They have yet to pass through tribulations to be brought upon them through certain civil powers at the instigation of the symbolic beast and false prophet. Doubtless the strenuous times of the future parts of the Great Tribulation will bring much sufferings upon them. All these experiences will call forth the exercise of Jehovah's self-control and patience; for He loves and deeply feels with His people. "In all their affliction He was afflicted." He will also exercise self-control and patience at the sufferings of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies and of the faithful Restitution class during the trying experiences of the Little Season, when Satan with great wrath comes forth and works deceptions. Thus we see that the sufferings of God's people from the beginning have called upon God to exercise self-control and patience in order to work out His Plan in connection with such sufferings.

Jehovah has likewise had to exercise self-control and patience in connection with the wickedness of

fallen men and angels. Above we showed His power acting in connection with their suffering evil. Here we would show it acting in connection with their sin. The wickedness of Satan in rebellion, ingratitude, deceitfulness, power grasping, in tyrannizing over and debauching the race for many millenniums, in entrapping the incautious angels before the flood, in organizing and administering a kingdom opposing God's Plan and in seeking most wickedly to blaspheme and misrepresent God's character, person, word and work, to thwart God's work, to seduce His servants, to incite others against them and to do them unto ruin and death, has undoubtedly occasioned God to exercise self-control and patience as He in spite of these things proceeded on His course of carrying out His Plan. The co-operation of the demons with Satan in his wicked course, consisting mainly of the things enumerated in the preceding sentence, increased the occasion of God's exercising self-control and patience in carrying out His Plan amid such a wicked course on the part of the fallen angels as Satan's co-operators. And what shall we say of man's wickedness as making conditions prevail in which it became necessary for God to apply power as an attribute of character in the way of self-control and patience? The idolatries, grossly material and refinedly mental, the unbeliefs and misbeliefs, the blasphemies and perjuries, the disregard for the higher powers and parental authority, the individual murders and collective slayings, the adulteries, fornications, unnatural lusts and vices, the marital, parental and filial sins, the thieveries, plunderings, banditries, briberies, devastations, corruptions and spoliations, the slanders, misrepresentations and character assassinations, and the envies, jealousies, evil surmisings, covetings, hatreds and cruelties and multitudes of mankind's other sins, have been occasions innumerable for Jehovah to exercise self-control and patience. Had He not done this, the race and

the fallen angels might have been blotted out, His Plan gone by default and His kingdom have been much undermined. We glory in God that His strength of heart and mind in self-control and patience are such as to have met in proper poise of character all the conditions confronting Him in the prevalence of evil among fallen angels and men and among His faithful people, and in the prevalence of sin among fallen angels and men.

In God's dealing with His elect peoples there has been constant need of His exercising self-control and patience. His typically elect people—Israel—gave Him many an opportunity of exercising self-control and patience, through their frequent lapses from their covenant obligations to Him. They were frequently wayward. Often they murmured and complained. They fell into idolatry and the wicked orgies connected with idolatrous religions. Not seldom did they rebel against God's ordinances and arrangements. For the sake of having a royalty they rejected Him as their King and His democratic arrangements as to their civil and social relations. They frequently mistreated His prophets. Many times in distrust of His protection they sought alliances with surrounding heathen nations. Time and again they corrupted their religious services and reduced them to mere formalism. Yet God continued to deal with them, correcting their faults, blessing their graces, stripping their rebellions, reinstating them on their repentance in His forgiveness, sending them warnings, giving them encouragements, surrounding them with His protection, exalting them in their loyalty, abounding toward them in their needs, and giving them every helpful influence. Had He not possessed infinite self-control and patience, how could He have continued for over eighteen centuries in dealing with them throughout the Jewish Age? He would long before have cast them off.

We can discern His self-control and patience in His dealing with the Ancient Worthies. Thus His self-control and patience worked continually toward Abraham, the friend of God; Isaac, the peaceful shepherd; Jacob, the man of action; Joseph, the man of humiliation and exaltation; Moses, the servant of God; Joshua, the warrior of God; Gideon, the daring; Jephtha, the courageous; Samson, the strong; David, the beloved and reliable; Elijah, the austere; Isaiah, the eloquent; Jeremiah, the sorrowful; Daniel, the loyal, and multitudes of less prominence, but of the same faithfulness. All of these needed help, were deficient in various respects, faultful in others; some of these were at times willful, forgetful and backsliding. To supply their lacks, to cleanse their faults and to strengthen their graces in their varied personal bents and circumstances required a continued exercise of self-control and patience on God's part in His efforts to enable them to fulfill His will and to qualify for their places in the earthly phase of the Kingdom. When we include among these Abel, Enoch and Noah, we find that God dealt with these Ancient Worthies over 4,000 years. Acting toward them successfully for so long a period required, among other qualities, self-control and patience of a unique degree.

A still greater display of these two graces as the elements of God's power in character respects is found in His dealing with Christ and His prospective Bride. Great were the expressions of His self-control and patience in His depriving Himself of Christ's prehuman companionship and service and in His emptying the Word of His prehuman nature and office when making Him flesh. It certainly required great self-control and patience in God's arranging for Him to be absent from Him for over thirty-four years. Great were the self-control and patience of God in making Him a sacrifice unto death for His enemies and in developing His new creature unto Divine completion

amid most heart-searching and crucial experiences. Under these circumstances it was especially the Father's love for His Son that made it necessary for Him to exercise such great manifestations of self-control and patience in order to accomplish His purposes with His Son. In His dealing with the Church in connection with the sacrifice of its humanity, its cleansing itself from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit, and its development, strengthening, balancing and crystallizing Christlikeness, there have been the most marvelous exhibitions of His self-control and patience so far enacted. This will become apparent, if we consider how God is as a rule choosing the weak, the base, the despised, the poor and the ungifted as heirs of the Kingdom. To train these into fitness for such a position is truly the greatest work of self-control and patience ever yet performed, if it is not in need the greatest work of self-control and patience that ever will be performed.

Certainly Jehovah's past, present and future activities with the Great Company, before recent years individually, and since recent years as a class, exhibits remarkably His power in the forms of self-control and patience. It is in these measurably unfaithful new creatures that Satan found more or less fit instruments for developing the errors of doctrine, practice and organization in Greek and Roman Catholicism and in Protestant Sectarianism. These were by their waywardness, stubbornness and revolutionism continually trying God's self-control and patience; for, children of His, they were using, doubtless ignorantly, their greatest endeavors to advance what actually were the plans of God's chief enemy—Satan. Only a good father who has constantly sought the best interests of his children, who despite this turned against his interests and sided with his mortal enemy and unscrupulous competitor, can to a large degree enter into Jehovah's feelings as to the course of the Great Company

now and in the past. Surely, great self-control and patience have been His in dealing with them. How great care in these qualities must He take in opposing their revolutionism! How much of these will have to be in evidence until their fleshly mind is destroyed! How highly will they have to act to bring them to a complete cleansing and to a proper service of Himself! The same remarks with slight modifications apply to His dealing with those of the Youthful Worthies who in character act much like, as they are also cooperators with, the Great Company; as also the same remarks as were made on Jehovah's self-control and patience in dealing with the Ancient Worthies apply to the activities of these two elements of God's power as an attribute of character in His dealings with the good Youthful Worthies.

It is, of course, manifest that in the great tribulation, already begun and to last yet many years, though we are now in one of its lulls, God's power in the forms of self-control and patience finds a marvelous field of action in overruling the tribulation for ultimate good to all concerned. In protecting His own, as well as measuring out adequate retributions on institutions, involving their individual supporters, whom by the trouble He designs to bless, there have been and will be marvelous displays of God's power as an attribute of character, ruling Himself and persevering on His course as to the workings of the tribulation.

Then, too, when we look forward to the times of restitution, we can with faith's eye see many evidences of God's exercising His power in self-control and patience in gradually giving the kingdom arrangements, in applying these to the billions of mankind, returned from the dead, in restraining, chastising, correcting and instructing the weak and wayward and in punishing the wilful, and that all for the sake of their reformation. Nor will there be wanting such power in the forms of self-control and patience in dealing 100

years with the fully wilful before He destroys them as incorrigible sinners. So, too, will there be many exhibitions of His attribute of power in self-control and patience in dealing 1,000 years with the reformable for their full restoration to human perfection—restitution—especially in dealing with those who will reform externally, but not from and in the heart. God, knowing their hypocrisy—that of the symbolic goats (Matt. 25: 31-47)—all through these 1,000 years, will nevertheless control Himself as He perseveres to uplift them. How great will be the display of these qualities in the Little Season, when Satan and his impenitent angels are permitted to attempt to deceive the whole perfected race! He will exercise these qualities for the perhaps 40 years of that season, in order to complete the outworking of His Plan. He will show them, too, in His relation to the rebelliously wicked and in His relation to the obediently righteous of mankind in the varying stands that they will then make. Self-control and patience will manifest themselves in Him when the sentence of destruction is pronounced and executed upon Satan, his demons and incorrigible men, as well as when the reward of life is pronounced upon and given to the righteous. Therefore in the Ages to come, among others, His glorious power in its forms of self-control and patience will be celebrated by all creation (Rev. 5: 13).

We have now finished our individual study of Jehovah's four higher primary graces. But we should not close this chapter without some remarks on the relation of these four attributes to one another and to other graces. Of these four, wisdom and justice are fundamental, *i.e.*, truth and righteousness are the foundations for love and power, as well as for God's throne (Ps. 89: 14). Always the first consideration that arises in Jehovah's mind as respects any action, course, principle or thing is this: Is it in harmony with truth and righteousness? No matter what other

good qualities may be found in it, if either truth or righteousness is in any way compromised or impinged in that action, course, principle or thing, Jehovah refuses to sanction it or co-operate in it. If a thing is in harmony with truth and righteousness, and if God desires to enter into it in activity, He will then act with respect to it in love and power, deferring always, however, to wisdom and justice. God's love and power have never acted, nor will they ever act, except in harmony with and in deference to His wisdom and justice. So, then, wisdom and justice are the foundations, and love and power are the superstructures of God's higher primary attributes of character. The harmonious activity and co-ordination of these four attributes in the order and way above indicated is manifest in every principle and feature of God's Plan. Therefore His Plan is a most sublime revelation and manifestation of His character. The harmony of His character is manifest in this Plan in that the foundation of its every feature is wisdom and justice and the superstructure of its every feature is love and power. If we view God's creative, providential, redemptive, instructional, justifying, sanctifying and delivering works as they are displayed in His Plan, we will find that they manifest the harmony and co-ordination of these four sublime qualities in the order and procedure above indicated. Thus we recognize that each of these attributes is perfect in itself and in its relations to the other three. Therefore there is a harmonious co-operation between them; for they never act in variance to, but always in support of, one another. Otherwise God's character would be imperfect.

And not only are there harmony and co-ordination in the activities of God's higher primary graces in their mutual relations, but there is also in this harmony and co-ordination a dominance on the part of these four graces over all God's other graces. It will be recalled that in the first part of this chapter we explained

that God had, in addition to His higher primary graces, lower primary, secondary and tertiary graces. None of the graces of these three later classes, or the other elements of the character has the right of controllership in God's acts. Whether they will be permitted to act or not is dependent on the decision and controllership of His higher primary graces acting in the harmony and co-ordination described above. Therefore God's higher primary graces have in the above-defined harmony and co-ordination the function of controlling all His other graces and elements of character. It is theirs to suppress, support, employ, modify, harmonize and inter-relate the others' use or uses. They are God's ruling, dominating graces. And in the wondrous perfection of each of these four graces, in their harmony and co-ordination with one another and in their dominating in such harmony and co-ordination all God's other graces and elements of character lies the marvelous balance of God's character. Never in the least item is there a deviation from this wondrous balance which, existing in infinite strength, constitutes the perfection of Jehovah's character. O, how sublime is His character! Worthy from every standpoint of disposition, thought, motive, word and work is He to be praised! He is so supremely good that our weak, fallen powers are unutterably inadequate properly to appreciate and praise Him. Lost in wonder, love and appreciation, we bow down before Him in worship and adoration, crying out, "Great and marvelous are Thy works, Lord God, the Almighty; righteous and true are Thy ways, Thou King of the Ages. Who shall not reverence Thee, O Lord, and glorify Thy name? For Thou only art holy" (Rev. 15: 3, 4)! Let us consider His holy character as displayed in His Plan so devoutly, so believingly, so lovingly and so adoringly, that little by little and more and more we shall be changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord (2 Cor. 3: 18).

CHAPTER IV.

THE LOWER PRIMARY GRACES OF GOD'S CHARACTER.

THE NATURE OF THE PRIMARY GRACES. GOD'S AND MAN'S LOWER AFFECTION-ORGANS—SELFISH AND SOCIAL. GOD'S SELF-ESTEEM. APPROBATIVENESS. RESTFULNESS. VITATIVENESS. SELF-DEFENSIVENESS. AGGRESSIVENESS. CAREFULNESS. SECRETIVENESS. PROVIDENCE. INTELLIGENCE. AGREEABLENESS. CONJUGALITY. FATHERLINESS. KINGLINESS.

IN THE preceding chapter we finished our study of God's higher primary attributes of character—wisdom, justice, love and power. The expression, *higher* primary attributes, implies lower primary attributes of character. Perhaps a brief review of our definition of primary attributes of character will at this stage of our study prove helpful: Primary attributes of character are such as are produced by the direct action of the various affection-organs, *e.g.*, the direct action of the affection-organ, spirituality, produces faith, a higher primary grace, one of the ingredients of wisdom; the direct working of the affection-organ, firmness, develops self-control, a higher primary grace, one of the ingredients of power; the direct operation of the affection-organ, continuity, cultivates patience, the other ingredient of power. Thus in all cases the direct result of the operation of any affection-organ is the pertinent primary grace. The direct operation of the higher affection-organs produces the higher primary attributes; and the direct working of the lower affection-organs cultivates the lower primary qualities, graces or attributes. Our speaking of such qualities being developed must, of course, be understood as applying to God's creatures who are free moral agents—angels and men. It would not be true to say that God has developed such qualities by the use

of His affection-organs; for He has always had and will always have them in infinite perfection, and therefore has always used and will always use them in infinite perfection. Thus they have not been developed in Him.

From the fact that man originally was, and new creatures now are, images of God, from the fact that fallen man has all man's original affection-organs, though in a corrupt condition, and from the fact that man has lower affection-organs, we conclude that God has them also. But this thought is not only an inference, but is also proven by direct Scriptures that ascribe such affection-organs to God. Some of these Scriptures, as they apply to His lower affection-organs, we will cite when we come to a consideration of His individual affection-organs of the lower order, as we have already cited some that apply to His higher affection-organs. God, having the same general affection-organs as man originally had, as new creatures now have and as fallen man now has, though these are more or less corrupt in the latter, we can recognize what God's are by a consideration of what man's are. Man has especially two classes of lower affection-organs in connection with which lower primary graces act: (1) selfish and (2) social. Hence God has these two classes of lower affection-organs. Man's selfish affections, each the sentiment of a distinct organ, are (1) love for a proper self-estimate, (2) love for others' good opinion, (3) love for ease, (4) love for life, (5) love for defending self, (6) love for attacking the injurious, (7) love for safety, (8) love for concealment, (9) love for possessions, (10) love for food, (11) love for knowledge and (12) love for making oneself agreeable to others. God has all of these selfish affections with pertinent organs, except love for food, which God as a Divine and immortal Spirit does not need, though His love for the Truth and its spirit is in Him the thing that corresponds with our love for

natural food. We speak of these affections as selfish, not in the sense of their being sinful, but in the sense of their being concerned with oneself. There is a righteousness selfishness, and it is approved as such in the statements, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as *thyself*" and "All things whatsoever ye *would* [desire] that men *do unto you*, do ye even so unto them." In fallen man his selfish affections, alas, have become more or less sinful; but this is not the case with God's selfish affections, nor with those of Adam and Eve before their fall, nor with those of Jesus.

The second set of man's lower primary affections is the social, each of whose affections has its own organ for activity. These affections are: (1) love for the opposite sex, (2) love for the members of one's family, including husband, wife, parents, children, and brethren, (3) love for relatives, (4) love for pets, (5) love for home, (6) love for native land and (7) love for friends. Some of these in the forms just mentioned God has, but others He does not have. There is no sex love in God, for there is no sex in spirit beings. Indeed, before Millennial perfection is reached, sex and sex love will cease in the human family, its purpose of replenishing the earth with a sufficiently large number of human beings having by then been accomplished. Gradually, in the Millennium, will the brain organ through which amativeness works dry up, and will finally cease to be a part of the brain, and by that process sex love will cease to be an affection of the human heart. Therefore God has placed the organ of sex love at the base of the brain, so that its drying up will not affect the rest of the brain disadvantageously. Without the pertinent human brain organs drying up there will be changes in the activities of other affections, *e.g.*, love for spouse, parents and children in the perfected race, but it is unnecessary here for us to go further into these matters. God, of course, has no father, mother, brothers, or sisters. Hence we infer

that He does not have pertinent organ departments for the operation of these affections. Nor has He a spouse in our understanding of the word. We will reserve details on this for later discussion.

We will now briefly discuss Jehovah's selfish lower primary graces. The first of these is His self-esteem, which is the quality active in His exercising a proper valuation of Himself. That the Scriptures teach that God has the quality of self-esteem is evident from those passages in which He describes His person, His attributes of being and of character, His word and His works. In the chapters on His attributes of being and character we quoted numerous passages which prove that God sees His being and character as we have described them; and thus He exercises self-esteem. The things that He says of His word or plan and His works proves the same thing. Ps. 119 contains numerous passages that describe in language of praise God's word. Ps. 103; Rev. 15: 3, 4, and numerous other Scriptures praise God's works. These prove that He exercises self-esteem as to His word or plan and His works. His self-esteem consists of three qualities—self-confidence, self-satisfaction and self-respect. By His self-confidence He feels that He is sufficient for anything in harmony with His being, character, plan and works. He never for a moment, or in any circumstance, feels distrust of Himself, well knowing that He is equal to any occasion, circumstance, demand or task. By His self-satisfaction He feels that He is "perfect and entire, wanting nothing." He never upbraids Himself. He never finds fault with Himself. He never finds any flaw with anything He is, plans or does; for He knows that He is in no way defective, but in every respect absolutely and unchangeably perfect. By His self-respect He sees Himself worthy of His own appreciation. He sees His every quality to be estimable, His every thought to be worthy, His every word to be appreciable and His

every act to be properly highly regarded by Himself, as He regards every evil thing as unworthy of Himself. Never does He disrespect Himself; never does He feel Himself in any sense unworthy and never does He feel shame at any of His thoughts, words or acts; for they are perfect.

Some might, in view of God's self-esteem, say that He is proud and conceited. It is true that if any creature would have this supreme self-esteem, we would be warranted in speaking of him as proud and conceited. Especially if that creature were imperfect, would it be conceited and proud for him to be self-satisfied. But if one's qualities, attainments, works and words were perfect, even if he were a creature, he would not be proud and conceited to think of himself as perfect and to be self-satisfied, self-confident and self-respectful in harmony with his creaturely position, so long as he gives God the glory for his being, attainments, thoughts, words and works; for this is exactly the measure of self-esteem that all perfected creatures are by God designed to have. Hence we can see that there is no conceit in God when He thinks of Himself and of His word and works in the highest terms of appreciation, since that is the exact truth of the situation. For Him to think otherwise of Himself would be wrong—a thing of which He would not be guilty. It is, therefore, not pride and conceit to think of oneself exactly as he is. On the contrary, this is just what the Scriptures say one should do (Rom. 12: 3). Well, then, one may ask, how can we fulfill the Scriptural injunction to be humble? We answer, A proper self-estimate is just what humility is. But to this we imagine one objecting, "I thought that humility is a lowly self-estimate." We answer, yes, with us; for with our many faults, lacks and weaknesses we do not amount to much; and a proper self-estimate is therefore a lowly self-estimate, as long as we are imperfect; but if one were perfect,

it would be in harmony with humility to think of himself as perfect. The above considerations prove that God is not proud and conceited in His esteeming Himself as supremely and incomparably perfect, and therefore worthy of His own self-confidence, self-satisfaction and self-respect.

The second selfish lower primary grace in God's character is His appreciativeness of others' approval. Because all others are His creatures God desires that they approve of Him in His person, attributes, word and works. He desires them to think highly of Him in these respects. Yea, He desires that they think of Him in these respects as incomparably superior to, and supreme above all others. So important does He regard this requirement that He made this the first of the ten commandments—"Thou shalt have no other gods before Me," *i.e.*, esteem Me supreme above all others, put Me first, and that above all others. Nor does He lightly regard the refusal to heed this commandment. There can be no proper creaturely relation to the Creator without such an estimate of God by others; for God made all things for His pleasure and His glory—His pleasure being to bless others and His glory being to make others like Him in character, word and works. We are not to think of this quality in God as a low one. It is partly because of the incomparable superiority of God in person, attributes, thoughts, words and works that He desires His creatures to esteem Him as such; for such He is; and they owe it to Him and to the facts of the case so to think of Him. Again, it is partly because so to think of and feel toward God is for the best interests of the person involved and all others, that God desires that His creatures think of Him so highly. It is also partly because of the principles underlying the relations of the creature to his Creator that God desires that He be supremely appreciated by His creatures. Certainly, in proportion as any of His creatures comes short of

such an appreciation of God is he injured and does injure others. God thus desires to shine before all as He is in deed and in truth—the supremely excellent One, nor is such a desire on God's part an imperfection; because His perfections deserve it; His creatures owe it to Him; good principles require it; and everybody concerned is thereby properly placed, ennobled and blessed, and God fittingly recognized.

Restfulness, which operates through God's affection-organ of love for ease, is the third selfish lower primary grace in God to be considered. Not that we are to think of God as ever becoming weary in His body; for that would be an imperfection in Him; nor is rest of body a grace. A grace is an excellence of character. By God's restfulness we mean the calmness and serenity of His Spirit. God is never fretted. He is never worried. He is never thrown off His equanimity. Nothing ever excites Him. No situation disturbs His calmness. No opposition sets aside His serenity. No untoward event ruffles His Spirit. He knows the end from the beginning; He has provided the ways, means and agents of His arrangements from of old; He knows what and how to do in every situation; He has the power to execute His purposes; He knows that all things are working together to further His plans and purposes; and therefore with utmost serenity He pursues the even tenor of His ways. Why should He not, in view of these things, be restful in heart and mind? And surely as we realize ourselves one with Him in spirit, plan and work, we, too, like Him become restful, serenity and calmness pervading our hearts and minds.

Love of life is God's fourth selfish lower primary grace. God has life, yea, He has the highest form of life—life in Himself, immortality, a death-proof condition (John 5: 26). Not only has God this highest form of life, but He is also the ultimate source of life to all that live. And God loves His life. While He

does not have to use ways and means to preserve it, to shield it from destruction, or to increase it as against loss, as we do, yet He loves it. It is a fault to desire not to live; therefore to suicide, or to neglect the preservation of health and life, or to contribute to its diminution and its loss, is faultful; for existence is conditioned on having life; and to pass out of existence is one of the greatest of evils. God loves to live, because to live is intrinsically valuable and because to live gives Him the opportunity to plan and do in the interests of truth, righteousness and His creatures; for He purposes to make truth and righteousness supreme and to illustrate their rule in perfected creatures. And it is because His living is an antecedent condition for the attainment of such ends that God loves to live—vitativeness, love for life, is one of His selfish lower primary attributes of character.

Self-defensiveness, which operates through the affection-organ of combativeness, is God's fifth selfish lower primary grace. God cannot be attacked in His person by physical act, but He certainly is attacked in His person, character, word and works by wrong theories and practices. Satan—*adversary*—is the chief attacker of God in these ways. Then He has succeeded in enlisting fallen angels and fallen men to join him in his attacks on God's person, character, word and works. Especially have God's character and person been attacked through the doctrines that God has equals, that God originated sin, that God absolutely predestinated and reprobated individuals, that man is conscious in death and that the bulk of mankind are to suffer eternal torment. His Word has been attacked through the misinterpretation of its doctrine by some of His friends; its inspiration and veracity have been attacked by higher criticism; its salient features have been attacked by evolution and other non-ransom theories; its precepts have been attacked by the wickedness of men and its plan has been attacked by various self-atonement

theories. His works toward both of His Israels have been attacked by subtle temptations and fierce persecutions. But Jehovah has ably defended Himself. Atheistic, agnostic, materialistic, pantheistic, deistic, rationalistic, and superstitious attacks on His being He has met and overthrown by the secular and religious truths that He has put into the hands of His servants. By numerous Scriptural truths He has utterly refuted the attacks on His character coming from those who have taught that He predestinated sin and beings to be sinful, that He predestinated a few to eternal bliss and the rest to eternal torment, that He made man so that he actually does not die and that He tortures eternally the bulk of the race. By scientific, archeological, historical, religious and numerical (Biblical numerics) truths He has successfully defended the inspiration and truthfulness of the Scriptures against the attacks of higher criticism. By the manifestation of the Divine Plan in its doctrines, precepts, promises, exhortations, prophecies, histories and types, He has defended His Word as Truth against all attacks. And by shielding and developing His faithful Israels amid their temptations, oppressions and persecutions, He has defended His work against attacks from fallen angels and men. No attack finds Him defenseless. Every one is in due time met and crushed; and He remains victorious in every defensive conflict that He enters. He quails not; He retreats not; He gives no ground; He loses no advantage under attack. Undismayed, unswerved, unafraid, He, as a veritable "man-of-war," rejoices to parry off every blow and loves to defend Himself against every onset. His meeting attacks on His plan, people and works, both in Bible times (*e.g.*, from Pharaoh and the Egyptians, the Ammonites, the Moabites, etc., heathen religions, Jewish apostates, persecuting Jews and Gentiles, etc.) and since Bible times (from pagan and papal Roman persecutions, Catholic and Protestant sectarianism and

false teachings, evolution, higher criticism, other forms of misbeliefs and unbeliefs, etc.) prove that Jehovah exercises the selfish lower primary grace of self-defensiveness. Thus self-defensiveness is one of His lower selfish primary graces.

The sixth selfish lower primary grace in Jehovah is aggressiveness, which works through His affection-organ of love for attacking. The preceding grace shows Him as active in self-defense, in shielding Himself, His people, plan and works from attacks. This quality shows Him as active in attacking obstacles, whether these be wicked persons, principles, acts, conditions or organizations, etc. This feature of His character especially displays itself in connection with His carrying out His plan. Whatever of evil persons (wicked angels and wicked men), evil principles, organizations, acts and conditions prevail in the universe is due to rebellion against God's sovereignty. This rebellion was originated by Satan and has spread among some of the angels and the whole human family. It is characterized by evil principles, organizations, conditions and acts. This entire complex may be called Satan's empire, an empire that has been holding its sway by initial and continued usurpation against God's authority. The Lord's plan has a variety of purposes, two of which are, the overthrow of Satan's empire and the restoration of the human family to Jehovah's rulership. To accomplish these two results the Lord, as features of His plan, has been selecting agents whom He will use for this work. For the overthrow of Satan's empire, He has been selecting as His agents, Jesus and His faithful followers; and for the restoration of the race to His dominion, He has especially selected these and added to them as assistants the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. In the selection of each of these four classes God has had to act aggressively; for apart from Jesus all of these, before their selection began,

have been more or less under the power and influence of Satan's empire (Col. 1: 12, 13). To deliver these from the power of darkness has meant somewhat of an attack on Satan's empire. This is manifest in the call of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the deliverance of Israel from Egypt and Babylon and the call of the Gospel Church from Judaism, heathenism and Babylonish sectarianism. These subsidiary attacks on Satan's empire were accompanied with all the aggressiveness on Jehovah's part necessary to accomplish His pertinent purpose. And in due time He will fill up the members yet lacking in any of these classes, using all the needed aggressiveness thereto. This aggressiveness has consisted in His arousing servants of His under Christ to minister this selective work, His providentially paving the way for their work and His overthrowing or neutralizing all obstacles to this work from wicked angels and men. God's opposing, restraining and weakening of the papacy from 1295 onward is an example of God's aggressiveness in this particular.

Jehovah's aggressiveness in His attacks on Satan's empire since 1874 has taken on a decidedly more intensified form; for from that time onward He not only continued aggressively in restraining and weakening it to the extent needed for His completing His elective work; but He has advanced to a concerted attack upon it, which in not many more years will result in its eternal annihilation. The attack began by the Lord using suitable agencies in giving world-wide secular truths in ever-increasing measure, especially along scientific, historical, sociological, political and financial lines, and religious truths, especially along elective and free grace lines, in opposition to the secular and religious errors and wrongs fundamental to Satan's empire. By these attacks God has mightily shaken its political, aristocratic, ecclesiastical and social foundations. He has accomplished something more by it the dividing of the subjects of Satan's empire

into two hostile camps—the conservatives, consisting of the political, aristocratic and ecclesiastical rulers and their supporters, and the radicals, consisting of the trade-unionist, socialistic, communistic and anarchistic leaders and their supporters. Aroused by the secular truths that exposed the errors and wrongs of Satan's empire, the radical group has become so menacing to the conservative group that Satan trembled for the existence of his empire. To prevent a revolution on the part of the radicals, which he feared would overthrow his present order of affairs, he plotted the formation of two rival European alliances and stirred them up against one another, deceiving the nations of each alliance into believing that the others sought their national destruction and plunging them into the World War, with the aim of uniting in each nation the conservatives and radicals about the fictitious issue of warring in defense of their national existence; but by this stroke he made a dismal failure; for shortly the peoples, through certain exposures God made through the consecrated, learned that the issue was a false one, and as a result the division of the conservatives and radicals became worse than before the war. And the war accomplished one thing very undesirable to Satan: it greatly weakened his empire, as the first stage of its overthrow, and has helped to prepare it for the next great stage of its breaking-up—the World Revolution—the great revolution of prophecy, which will destroy the present form of Satan's empire. Since shortly after the war started, God has been giving many secular and religious truths on the causes of the war and the evils of the present world conditions. These truths have been arousing the radicals, through a selfish use they are making of them, more and more against the conservatives; and before many years will have passed these truths will stir up the radicals to the World Revolution, with the forementioned results. After the revolution Satan will seek to build up another

form of government, which will very shortly afterward perish in anarchy. The truths that the Lord will give after the revolution, selfishly used by the anarchists, will produce such unparalleled worldwide anarchy as will destroy every vestige of Satan's empire. God's part in all of these matters since 1874 has been an aggressive setting forth of truths exposing the corruption in theory and practice of Satan's empire, well knowing that these truths would be selfishly used by both conservatives and radicals, and in such selfish uses ultimately produce effects—war, revolution and anarchy—that would break up forever that wicked kingdom. Therefore He has been aggressively giving them.

God's aggressiveness has shown itself in others of His works, *e.g.*, in creation, providence, redemption, instruction, justification, sanctification and deliverance now for the Church and in part later for the world, though in different forms from those used toward the Church. God's aggressiveness is due partly to His love for righteousness and partly to His hatred of wickedness. It acts constructively for righteousness and destructively toward wickedness and toward the incorrigibly wicked. His wrath—punishment, not rage—is an expression of His aggressiveness. The cases that we have mentioned, from both Biblical history and prophecy, are sufficient to prove that aggressiveness is one of God's selfish lower primary graces.

The wrath of God shall never strike in vain,
Nor cease to strike till sin shall be no more;
Till God His gracious purpose shall attain!
And earth to righteousness and peace restore.

The seventh lower primary grace in God that we will briefly study is carefulness, watchfulness, working through the affection-organ, love for safety. The quality of carefulness or watchfulness implies danger which one senses and against which he shields himself. In Himself, *i.e.*, in His person or character, God is

in no danger; for none can harm Him in His person or character. But with the enemies that He has, His plan, people and works could be harmed, if He did not exercise carefulness or watchfulness with respect to them. Therefore God's love for safety is not directed against dangers to Himself personally, but to dangers to His interests as they center in His plan, people and works. His carefulness for the safety of His people is compared to that of a shepherd for his flock (Ps. 23; 78: 52; 80: 1). Beautifully is He described in this carefulness or watchfulness on behalf of His people in passages like the following: "He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep." "Arising early and sending them"—the prophets to warn His people against danger. Satan has concocted many a plan to frustrate God's plan. The religions that he taught the ancient nations—the Egyptians, Babylonians, Indians, Greeks, etc.—were counterfeits of God's plan as it was epitomized in Gen. 3: 15; 12: 3; 22: 16-18. At every stage of the operation of that plan Satan sought to thwart it. This can be seen in his dealings toward Joseph, Moses, the judges, the kings and prophets of Israel and his continued attempts to mislead the people. To thwart Satan in these things required watchfulness on God's part to guard His plan and its agents. Satan sought to defeat God's plan in its chief agent, Jesus; and God's carefulness thwarted him and turned his machinations into the furtherance of that plan, as can be seen in Satan's purposes in the temptations of Jesus, in the opposition of the religious leaders to Jesus and in His death and the outcome of these.

Then Satan in the Jewish Harvest sought by five siftings to corrupt the Apostolic Church and failed, because the Father's carefulness averted the effects that the adversary sought through those siftings. In the following period of the Church Satan made his masterpiece in counterfeit work—the development of

the papacy, whereby he made a detailed counterfeit of the True Christ—Jesus, the Head, and the Church, His body—in His teachings, practices and organization, while by that counterfeit he sought to destroy the real people of God. Against these dangers and amid them, with great carefulness God watched over the interests of His plan, His people and His works, so that these untoward experiences were manipulated by Him to their advancement. Thus again God's carefulness thwarted Satan's effort to destroy "the Seed." From the time of the Reformation onward until 1874 Satan introduced additional and increased sectarianism among God's people to injure them in His Truth and works, in ways that the papacy could not affect them; but God was always on His guard to shield them, with the result that Satan failed to overthrow them by the dangers of additional and increased sectarianism and of clericalism.

Since 1874 Satan has been endangering God's people, plan and works by such a multiplicity of false teachings and wrong practices as never was before manifested. Note some of the worst of these errors: various no-ransom theories, denial of the vicarious death of Christ, the Church's sharing in Christ's sufferings and glory, evolution, self-atonement, Eddyism, New Thought, Spiritism, occultism; various infidel theories—atheism, agnosticism, materialism, pantheism, deism, rationalism, higher criticism, modernism, etc. Note some of the worst of these wrong practices: combinationism, reformism by legal enactment and enforcement as against moral suasion, federationism, papalism, international league-ism, revolutionism, communism, socialism, anarchism, syndicalism, etc. Through these errors and wrong practices Satan again sought to destroy God's faithful people, thwart His plan, and overthrow His work. God's carefulness, watching the adversary's works and purposes, set into operation powerful truths, refutative of these errors,

and good principles, destructive of the evil principles underlying these wrong practices, and thus shielded His faithful from "the arrow that flieth by day" and from "the pestilence that walketh in darkness." His carefulness guarded well each feature of His unfolding plan and brought each feature to a completion as it was due. When the adversary came in like a flood to devastate God's people, plan and works, our guarding God by His acts put limits to Satan's efforts, thus realizing the words, "so far and no farther." In the night of trouble now on the world His watchfulness will care for His plan, that all untoward things may work together for good to them that love God, and that out of this night His plan and works will emerge more nearly completed than before.

His carefulness will see to it that in the Millennium every condition not conducive to mankind's restitution to the original perfection will be removed, including Satan and his fellow fallen angels, and that every condition conducive to that end will be introduced and maintained. His carefulness will see to it that the weakest and most depraved will get every help needed for his uplift. His carefulness will guard against every external attempt to violate the kingdom arrangements and to wrong or to overreach one's neighbor. When the obedient of the race have by the Millennial operation been restored to perfection, God's carefulness will be exercised toward the preservation of the faithful amid the final trial which must demonstrate the fitness or unfitness, of each one so perfected, for eternal life. Nor will His carefulness permit Satan to bring too sudden and strong temptations upon the people. His carefulness will watch the course of the temptation to bring it within certain metes and bounds, within certain restraints as to progress in severity, and thus will He carefully guard the faithful and sever them thoroughly from the unfaithful. His carefulness will guard those worthy of everlasting life from eternal

association with the unfaithful and from future Satanic temptations, by annihilating eternally all the unfaithful, with Satan and his fallen angels. And throughout all the Ages to come, the same carefulness of Jehovah will surround those worthy of eternal life, whether in the new heavens or in the new earth, with every condition guarding them from evil, and surrounding them with good. Surely the considerations above given prove and illustrate God's carefulness and watchfulness over His people, plan and works, and thus show that carefulness is one of Jehovah's selfish lower primary graces.

Somewhat related to watchfulness or carefulness is the eighth lower primary grace in God's character—secretiveness. It is the quality that God exercises in manifesting His love for concealment. Carefulness is exercised in the presence of danger, while secretiveness is exercised to obtain advantages that its use will gain and to prevent disadvantages which would come, if the matter at hand were known. No personal disadvantages could come to God considered in Himself alone, *i.e.*, as to His person and character; but disadvantages could come to His plans and their agents, and certain advantages would be lost to Him, if His enemies understood these. Hence He uses His secretiveness to ward off disadvantages from His people and His works or plans, and to secure to them certain desirable advantages. God's secretiveness therefore is the quality whereby He uses His love for concealing to secure advantages and to ward off disadvantages. He always uses His secretiveness in harmony with sincerity and honesty. The abuse of secretiveness makes people untruthful, deceitful and hypocritical. Of course God's holy character makes Him proof against such abuse; but His secretiveness makes Him tactful and resourceful against the machinations of evil ones. Thus time and again "He taketh the [supposedly]

wise in their own craftiness," as He exercises this quality.

God has had to use this quality for various reasons. In testing the devotion of the various classes connected with His plan He conceals many details as to the meaning and nature of their experiences under test, because of His purpose in that test—to demonstrate whether they will be loyal to Him on the basis of devotion to His principles, regardless of the personal disadvantages that such devotion might bring them. This is manifest in the trial of the good angels, of Adam and Eve, of the Ancient Worthies, the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. It will also be manifest in the trial of the fallen angels and the restitution class during the Millennium, as it has been manifest during the trial that the fallen angels have been having during the Gospel Age as to fitness for having the opportunity of standing the Millennial trial for life. If God had revealed or would reveal the exact reasons for each feature of the tests of the above—mentioned classes, He would have defeated His purpose in giving the test. Therefore He practices secretiveness with respect to these trialsome details. Again, if the Lord would reveal clearly His various purposes, Satan and wicked men would make use of such knowledge to thwart the plan, and such a course would necessitate an alteration of God's methods used in carrying out His plan. In ultimate analysis no one can thwart the Almighty; but their thwarting efforts would require changes in effecting the plan not so advantageous as those the Lord uses compatibly with His purpose; for in the execution of His plan He has put Himself into harmony with the principle always to respect the creatures' uncoerced use of their wills. To act in harmony with this principle God must use secretiveness.

The Bible is replete with evidence of God's using secretiveness. He did not let Lucifer understand the

details of his test when he was given the work of being the covering—protecting—cherub in Eden (Ezek. 28: 14, 16). Nor did Adam and Eve understand the details of their trial. When God in sentencing Satan pronounced the woe of enmity and conflict between him and the woman's seed, foretelling his persecuting and wearing out of the seed ("bruise his heel") and the seed's destroying him ("bruise thy head"), He left in that dark saying many things unexplained. Indeed various features of His plan are called mysteries—secrets unknowable apart from special enlightenment from God. Thus, that the promised Deliverer would be a class, not an individual, that this class would have two advents—the first to suffer for sin and the second to reign unto its extirpation—were secrets that God hid from the ages and generations before the Gospel Age, during which He even conceals it from all but the elect classes (Col. 1: 26, 27). That Israel was to be in blindness until the full company of the Gentile elect would be won was kept a secret until St. Paul's time (Rom. 11: 25-33). That God used the Israelites as types to shadow forth Gospel-Age and Millennial-Age features of His plan He concealed from Israel and all others, and even now He makes these things known only to His saints (1 Cor. 10: 6, 11; Col. 2: 16, 17). God wove time features into His plan, but put them there in such a hidden manner that the general readers of the Bible have been and are completely oblivious to the times and seasons of God's eternal counsel (1 Pet. 1: 10-12).

God put all the secrets of His plan into the Bible; but knowing that it would come into the hands of wicked angels and men, as well as into the hands of His faithful people, and that the former would fearfully misuse the Scriptures, He put the secrets there in so hidden a manner that none could understand them except by a special act of God's enlightening

grace, which He has withheld from all except from those to whom He wished to reveal Himself—the faith class. It is for this reason that the Bible in large part is simply unintelligible to any but the consecrated, and that as due. This St. Paul makes very clear in 1 Cor. 2: 7-14. Truly he could say, "We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery"—in a secret way. Take, for example, the Book of Revelation, which professedly is a great mystery. How very ambiguous this book is! Does one wonder why it is that there are so many sects that teach mutually contradictory doctrines and yet profess to base them all on the Bible? *E.g.*, over 450 different interpretations have been given to the words of Gal. 3: 20: "A mediator is not of one; but God is one." We will now explain this strange fact so patent to all observing persons in Christendom: To the natural man God purposely mixed up the teachings of the Bible more inextricably than a thousand Chinese puzzles made into one could be mixed up. Why? Because during the time for the development of the elective features of His plan, God desired these features hidden from fallen angels and non-elect men, who would only misuse their understanding to the thwarting of that plan, if they understood it. While the Word is a light in a dark place (2 Pet. 1: 19) to the faithful, it is also a trap and a snare to the wicked, who in their pride and naughtiness are repeatedly caught by its teachings to their confusion (Is. 28: 13). It was designedly so made for the ultimate benefit of everybody concerned. This secretiveness of God in His revelation is also designed to test especially the humility, honesty, meekness, obedience, faith, loyalty, and patience of His people. He makes each new advance in its knowledge a reward for loyalty in the pertinent test, as He repeatedly withholds the advancing light from them until they have successfully stood the Divinely required test to the heavenly Father's pleasement.

Satan and wicked men would undo the righteous, were it not that God exercises His secretiveness on their behalf. He has hidden the righteous in' His secret place (Ps. 91: 1), "in the secret of His pavilion," just to protect them from the snare of the fowler, Satan, and the noisome pestilence. Psalm 91 is a most beautiful description of how God uses His secretiveness to protect them from all disadvantages and to work for them His advantages. Therefore God has so composed the Bible that Satan and the wicked can learn to understand it only as they hear the saints expound it. And this knowledge they always pervert, and that with fell intent to injure the righteous. *E.g.*, Satan, not understanding the Bible plan, listened to Christ and the Apostles expound it, until he thus learned its general features. On the basis of what he heard them say he made a counterfeit of it in the papacy. In this counterfeit he palmed off' the pope, a head, and his hierarchy, a body, as the counterfeit of Jesus, the Head, and the Church, His Body. Every Biblical doctrine, prophecy, promise and type, and practically every Biblical precept, history and exhortation, he counterfeited in the papacy, and palmed off on the world as of God. The Biblical practices, times and seasons, he also counterfeited in the papacy. This truly dreadful counterfeit he used to enslave the bulk of the human family in error and superstition and to persecute with extreme cruelty the saints of the living God. Having to deal with such a resourceful enemy, who He knew would pervert and seek to thwart God's plan, no wonder that Jehovah used His secretiveness to protect His plan and people from disadvantage, and to secure advantages to them.

The result of Jehovah's exercising such secretiveness in the revelation and outworking of His plan has been the successful execution of all its features in harmony with his foreordained methods as due; and from this we may well infer that its future features

will be successfully carried out. His secret work during the order of affairs among men before the flood inured to test the race in Adam and the angels in place of rulership, and thereby to demonstrate that angels could not lift the race up from its fallen condition. During the Patriarchal Age God's secret work effected the revelation of His great covenant with Abraham and his seed, and also the selection of part of the Ancient Worthies. His secretiveness enabled Him to select a nation—Fleshly Israel—for His dealings and other purposes, and He succeeded in this. His secretiveness worked in a climax in the successful winning of the Christ class from the world during the Gospel Age, as it will also win the complete Great Company and the Youthful Worthies in due time. Then in the Millennial work toward fallen angels and men will appear in part the profit that His secretiveness, working out the elective features of His plan, will achieve by the use that He will make of the four elect classes for turning the fallen angels and men to Him. Yea, in the Ages to come, Age on Age will tell of the marvelous result of the secret working of Jehovah on the four elect classes; for these with the angels in their various orders will be Jehovah's agents in developing the various planets of the worlds about us and filling each of them with new orders of beings. It will then be glory to God and the Lamb—to God, in part because His secretiveness wrought out the Christ class and its associates with this marvelous purpose in view.

God's ninth lower primary attribute of character is providence, which acts through His love for possessing—both in its gaining and retaining aspects. By God's attribute of providence we mean that quality whereby He gains and retains possessions, with which He supplies His coming needs as to the universe and its creatures and carries out His purposes. We speak of a man as provident who by his work

gains, and by his economy retains, possessions in order to have them to use for his future needs and purposes. In a similar way God is provident. When we speak of His coming needs, we are not to understand personal needs; for such He does not have. But by His needs we mean the necessities of His plan and people. There are many needs that God's plan has in the way of agents, instruments, arrangements, spheres, etc., of operation. So do His people in their relation to His plan have many needs—they need mercy, forgiveness, righteousness, instruction, sanctification, deliverance, etc. It is the providing quality in God that makes Him gain and retain the things necessary to supply such needs. That He does supply them is certainly a Scriptural thought. "My God shall supply all your need according to His riches [abundant possessions] in glory by Christ Jesus" (Phil. 4: 19). This abundantly satisfies us.

Let us notice how God acquired and stored up such riches. The Truth that we need for our instruction He drew out of the well-spring of His own heart and mind, and stored it up in the Bible for our use. The righteousness, a supply of which we need, He acquired by making the Logos—the Word—human, and inducing Him by the promises of the Divine nature to sacrifice His righteous humanity, so that His human righteousness might be available for us in an imputative way; and He stored it up as a deposit on our behalf; and thus His providence has and uses what we need to supply our necessities in the way of righteousness. How did He gain and retain the means needed for our sanctification? These are His Word, Spirit and our surroundings, circumstances, etc. Thus He arranged in His plan for an opportunity of co-suffering and co-reigning with Christ on behalf of those who in faith would consecrate themselves to Him under the call of the Gospel Age, and who would prove faithful to death. He stored up His

Word in the Bible so that it would become the power of God working in them (Rom. 1: 16). Then when they were ready He used it to give them the enlightenment and stimulation necessary to work in them a consecrating faith and love whereby they gave themselves without reserve to God. He impregnated that Word with His Spirit—the Divine energy—which He also stored up for this purpose, whereby He begat them of the Spirit: gave a spiritual power to every faculty of their hearts and minds, adapting these to spiritual objects, whereas before such begettals these were adapted to certain objects, only from the natural human standpoint. Thus He began to supply our needs as to sanctification. But in sanctification we have more needs. We need advancing Truth for each new experience. This He acquired in making His plan, and then stored it in the Bible, which is a storehouse for all our need of Truth and its Spirit, even to the end of the way. Then we need power that will enable us to develop every feature of a Christlike character. This power He acquired by the use of His power and stored it, too, in His Word, and by it He enables us to grow in heavenly affections and in the graces of Christ. For the various experiences of our lives He takes from His bounteous store such parts of the Word and of the Spirit as we need and bestows them upon us, and thus His providence supplies these and satisfies our need.

We also need opportunities of demonstrating devotion to our Heavenly Father's cause. This He has also made provision for. By permitting evil in the world He acquired a condition for His cause that calls for our sacrifices in order to its furtherance. These conditions He reserved as a store, supplying us opportunities of service. He puts us in such places where there is need for our declaring His Word to the world or to the brethren, or to assist others to do it. Some of these opportunities call for our personal

declaration of the Truth by word of mouth, others by the printed page, others by letter, while still others call for us to do these things through our brethren. Thus His providence through the permission of evil has made for our needs as to service the opportunities, that if embraced, give us the chance to demonstrate our devotion to God's cause. In arranging for deliverance for us God has used His quality of providence. This He accomplishes by giving us opportunities amid tests to demonstrate loyalty to His character in an exercise of its graces amid trialsome conditions. He has acquired such conditions by allowing us to have fallen flesh with selfish, worldly, sinful and erroneous propensities. Furthermore, He has permitted the fallen angels and fallen men to be in a condition and to do things which very sorely test our devotion to God's character as a character whose likeness we are to attain. Thus we see that God acquired, in these conditions that He permits, a wealth of things for the testing of a Christlike character in us, in order to work deliverance for us, *i.e.*, victory in all the conflicts incidental to the Christian warfare and final victory as a result of these victorious conflicts in delivering us from death in the glorious first resurrection. How marvelously has God's love for gaining and retaining acted toward us in the providence that acquires and stores up against future needs. These same things under altered conditions will be manifested toward the world in the Millennium, as they have been toward the other three elect classes; but we will not discuss them further.

There is another remarkable way that God's love for acquiring and storing up for future needs has manifested itself—in acquiring all creation as His own, particularly the various orders of angels, the Christ class, the other three elect classes and the world in the Millennium, and not only so, but in the Ages to come the perfected planets and their perfect inhabitants

in ever increasing additions. When we look at the various features of His plan as respects the Church and the world, we see that they result in God's acquiring sons on various planes of being. Some may say that God must be very avaricious to be gaining and retaining on such a colossal scale. We answer, No; for He does all this gaining and retaining in order to bless. He doubtless has pleasure in such gaining and retaining, but that pleasure instead of being a selfish one is a benevolent one; for it is all to the intent that He may, in harmony with good principles, bless and make happy all the larger number of beings. What a noble use God makes of His acquiring and retaining faculty! How beautiful and noble, therefore, is the grace that this faculty of His exercises—providence! And how it should move us to love and adore and praise Him all the more, especially giving Him the highest form of praise in this particular, viz., in cultivating a similar kind of providence—one that gains and retains good things, not for self-aggrandizement, but to bless and ennoble.

We have so far studied nine of God's lower primary attributes of character. Those of this class of Divine attributes so far studied belong to the lower selfish, as distinct from the lower social primary attributes of character. We have shown that man has twelve lower primary selfish affections—nine of them corresponding to the nine in God so far studied, the other three being love for food, love for knowledge and love for making oneself agreeable to others. God has no affection organ corresponding to love for food as we use that word in its natural sense; for love for natural food is implanted in natural beings to incite them to take nourishment to replace the depleted cells of the body by cell matter gotten from natural food. Such food implies that its partaker has a corruptible body, whose wasted cells must be replaced by other cells derived from the food that one digests and assimilates; but

God has an incorruptible and immortal body (Rom. 1: 23; 1 Tim. 1: 17; 6: 16). Therefore there is no cell wastage in His body, and thus no need of food to supply cells to replace such wastage.

We speak spiritually when we talk of our partaking of God's Word, as of our eating it (Jer. 15: 16, 1 Pet. 2: 2; Heb. 5: 11-14; 6: 5; Rev. 10: 8-10). It is the food on which our spirits—new creatures—feed. From it we gain nourishment for our spiritual hearts and minds; and by it we spiritually grow and gain strength. Thus it also supplies spiritual lacks and wastage. But we cannot speak of God as using His words or thoughts to supply spiritual wastes or lacks; for He has none of these. Therefore there is, so far as we know, nothing in God that corresponds to our need of natural and spiritual food. So far as we can discern, God is the only being in the universe who needs no spiritual food; and this is due to His omniscience. Christ now, and the Little Flock beyond the veil, will not need it in order to their replacing lost knowledge or to their strengthening in character; for they will never forget anything and their characters will be forever unbreakably strong. But they will need the revelations of new things from God in order to know what and how to do in the future works of creation, as the Ages roll on in endless succession. Such knowledge with reference to the Millennial arrangements is part of the blessings implied in the term, the marriage *supper* of the Lamb (Rev. 19: 9). Here we note that the figure of eating is implied in the language, the marriage supper; but the only lack that its knowledge part will supply is of new intelligence. There will be no character lack, nor forgotten knowledge, supplied by that supper. God's intuitive and universal knowledge of things precludes such a lack in Him. Hence we cannot speak of God's even having a longing for spiritual food, and therefore cannot discuss appetitiveness as a lower primary grace in God.

God has the affection-organs in which love for knowledge lies; but He does not love any knowledge as a thing that He longs for, and does not have; for He has all knowledge, has always had all knowledge and will always have all knowledge. His store of knowledge is infinite. It can neither be increased, nor diminished. And His love for it consists not in a longing for and a delight to attain it, but in a delight in its possession, as an excellent, good and valuable thing in itself and in its uses. He does not have to study to gain it. It, and all of it, is His intuitively and has been and will always be His intuitively. Our love for knowledge makes us studious; and studiousness is a lower primary grace in us; but God does not have this quality, because He does not study, not needing to do so, for the reason that without study, *i.e.*, intuitively, He has known and does and will know all things. It is for this reason that we classed and treated of omniscience as an attribute of God's being (Chapter II). Thus we see that two of our lower primary graces, appetitiveness and studiousness, God does not have; the first because of the incorruptibility and immortality of His body, and the second because omniscience is in God an attribute of being, not of character. His love for true knowledge—the Truth—is, however, an activity of His character, for it is the first feature or element of His disinterested love, and as such we have treated of it when discussing His love (Chapter III). Hence we cannot treat of studiousness as a lower primary attribute in God.

In our enumerating the lower selfish affections, we just noted that as the eleventh we gave: love for knowledge, which produces intelligence, a lower primary grace. Hence the above remarks on studiousness. Love for work has not a single affection-organ through which it might operate. It results in part from other qualities seizing our affection-organ of love for ease and suppressing its efforts to control us, and this

produces as a result a secondary grace—industriousness. Hence its producing qualities need not be those of our lower affection-organs. Working properly such qualities would usually be the higher primary graces. We therefore see that love for work does not belong in the list of the selfish affections.

There is, therefore, but one other lower selfish affection in God that we will consider—love for making Himself agreeable. Its being a love to make *self* agreeable to others in part induces us to class it among the lower selfish affections. We would not insist as a matter of doctrine that this is a lower selfish affection. In some respects, when properly working, it is quite unselfish, and its place in the head is not adjacent to any selfish affection-organ. It is more of a general affection than a selfish affection; but because self is involved in it and it uses the selfish affections in activity and suppression probably more than it does any others, we have, from other apt considerations also, put it among the selfish affections, though in its nature it is not a selfish sentiment. We cannot place it among the higher affections; nor can we place it among the artistic affections, like love of oratory, of acting, of the beautiful, of the sublime and of the humorous; nor can we place it among the intellectual affections. In some respects it fits very well among the lower social affections, and in other respects among the lower selfish affections. We are discussing it at the end of all the lower selfish graces, and before the lower social affections, designedly, because it very much belongs to both of them. It is either to be classed as an affection by itself alone, or to be classed as belonging to both the selfish and social affections, with a leaning toward the former—hence our classification of it. But if one might think otherwise and place it among the social affections, we will not at all be disposed to dispute with him for so doing; for much can be said in favor of such a classification. These facts move some

to count it a general affection by itself alone, and not belonging to any group, but acting through all of them. This view has probably more in its favor than the other two, and for this reason we will treat of it as a figurative bridge between the lower selfish and the lower social affections. But the question of classification is not essential to our understanding of its nature, office and effects in God.

The affection-organ through which love of making oneself pleasing to others works, develops by exercise agreeableness as its lower primary grace. By this we do not mean the quality that makes people agree in everything with others; for such a quality is hardly a grace; at least it is not usually so; rather it is often a *dis*-grace. It shows that its possessor lacks independence of thought, feeling and will. It proves that he is servile and unmanly, lacking in courage and decision, as well as in independence. We think of such as echoes. In religion they are the priest-ridden, in politics the bossed, in labor the enslaved, in business the ciphered, in state the bound, and in family the hen-pecked, or rooster-pecked—in a word, these are Crusoe's man, Friday. By agreeableness as a lower primary grace we mean the quality whereby one makes himself pleasing to others. His words, looks, acts and manner please. He is winsome. He readily insinuates himself into the good graces of others. They think him pleasant, delight in his society and feel at ease with him. They readily lend themselves to be persuaded by him. His bland conduct soothes those with whom he comes in contact. Where others excite, anger, enrage, disgust and sadden, he calms, composes, pacifies, conciliates and delights. He knows what to avoid as working for disagreeableness; he knows what to use as making for agreeableness. So peculiarly winning is he that he even fascinates and gains over opponents to himself. He knows how to speak so as to take the sting out of disagreeable things that he

must at times utter; and often endears himself to a wrongdoer by the pleasant way that he administers a needed correction. He is a benediction to the mourners and troubled, and makes loyal friends of those even who are not naturally disposed to friendship. The quality that acts in this way is the one that we mean by agreeableness; and when it is controlled by the higher primary graces it is one of the most useful of the lower primary graces, especially in contact with our associates, friends and neighbors.

God in a pre-eminent way has this quality. He lacks those qualities that make for disagreeableness and has in perfection those that make for agreeableness. He is not contentious. Where in the Bible or out of it do we find Him so? Everywhere He expresses His thoughts long-sufferingly and peacefully. He is not disputatious. We search the Scriptures and history in vain to find Him disputatious. Without disputing He sets forth reasonably His mind on the subjects that He discusses. Never does He revile His opponents, though He does at times say uncomplimentary things of them; but He tells disagreeable truths as mildly as can be done. Did He oppose Pharaoh? It was without bitterness, ridicule or vituperation. Did He send His messengers to proclaim the flood in Noah's day, the angels to deliver Lot and his family from Sodom's approaching doom, Moses and Aaron to predict the fate of the Egyptians, the angel to destroy the Assyrian host, the prophets and Jesus to announce Jerusalem's fall, and the faithful to proclaim the destruction of the second, "this evil" world? He commissioned none of them to be vituperative or abusive. Rather, both He Himself used sober language in prophesying the pertinent calamities and He commissioned His messengers to imitate His example. How agreeably did He act toward Abraham at Mamre, Jacob at Bethel, Moses at Horeb, Joshua at Jordan, Gideon at Abiezer, Samuel at Shiloh, David at Bethlehem,

Solomon at Gibeon, Elijah at Samaria, Isaiah and Jeremiah at Jerusalem, Daniel at Babylon, Mordecai, Ezra and Nehemiah at Shushan, Jesus at Nazareth, Peter at Caesarea Philippi, Paul at Damascus and John at Patmos. Insinuatingly winsome was He in all these acts. And when we view His dealings with Polycarp, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Arius, Claudius of Turin, Berengar of Tours, Peter Abelard, Arnold of Brescia, Waldo, Marsiglio, Tauler, Wyclif, Huss, Wesel, Wessel, Savonarola, Luther, Zwingli, Hubmaier, Servetus, Cranmer, Browne, Fox, Wesley, Stone, Miller, Russell and all the other saints, less prominent indeed than these, but yet loyal to Him, we see how winsomely He has acted toward them.

In our own experiences with Him we have found Him the acme of agreeableness. He giveth liberally and upbraideth not. How open-hearted and kindly He was to us as He led us out of sin into repentance and faith unto justification! How ineffably winsome He has been while enlightening us in our ignorance and giving us freely, without upbraiding, and most graciously His all-embracing, mind-satisfying and heart-resting Truth! How winsomely did He woo us to the brideship of Jesus—"Harken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; forget also thy people and thy father's house. So shall the King greatly desire thy beauty; for He is thy Lord and worship thou Him!" Was ever a marriage proposal clothed in more gracious and winsome terms than these? So did He woo us to brideship for Jesus, and certainly He has been conducting us most agreeably to the Bridegroom's home now being prepared for us. How agreeable have been His spirit, words, acts and manner, as He gave us the bridal present of the hearing ears, the working hand, the ornate will, and the espousal robe of the beauty of holiness? Agreeable indeed have been His attitude, works and acts toward us as He develops us in every good word and work. How fascinatingly

winsome have His words been to us when we are weary and heavy-laden—"Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest." When tribulations as a great flood would overflow and submerge us, most agreeably He tells us: "When thou passest through deep waters I will be with thee; and they shall not overflow thee." In our storms He reassuringly tells us: "It is I; be not afraid." In our battles with sin, error, selfishness and worldliness He strengthens us with the comfort that the battle is the Lord's and that He will go forward with us. In every experience of life, whether it be toward or untoward, easy or hard, pleasant or unpleasant, joyful or sorrowful, pleasurable or painful, He shows Himself toward us as the gracious, winsome, pleasing and agreeable God that He is, our Father and our Helper, our Lover and our Friend, our Preserver and our Provider, our Teacher and our Trainer, our Comforter and our Encourager; and in it all, through it all and by it all, He ever remains our ever gracious and winsome God.

Is it any wonder that so gracious and agreeable a being as God wins many and holds them, not by physical, but by heart and mind ties? Is it any wonder that now, while sin is in the ascendancy, the best of minds and hearts are unbreakably drawn to Him? Is it any wonder that He shall yet win to Himself billions of the fallen race and myriads of the fallen angels in everlasting ties of sacred loyalty? To deal with Him in a reciprocal spirit is to become won by and to Him. To fellowship with Him is to admire, appreciate and cling to Him. To know Him is to desire to be everlastingly united with Him. To feel His favor, to know His generosity, to experience His benignity and to have His smile, are joy ineffable, peace ununderstandable and heaven on earth. His agreeableness brightens our nights and glorifies our days; it turns our winters into spring and makes our Decembers as pleasant as May. Overcome by a sense of His winsomeness we

forget our sorrows, bid "good-bye" to our troubles, triumph in our trials and conquer in life's battles. In His favor, which expresses itself in His agreeableness, we find life and health, peace and joy, faith and sight, hope and fruition, love and delight, brotherhood and Fatherhood! The Scriptures, in ascribing to Him supreme longsuffering, forbearance, forgiveness, generosity, magnanimity, liberality, mildness, love, peace, joy and graciousness, declare to us His supremacy in agreeableness. We praise, worship and adore Him for another of His glorious lower primary graces—even His agreeableness. And our praise, worship and adoration of Him should be so heartfelt as to make us long to be and daily endeavor to become like Him in the lower primary grace, agreeableness, a quality that will make us a blessing to others, a strength for ourselves and an honor for God.

In the discussion of our theme in the foregoing parts of this chapter we have finished our consideration of God's Selfish Lower Primary Attributes of Character, and with the next part of this chapter we begin our study of God's Social Lower Primary Attributes of Character. The difference between these two sets of primary attributes of character lies in this: That whereas the selfish lower primary attributes go out to self as their object, the social lower primary attributes go out to others. Thus self-esteem, approbateness, restfulness, etc., reach out to self as their object in certain respects, while conjugality, friendship, parental love, etc., go out to others as their object. There are certain aspects of the social graces that God does not have, *e.g.*, amativeness—love for the opposite sex—love for parents and love for brothers and sisters. There being no sex in God, there is no sex love in Him. He not having parents, brothers or sisters, He of course does not have corresponding qualities—love for parents, brothers or sisters. Thus there are certain affections that human beings have

which God does not have. And since these are such as are based on the differences of their natures, there are certain respects in which God's character differs from man's character. But, apart from love for food and drink, which man's physical constitution will always require him to have, these differences will cease after man has attained full perfection and crystallized character; for then in mankind sex will have passed out of existence (Luke 20: 35-37), and human family ties will have been swallowed up into the family relation of Christ and the Church as the parents of the perfected race, all of whose members will then be brothers.

While there is no sex in God and while He does not have a wife in our sense of the word, wife, nevertheless God's relations to the covenants whereby He develops His children are Scripturally set forth as those of a husband to a wife. Thus He is set forth as the husband of the covenant that develops the Little Flock (Is. 54: 1, 5; Gal. 4: 26, 27). In this He is, as Husband, typed by Abraham, whose wife, Sarah, types this covenant (Gal. 4: 21-31), God's symbolic wife. The Divine covenants in their primary significance are promises (Eph. 2: 12). Some of His covenants are unconditional and some are conditional promises. Thus the Lord's promises—covenants—to Noah and to Abraham and to Abraham's seed are unconditional (Is. 54: 9; Rom. 11: 29; Gal. 3: 15—18; Heb. 6: 17, 18); while the Law Covenant and the New Covenant are conditional promises, man's obedience being required, if he would get the promise (Gal. 3: 10-12; Ezek. 18: 4-24).

But the word, covenant, is used in a second sense in the Scriptures, *i.e.*, in the sense of all the teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc., connected with a covenant in the primary sense of the word. Thus all of the teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc., connected with the covenant made at Sinai are a part of the Law

Covenant in this second sense of the word. Thus while God and Israel bound themselves to one another in a covenant, in the first sense of that word, at Sinai; the covenant, in the second sense of that word, began to be made with the institution of the Passover, the day Israel left Egypt (Heb. 8: 9), and was not completed until Moses finished giving the covenant teachings, etc., to Israel just before he died, a few days before Israel's crossing Jordan and about forty years after leaving Egypt (Deut. 33: 1-29).

Then, in the third place, the word, covenant, is Scripturally used to include with the two preceding senses the servants who apply the promises and their pertinent teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc., to those in the covenant. It is in this third sense of the word, which includes the first and second senses as a part of it, that the covenant is called Scripturally, the mother. This we gather from Is. 54: 17, compared with the rest of the chapter, where the Sarah Covenant is addressed as Jehovah's wife and the mother of His children, while the one addressed is shown in verse 17 to include God's servants. Compare also St. Paul's use of Is. 54: 1 in proof of his explanation of the antitype of Sarah, in Gal. 4: 21-31. This is also manifest from what St. Peter said in Acts 3: 25, where the prophets, in their capacity of ministering to the Church (1 Pet. 1: 12) various features elaborative of the Sarah promises, are with those promises called the mother of the Israelites indeed, who had just become new creatures through the faith wrought in their hearts by the preceding part of St. Peter's discourse. It is when the third sense of the word, covenant, is used (which third sense includes the other two senses of the word), that God figures forth the covenant as a woman who is His wife. This is quite manifest from the fact that while the Sarah Covenant was barren (during the Patriarchal and Jewish Ages), it is spoken of as sorrowful, mourning, desolate,

troubled, forsaken, etc., in Is. 54. All these expressions descriptive of distress characterize the covenant in the third sense of the word, because the prophets, who were a part of the covenant in that sense of the word, had just such experiences while "unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the Gospel unto you with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven." (1 Pet. 1: 12). Yet the covenant was barren in their days and only at Jordan in our Lord and at Pentecost in the first representatives of the Church did it begin to bring forth the Seed of promise and has throughout the Gospel Age been continuing to bring forth that Seed, that in its last part will soon be glorified.

In God's relations to the Law Covenant and especially to the Abrahamic Covenant, particularly in its Sarah feature, God has been exercising the social lower primary grace of conjugality—husbandliness. That is, just as a true husband feels and acts toward his wife, so has God felt and acted toward this great covenant. In God's relations to these two covenants, God is typed by Abraham and these two covenants are typed by Sarah and Hagar (Gal. 4: 21-31). Just as Abraham, at Sarah's suggestion, took Hagar only temporarily, and then at Sarah's suggestion dismissed her; so God, at the suggestion of the servants of the Abrahamic promises, took the Law Covenant in the third sense of that term as His temporary wife, and at their suggestion dismissed it. In both cases the latter was done only after each mother and son had shown their wrong attitude toward the true Seed of promise. Nevertheless God acted a husbandly part toward the Law Covenant in the third sense of the word throughout the Jewish Age, until at its end the servants of that covenant—the priest, Levites, scribes, Pharisees, etc., proved their utter unworthiness, whereupon the Lord cast off them, the Law's promises and its teachings,

arrangements, institutions, etc., with all under them, from His favor.

It is, however, more in His relations with the married wife, antitypical Sarah, and not with the desolate—cast off—concubine, antitypical Hagar (Is. 54: 1), that Jehovah's quality of husbandliness appears; for God acts like a true husband toward antitypical Sarah—the oath—bound promises to the Christ, their Biblically elaborated teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc., and His servants that apply these to His faithful children. These promises, teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc., and servants, are of the highest order and call forth God's appreciation and sympathy. And He richly gives these to them as His wife. In sublimest strain and tenderest sentiment Jehovah tells of His feelings and activities toward antitypical Sarah. We make bold to say that for elevation of thought, tenderness of feeling, delight of spirit and oneness of heart and mind, nowhere in literature does husbandly feeling and activity go out in so noble, beautiful and sublime ways as God's husbandly feelings and activities express themselves to antitypical Sarah in Is. 54. We ask our readers, especially those among them who are husbands, carefully to read Is. 54 and then try to match it with anything in all literature descriptive of good husbands. Note, in verse 1, the triumphant joy of the husband at His wife, long childless, becoming the mother of His children. Consider His encouraging her, in v. 2, to make a suitable home for the increasing family, unstintingly in His providing for its every comfort and enlargement. See how, in v. 3, He rejoices with her in the future success of their beloved and mutual children. See how, in v. 4, He beautifully describes her glorious future and lovingly and sympathetically comforts her as against a sad past. Note carefully how, in v. 5, He points out her highest honor in being the beloved wife of the Supreme Being, the Hallowed of God's people and the Covenant God of

the whole earth. Notice the marvelous contrasts in vs. 6-8, each one blotting out a sad past by a bright present and future. Keep in mind, in vs. 9 and 10, how He swears undying fidelity, tenderest care and sure joy for the future. How tenderly, in vs. 11, 12, He, reminding her of the sad past (the Patriarchal and Jewish Ages) in which she was the afflicted, tempest-tossed and uncomforted one, assures her, His beloved wife, of the great prosperity, beauty and value of her glorious palace which she will share with Him! Her wifely heart as the mother of His children is, in v. 13, made to beat with joy in His husbandly assurance that He Himself will be the teacher of their children and will lead them into great prosperity. How remarkably His confidence in her noble character of righteousness, mercy and courage is set forth in v. 14! While, in v. 15, He tells her that envious evil-wishers will take counsel against her. He nevertheless assures her that He will so thoroughly defend her as to deliver her and foil them—a real Husband protecting the wife of His bosom. While He assures her, in v. 16, that it is of His permissive ordering that the evil-intentioned will act, yet, in v. 17, He promises her—His servants—complete victory over every error and wrong that will arise against her and that He Himself will provide her righteousness—in Christ will this be. In this chapter every husbandly function as possessed by Jehovah in the highest degree, is touched on. Here the husband is set forth as the one who loves his wife, cherishes her, honors her, companions her, trusts her, provides for her, protects her and co-operates with her in the raising and training of their children. Is there any husbandly quality and act found wanting in Him? And did ever a husband tell it all more beautifully, winsomely, lovingly and reassuringly than Jehovah, the Husband—antitypical Abraham—of the Sarah Covenant? This chapter, through the light thrown on it by St. Paul in Gal. 4: 21-31, is indescribably fine, and

certainly proves that God has in the highest degree the social grace of husbandliness. This would also appear from a consideration of His husbandly relations to the New Covenant, but we forbear giving further particulars.

As Jehovah is the best of husbands, so, too, is He the best of fathers—He has the social grace of fatherliness. At the present time God is the Father of the angelic hosts (Job 1: 6; 2: 1; 38: 7), of the Little Flock (Rom. 8: 14-16), and of the Great Company (2 Cor. 6: 18). After the Millennium, as the antitypical Abraham, He will also be the Father of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies and of the faithful of the Restitution Class (Rom. 4: 17). While in all these relations He is an ideal Father, exercising unapproachable fatherliness, we will limit our consideration of Him as Father to His fatherly relation to the Little Flock—Jesus and His faithful footstep followers. God is the Father of these, according to many Scriptures (Matt. 3: 17; 11: 25-27; 18: 10, 14, 19; Luke 22: 29; 23: 46; John 1: 14, 18; 10: 36-38; Rom. 1: 3, 4; Gal. 4: 6, 7; 1 Thes. 1: 3; Heb. 12: 9; 1 John 3: 1). And He does toward and for them everything that a real father should do toward and for his children, with this important difference: that whereas there are frequently mistakes of head and inabilities of hand in the best of earthly fathers, Jehovah, as the Father of Jesus and the Church, never makes any mistake of head or lacks any ability of hand in His relations to His children. There are especially seven things that must be done by one who has full fatherliness. We will, on consideration, readily recognize these as the acts of a real father; and these God does in supreme degree toward the Christ Class. A true earthly father begets, loves, companions, provides for, trains, prepares an inheritance for, and gives an inheritance to, his children. And God does these things in a perfect and supreme way, thus exercising real fatherliness.

In the first place, God begets His children. Without begetting children one cannot really be a father; for the begetting act is fundamental to fatherhood. The Scriptures clearly teach that God has begotten Jesus and His followers (John 1: 14, 18; 3: 16, 18; Jas. 1: 3; 1 John 5: 1, 18). Of course we are not to think of God's act of begetting the Christ as a carnal thing. It is altogether spiritual. The seed whereby the begetting has been done is God's Word as it pertains to sanctifying faith and love (Jas. 1: 18; 1 Pet. 1: 23). The mother in whom the begetting has taken place is the Sarah Covenant in the third or wide sense of that word. She furnishes truths other than those that create sanctifying faith and love unto the begetting of the Spirit. With these other truths she has nourished the begotten powers implanted in the consecrated head and heart. These truths correspond to the ovum and subsequent nourishment furnished by the human mother to the seed of human begetting and to the begotten thing. If we ask what the act of the begetting is, we answer: the impartation of spiritual capacities to all the brain organs of a consecrator. These capacities enable each brain organ of ours to reach beyond its natural objects and to attach itself to corresponding spiritual things. *E.g.*, our intellectual organs naturally reach out and grasp human knowledge. While after our spirit-begetting our intellectual organs continue so to exercise themselves; yet, through the spiritual capacities bestowed upon them by the begetting, they additionally reach out and grasp, spiritual knowledge. Again, our heart organs—affections—naturally reach out to human objects, like our human parents, brethren, friends, etc. But after our spirit-begetting, while our affections still continue to go out to our human parents, etc., our affection-organs through the implanted spiritual capacities reach out to our heavenly Parents—God and the Sarah Covenant, our heavenly brethren and friends—Jesus and the Church, etc. God

has been our begetter, because by the pertinent Truth He implanted spiritual capacities in every one of our brain organs, adapting them to spiritual objects. The begetting of the Spirit is God's first act as our Father. With the greatest of care has He done this, choosing the proper persons, time, place and condition, so that the embryo new creature is started on his way under the best circumstances for his development; which is real fatherliness.

A second thing that belongs to the quality of fatherliness is fatherly love. The proverb puts it like this: Every father loves his child. Human experience proves this with respect to a good earthly father; and certainly the Scriptures and the experiences of God's children prove that God loves them. "The Father Himself loveth you" (John 16: 27). "He that loveth Me [Jesus] shall be loved of My Father ... If a man love Me [Jesus], he will keep My words, and My Father will love him" (John 14: 21, 23). "Thou ... hast loved them as Thou hast loved Me ... That the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in [given to] them" (John 17: 23, 26). These passages show that God loves Jesus and His faithful ones and that with the same kind of love, though, of course, not in the same degree. "All that be at Rome, beloved of God, called saints" (Rom. 1: 7). "His great love wherewith He hath loved us" (Eph. 2: 4). "Our Father, who hath loved us" (2 Thes. 2: 16). "Herein is love ... that He loved us ... God so loved us ... He first loved us" (1 John 4: 10, 11, 19). This love includes duty and disinterested love in appreciation, sympathy and service. What are His creative works toward us other than expressions of His love? Look at His providential blessings on us and therein see His great love for us. Consider His redemptive work in giving up His Son, even unto death, and His love toward us becomes manifest. His instructional blessings prove His love for us by experience. His justifying

blessings in forgiving us our sins and in imputing Christ's righteousness to us, are another proof from experience that He loves us as His children. His sanctifying blessings, both with respect to the sacrifice of our humanity and the development of our new creatures, evidence from experience His love for us. His delivering blessings, giving us victory in our battles with sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, reveal in experience His love for us. And what shall we say of the future features of His delivering blessings—deliverance from the grave and human nature into heaven, the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ. All this certainly proves His love for us. Yea, in these ways God loves us as His children. So, in the highest sense, He has that feature of fatherliness whereby He loves us as His children.

The third thing that a genuine father does toward His children is that He companions them—gives them fellowship. He is not a real father who in cold austerity holds his children at arm's length, feeling, looking, speaking and acting sternly and distantly toward them. Such a father may secure their obedience and fear; but he will never endear himself to them; nor will he ever draw out the spirit of childship from them toward himself. Companionableness on his part that draws out his children's confidence and love are needed as elements of fatherliness, if he would fulfill this one of the functions of fatherliness. God as our Father exercises this quality of fatherliness in His dealing with us as His children. The chief elements of such companionableness are: Confidence, sympathy, adaptability, agreeableness, kindness, interest and partnership. God as our Father has confidence in us to the degree that our qualities of heart and mind and our spirit of consecration warrant; and He shows us that He has such confidence by imparting to us the secrets that He keeps within the family circle and by entrusting us with a stewardship in His interests. He sympathizes

with us in all our joys and sorrows, pleasures and pains, successes and failures, hopes and fears, aims and ambitions, works and recreations; for it is especially with reference to the Church that it is written, "In all their affliction He was afflicted" (Is. 63: 9). Moreover His sympathy with us is also one of heart's oneness—kindredness of feeling with us. Such sympathy, of course, conduces to fellowship.

Then He certainly adapts Himself to the peculiarities of all His children. There is not a quality in us that He does not understand; there is not a weakness in us toward which He does not know how to act and does not act properly. There is not a circumstance in our lives but He accommodates Himself to it. There is not an experience coming to any one of us but He sees and feels its ins and outs. In all the changes of our moods and modes, in all the vicissitudes of our work and rest, in all the diversities of our talents and attainments, in all the varieties of our graces and faults and in all the variations of our states and activities, He knows how to, and does adjust Himself to us in most helpful, uplifting and beneficent ways. His agreeableness toward us as His faithful children is never ruffled; it is unchangeable and it is always in evidence. No petulance, no touchiness, no garrulity, no grouchiness, marks His carriage toward us. When we offend in weakness or ignorance, He knows how to close one eye; when we do not play fair, He knows how to forgive; and when we do well, He knows how to smile most charmingly and winsomely. Then He is also interested in us and in what concerns and interests us. He never loses the sense of a personal concern for us and a personal feeling toward us. And in what interests us He is interested; and for what concerns us He is concerned. He is not indifferent to what is for our weal or woe. He never clothes Himself with the mantle of forgetfulness and the girdle of abstractedness when our good is concerned; for He always

makes our interests His. His kindness, too, is ever on hand and active. If danger lurks in some place, He beneficently points it out and guards against it. If need threatens us, He provides against it; and if it is present, He supplies it. If good is present, He works on it to improve it; and if anything is wanting for our best good, He sees to it that it is bestowed. And, finally, in His fellowship feeling toward us He enters into a real partnership with us. This partnership is one of spirit; for He gives us His Spirit. It is one of interest; for He shares with us His wealth. It is one of work; for He makes us collaborators of His. And it is one of ambition; for He associates us with Him in the realization of His plans and purposes. Thus in the highest sense He embodies in His companionship of us as His children the qualities of confidence, sympathy, adaptability, agreeableness, interest, kindness and partnership; and this is the third element of true fatherliness.

The fourth thing that a good father does for his children is to provide their food, raiment and shelter, and that in harmony with his ability and station in life. This God does, not only in earthly, but more especially in heavenly respects, from which latter standpoint we desire to give briefly some general items. He provides the best of spiritual foods for them—the pure and unadulterated nourishment of the Word, both in its milk [simpler truths] and in its strong meat [deeper truths] aspects (Heb. 5: 12-14). This food covers doctrinal, ethical, promissory, hortatory, prophetic, historical and typical truths, variously adapted in each of its forms to the babe, the child, the youth, the man and the aged. And the raiment that He provides for them is both beautiful and useful. How beautiful is our Lord's robe of righteousness, which God has provided for us to wear (Is. 61: 10)! It hides every uncomely feature in us and adorns us in real beauty. Our Father, whose sense of beauty and comeliness is superior

to that of any other being, looks upon us when so arrayed with the utmost satisfaction and pleasure. It protects us from too much cold and heat, keeps us comfortable and expedites our movements. Additionally, He provides us with the means and instrumentalities whereby we may embroider our raiment. With threads of gold [Divine Spirit] and needles of silver [Truth] we are by Him enabled to work out on our Divinely provided raiment beautiful designs drawn thereon into the Christian graces, whereby our wedding garments will be charmingly beautiful (Ps. 45: 13, 14). So, too, He gives us the best of shelter; for He Himself is our habitation (1 John 4: 16). This is the most beautiful, tasteful and practical home ever erected. It is well lighted and ventilated. It is roomy and comfortable. It has the elegance of a palace and the invitesomeness of a home; and perpetual joy and peace reign there. Father, mother and children here are in the best of bonds, in the finest of spirits and in the most joyful of hearts. The house is well protected from the contagion of error, which cannot come nigh it (Ps. 92: 10). The sun of temptation (Luke 8: 6, 13; Matt. 13: 6, 21) cannot beat upon this house so as to make it uncomfortably hot within, or smite with sunstroke those who dwell therein. In the winter time of trouble it is kept comfortably warm, so that those who dwell therein are never cold; for no tribulation too great for them to bear is allowed to come nigh them. And while outside of this house the night of sin reigns with its sorrows, woes, uncertainty and fears, within that house it is always light; for the light of Truth illuminates its every room and hall. Thus God Himself provides His children perfect shelter. His giving His children food, raiment and shelter, and that of the best quality and in abounding quantity, proves Him to fulfill perfectly the fourth function of a father—providing for his family—and thus proves that He has also this ingredient of real fatherliness.

The fifth function of a father is training his children; and therefore the ability so to do and the exercise of this ability are the fifth element of fatherliness. As a true Father, God trains His children. This training embraces intellectual, heart and manual matters. He trains their heads by teaching them true knowledge, which He enables them to perceive, remember and reason on, so that this knowledge becomes a part of their very being. Thus they live in His knowledge, and it becomes, so to speak, a second nature to them. This knowledge is both theoretical, inasmuch as it gives them the right principles of thought, speech and action, and practical, inasmuch as it is of a kind that they can and do apply helpfully to all the problems of life. Furthermore, He trains their hearts, because He knows that character is the best of all acquisitions, the most useful of all attainments and the most attractive of all embellishments. In their training He puts them through every process of character development: supply of lacks, overcoming of faults, quickening in good, growth in good, strengthening in good, balancing in good and crystallizing in good. And when He has finished His training of their hearts, they have the finest of hearts in the universe; and thus with such characters they will be well adapted to living forever (Ps. 22: 26). Then, God as Father gives His children manual training as well as head and heart training. He trains them in the arts of building (Matt. 7: 24-27; 1 Cor. 3: 10-15), whereby they erect the structures of faith and character; husbandry, whereby they plant and water God's garden (1 Cor. 3: 6-9); vineyardry, whereby they grow precious fruits in God's vineyard (Matt. 21: 28-31, 41, 43); and farming, whereby they sow, reap, sheave, dry, thresh, winnow, supervise the sifting and co-operate in the garnering of the wheat. Many of them He trains in the work of shepherding sheep (Acts 20: 28); and some of them make a splendid success of such work. He trains them to be good

merchants (Matt. 13: 45, 46), capable fishermen (Matt. 4: 19), careful watchmen (Matt. 24: 42-44), successful executives (Matt. 25: 14-17) and good teachers (Matt. 28: 19). He develops them into being athletes, whereby they become great racers (Heb. 12: 1; 1 Cor. 9: 24-26), mighty wrestlers (Eph. 6: 12), skillful boxers (1 Cor. 9: 26, 27) and brave, efficient and victorious soldiers (2 Tim. 2: 3; Rev. 3: 21; 15: 2). Thus He trains them for many forms of occupation in this life; but additionally He is training them for successful careers in life everlasting as Kings, Priests (Rev. 20: 6), Mediators (Acts 3: 23; Heb. 9: 15-17), Physicians (Rev. 22: 2, 3), Teachers (Ps. 22: 30, 31), Judges (1 Cor. 6: 2, 3), and Saviors (Ob. 21). Accordingly, God as Father gives His children a splendid training.

The sixth thing that a good father does for his children is to prepare for them an inheritance. And God has this feature of fatherliness in His character. Before the foundation of the world He made a plan, an integral part of which embraces the preparation of an inheritance for His children (Eph. 1: 11). This inheritance is not gotten in this life, but is one that will be bestowed in the next life with the saints in light (Acts 20: 32; 26: 18). It is therefore an inheritance reached through the salvation process, and that at its end (Heb. 1: 14). St. Peter assures us of this also, adding that it will be incorruptible as to the body, undefiled as to the heart and mind, unfadeable as to life, and heavenly as to nature (1 Pet. 1: 4). The process through which it is being prepared is the Spirit begetting, quickening, growth, strengthening, balancing, crystallizing and birth (1 Pet. 1: 3; Eph. 2: 5; 2 Pet. 3: 18; 1 Pet. 5: 10; John 3: 5-8). Our Lord Jesus is God's Agent in preparing this inheritance (John 14: 2). The offer and acceptance of the hope of obtaining this inheritance makes us heirs of God and joint-heirs with the Lord Jesus (Rom. 8: 14-17; Gal. 4: 6, 18).
The

things that the heirship has in store for us are: eternal heavenly life (Titus 3: 7) in heavenly Divine bodies (1 Cor. 15: 41-54; 2 Cor. 4: 16-5: 8; 2 Pet. 1: 4), joint-heirship with Christ (Rom. 8: 17) in the kingdom promise of ruling and blessing (Jas. 2: 5; Rev. 1: 6; 5: 10) and in the administration of the universe by perfecting yet uncreated orders of beings and their residential planets in harmony with God's plans yet to be revealed (Eph. 2: 7; Is. 9: 7). Truly, the preparation of our inheritance outshines any other parental preparation of inheritance for children.

The final thing that a good father does for His children is to give them a well ordered and sufficient inheritance—the best he can give. Certainly, Jehovah as Father does this for His children in superlative degree. The time when He will give this inheritance is our Lord's Second Advent (1 Pet. 1: 7). It will be before the assembled heavenly host. It will include all God's wealth—the boundless universe with all that pertains to it. It will be an undivided inheritance. Nor need any fear that such an inheritance will breed discontent and strife in the heirs, because each of them will love the others more than self; and thus they in perfect peace and prosperity will jointly administer their inheritance. Nor will they be the objects of others' envy for their great inheritance, since they will use it for the best interests of all concerned—first for fallen men and fallen angels, and then for the good of various orders of beings that God is planning for the billions of planets in His universe; and in this work of developing their inheritance they will have the glad cooperation of the angels, those who never fell, as well as those who fell and will rise again. The wealth of this inheritance is inconceivably great, which will appear when we think of the wealth of this earth and remember that there are billions of at least as rich planets in the universe. And this wealth will ever increase as these planets and their various orders of beings

are developed to perfection. It is an inheritance that will be developing endlessly; for the work of the Faithful will be the development to perfection of one planet after another with their pertinent orders of beings. And they will have the satisfaction of perfect success in their task, as the Ages to come will witness the planets and their inhabitants started on the way of, and reaching perfection. Nor will their entering into the possession of their inheritance be marred by the sense of loss of, and mourning for, a dead Father, as it is among men; for the Immortal Jehovah will give them the inheritance and live on; and this He can safely do, because their absolute devotion to Him and His interests will have been unchangeably proven by most crucial tests. What a super-wonderful inheritance God will give His people! Surely He has the seven main features of the grace of fatherliness, as our study abundantly proves; and this grace of fatherliness surely is His.

We have hitherto treated of God's main selfish lower primary attributes of character and of two of His main social lower primary attributes of character. We now proceed to our discussion of the rest of God's lower primary attributes of character. We trust our discussion of this subject will prove instructive to our readers' heads and uplifting to their hearts. We rejoice in the prospect of such blessings and trust that a like experience will follow the study of all the chapters of this book. After finishing our discussion of God's primary attributes of character we hope, *D.v.*, to consider in turn His secondary and tertiary graces. Such a study should equip all of us with a reasonably comprehensive understanding and appreciation of God's qualities of Spirit. In the rest of this chapter we propose to study friendship and kingliness as social lower primary attributes in God.

When we speak of friendship we mean a mutual regard cherished by like minds and hearts. Friendship

can never be experienced by one person alone. It implies at least two persons as its possessors; for it is a mutual regard cherished by like minds and hearts. Thus friendship is a quality that requires at least two persons before it can be exercised at all. In this it differs from friendliness, which does not necessarily imply a mutual regard. Accordingly, friendship, as an attribute of God, implies that it is exercised by Him and others mutually. It means that there are hearts and minds that are kindred to God's heart and mind, and that these and God's heart and mind have a mutual esteem toward one another. This is true of the relations of the Father and the Son to each other; for they are linked together in kindredness of heart and mind by the fact that they have the same Holy Spirit or disposition. This is likewise true of God and the good angels, and of God and certain ones in the human family. It is not now true between God and all human beings; for some are now not at all of a kindred spirit with God. Hence there can be between them no mutual regard that constitutes friendship. Sometime there will be between God and all mankind such kindredness of disposition as will make them hold one another in mutual esteem, *i.e.*, when after the Millennium all who after full opportunity prove that they are worthy of everlasting life are rewarded with it, and all others are destroyed.

The entrance of sin among certain—the fallen—angels and among mankind has disrupted friendship between God and them. Sin of necessity destroys friendship between God and the sinner; because sin is a repudiation of friendship with God on the sinner's part. Thus God could not find in fallen angels and men, as such, that kindredness of heart and mind necessary for a mutual regard based on harmony with righteousness, which is the necessary foundation of a friendship in which God is a partaker; for He is of too pure eyes to behold [look with favor and esteem

upon] iniquity (Hab. 1: 13). Hence when certain angels and mankind fell into sin, God withdrew from the relations of friendship with them. We are not to understand that thereupon He hated them. Rather that He became so displeased with them for their casting away of their former state of mind and heart that was kindred to His, that mutual esteem was no longer possible as between Him and them. But while this became the condition between them, and while sinful men and angels turned into hating Him, He, instead of returning hatred for hatred, continued to be as friendly toward them as their changed attitude toward Him permitted this to be; *i.e.*, insofar as this was in harmony with truth and righteousness. Hence in His friendliness He gave them such blessings as were compatible with the sentences that He imposed upon them severally for their wrongs. Furthermore, He cherished the hope of winning them back into friendship with Him, after their experience with evil would sufficiently teach them the unprofitableness of sin and the desirability of righteousness.

His friendliness toward them despite their evil reached an almost inconceivable height of greatness when, in order to restore them to friendship with Himself, He willingly gave up His Son to a most shameful, cruel and painful death, as the basis for the restoration of such a friendship. And in the meantime He kept Himself open to entering into friendship with any of the race that, hungry and thirsting after such a condition, would accept of His overtures of friendship. It was in harmony with this thought that He and Abraham entered into friendship with each other, so that Abraham became known as the friend of God (Jas. 2: 23). And not only Abraham, but all who walked in his footsteps have entered into friendship with God (Rom. 4: 12; 5: 1). Accordingly, God welcomes back into friendship with Him all who exercise repentance toward God and faith in

Christ. These thereby become friends of God and God the friend of them. We trust that all of our readers have at least attained to friendship with God.

It might be well for us to look into the ingredients of such a friendship. Keeping in mind the thought that in spirit the sinner must retrace the steps that he took when he left the condition of friendship with God, and that the restoration of the long-wrecked friendship does not imply that God lowers Himself to the degraded state of mind and heart of sinful man, though it does imply that He condescends to lift man back toward the state of heart and mind that existed before sin entered into the world, we will be able to see the ingredients of the restored friendship. On God's part it implies that He retain the same thoughts and feelings that He had before friendship between Him and man was broken off. It also implies that He has sought to renew mankind into a condition in which He can take the same interest in them as formerly, exercise the same trust in them as of yore, show them the same amiableness as before, bestow the same benefits as in days gone by and give them the same companionship as He once did. Unless He would do these things and thus renew them unto their former condition toward Him, mankind could not perform their part in the mutual relations implied in friendship between God and themselves. And all these things God works on behalf of all who are responsive to His advances; and as a result, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, He and certain humans have already re-entered into friendship with one another.

And in this friendship we see operative a kindredness of thought in which man accepts the Divine thoughts connected with friendship's restoration. Thus this enables such men to gain kindredness of mind with God and one another. Again, by renewing kindred feelings in the responsive, God puts men into a condition in which they love the things that God loves.

Further, by arousing the responsive to taking interest in truth and righteousness for themselves and others, He creates in them the same interests as He has. So, too, by enabling these to stand fast in devotion to truth and righteousness for themselves and others, He makes them dependable, and thus restores His confidence in their integrity; and of course only such as trust Him are dealt with in such restoration of friendship, as is evident from the case of Abraham and those who follow in his steps. God's amiableness toward them takes away from them all unamiableness toward God and fills them with amiableness toward Him. His constant benefactions on them arouse them to do good to Him, in the sense of benefiting His cause. And His companionship arouses them to companion Him; and thus every ingredient of friendship is restored between God and responsive ones.

This description of the restoration of friendship into operation between God and man shows that friendship as a quality operating between God and man consists of the following things: Mutual thoughts, mutual feelings, mutual interests, mutual trust, mutual amiableness, mutual helpfulness and mutual companionableness. God shares with reconciled humans every one of these things. We may say that He craves these things—not that He needs them for His own existence, but for the pleasure that it gives Him in working in others the blessings for them implied in these things. We are not to think of this matter as though God could not get along without entering into friendship with us, as though He needs us or what we can give Him. Rather, in His friendliness He does out of pure benevolence the things that we need for our well being, in a restoration of friendship with Him; and He is made happy in such restored friendship in the thought that it has blessed, uplifted and ennobled us; for His delight is in benefiting others. Thus His friendship is of the noblest character,

the most generous feeling and of the most comprehensive kind. Blessed indeed are they who have God as their Friend and who are friends of God!

And who are these? We reply that now, they are first, those who have taken the steps of repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus; and second; those who thereafter have made a full consecration of themselves to the Lord. The first class are indeed friends; but they are not privileged to enter into the deepest friendship with God unless they take the further step of consecration. Justification gives them peace with God; but only the consecrated enter into God's heart of hearts, in the most intimate friendship in which their very beings become one with God's Spirit. While we, therefore, rejoice with the justified in their measure of friendship with God, we would urge them to enter into still deeper and closer relations with God and bind themselves to Him with still stronger ties than those of justification—even those of consecration; for in the latter, becoming dead to self and to the world and becoming alive unto God; they take His good and perfect and acceptable will as theirs, and this enables them to enter into most intimate thoughts, feelings, interests, trust, amiableness; benefaction and companionship with God in ways that those who have proceeded no further than justification are unable to experience, understand and appreciate: This is the unanimous testimony of the faithful consecrated. And this friendship is mutually to God and them one of the most precious, endearing and happifying of all experiences.

It is not only such, but it is also a very fruitful one to both parties of this friendship. God has His fruitage in their profiting, which shows His unselfishness in this friendship; while they have as their fruitage from this friendship the blessings of creation's providence, redemption, instruction, justification, sanctification and deliverance. Therefrom are they undergoing

a recreation, in ultimate analysis, to perfect spirit natures. God makes all things work together for their good in His providence. He has given His Son in redemption to recover them from the curse. In instruction He teaches them all the things of His Word due in their times, so that they are favored with His thoughts. In justification He forgives their sins and reckons them righteous in Christ's righteousness. In sanctification He enables them to become and remain dead to self and the world and alive unto God, while sacrificing their humanity in His interests, and while undergoing transformation into Christ's likeness as new creatures. And in deliverance He protects them amid, and gives them victory in, their battles with sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, as these fight against them under the leadership of the devil, the world and the flesh. And ultimately He will give them victory over the grave by raising them from the dead, and will give them pertinent rewards in life eternal. These are the fruitage that God's friends receive from Him in their friendship relations with Him; and, as stated above, His fruitage from His friendship is the possession of such friends and the pleasure of so greatly benefiting them.

As precious and fruitful as His friendship is, so lasting and strong is it. One of the sad facts of human friendship is in most cases its weakness and transitoriness. Most friendships are unable to bear the weight even of prosperity, let alone adversity. Hence, earthly friendships for the most part quickly break up, and former friends frequently are lightly forgotten. Almost none survive the pressure of adversity. Not so with Jehovah's friendship. Time does not only not weaken, but strengthens it. Prosperity brightens it, and adversity crystallizes it. The dangers incidental to it cement its possessors the more firmly together. Pressure put upon it makes it all the more enduring. Our faults and weaknesses arouse Jehovah

to all the more manifestations of it. In health and in sickness, in joy and in sorrow, in pleasure and in pain, in rest and in labor, in safety and in danger, in prosperity and in adversity, and in life and in death, it abides strong and enduring; for no such things can separate the faithful from the friendship between them and God. The only thing that can make God withdraw friendship from His friends is that faithlessness which sins willfully against God, the best of friends; for His friendship is so strong and enduring that it stands all other pressures, while this one disrupts its very conditions of existence. Such a friend is a friend indeed. Blessed are those who are knitted together in friendship with God; nothing shall stumble them, nothing shall injure them and nothing shall be lacking to them; for in God and in His friendship they find their all in all.

The last of God's lower primary graces of character that we will consider in this chapter is His kingliness. Kingliness is a social grace. It is true that all social beings do not now have it; for it is limited to but a small class of human beings—royal rulers. Its ingredients, however, should in part be found in all who, as social beings, are placed in some respect or other over others. Thus certain phases of this quality should be found in husbands as the heads of their wives, in parents as the guardians of their children, in teachers in the management of their scholars, in employers in the direction of their employees, in political officials in the governing of their subordinates and non-official citizens and in officers in the command of soldiers and sailors, etc. By kingliness we mean the quality of heart and mind whereby one is, thinks, feels, speaks and acts as a royal ruler must, in order properly to govern his people. We would not think of everybody as being kingly in character and bearing. Certainly an ignorant and foolish person could not commend himself to us as kingly; nor could an impulsive, weak

willed person do so. Nor would we think that a tactless or a cringing person were kingly in heart and bearing. Neither does a selfish and unpatriotic person deserve the praise of kingliness. So, too, does the world not regard one who is impractical and unfaithful as being kingly. Why so? Because these qualities are the direct antithesis of those that we think a king should have. His being the leader and ruler of his people, he must be intelligent and wise enough to think out laws and policies to put into effect, whereby to lead, benefit and rule them. He must be steady and firm to give these laws and policies the necessary backing to make them operative. He must be tactful to win his subjects to them, and dignified enough to command that respect that insures obedience to them. He must be so unselfish as to put the interests of the commonwealth above his own interests, to insure the good of his country; and he must be so patriotic as to sink every consideration into the interests of the nation. He must be so practical as to execute with good results his laws and policies and so faithful as to make himself the embodiment of conscientiousness in fulfilling the duties of his office. Such a king is indeed kingly. David in Israel and Alfred in England are among the most conspicuous examples of such kings among human rulers. Of each of them it can properly be said that he was every inch a king.

But Jehovah has these features of kingliness in the supreme degree; and He is therefore the greatest and best of all royal rulers. His omniscience makes Him know everything that pertains to royalty in itself, in its duties, in its laws, in its subjects, in its processes, in its purposes and in its results. His wisdom makes Him able to use His knowledge in ways best calculated to achieve the ends of rulership—the well being of His subjects. His self-rule makes Him adjust Himself to the conditions and demands of His position as King; and His moderation makes Him steadfastly pursue

His ends to a successful consummation. His tact is unendingly making Him speak and do at the proper time what is necessary, as it also makes Him suppress unsuitable words and acts. Such tactfulness makes Him winsome in the superlative sense toward those who are winable. He is always dignified in carriage, in sentiment, in speech and in act, with a result that He inspires His subjects with the profoundest reverence to His person, laws and works. He neither fears, nor stands in dread of, anyone; hence He needs not, nor does He, cringe before anyone. He is wholly unselfish in His ways; and thus instead of exploiting His subjects in His own interests or tyrannizing over them to their own detriment, He constantly seeks and achieves their good. He does not set at naught, nor break His own laws; but is subject to them as a supreme ruler, and thus commends them with all the greater impressiveness to His subjects. This is all the more noteworthy in Him, inasmuch as He is an absolute monarch in the supreme sense of the word; for He never submits His decisions to the vote of His subjects in order to make them valid, as do most earthly rulers. But He commends them to their willing obedience by virtue of their intrinsic value and their source. Indeed He and His viceregents are, and will forever be, the only absolute monarchs who can be absolutely trusted to use their unique power solely in the interests of their subjects; and for this reason they will forever be the only ones really worthy of, and fitted for, the exercise of absolute and unconditional power over subjects.

As a sovereign God is the highest example of a patriotic ruler. He loves His country, its laws, its policies, customs, citizens, works and ideals, and in all His works and plans as its ruler He ever keeps this in mind and furthers them. He defends them against corruption, attack and conquest; and successfully assails and overthrows every person and thing that seek

to effect any injury to the realm. As an executive, He carries out the laws and policies that He makes for His kingdom, attaining thereby every feasible result. No executive has His abilities as a successful executive in His empire. And finally, as our king, He is faithful in everything pertinent to His office as king. Faithfully does He use His intelligence and wisdom to devise laws and policies for the good of the realm. Faithfully does He exercise self-control and steadfastness in initiating and carrying out these laws and policies. In all negotiations He faithfully exercises the necessary tact and dignity to gain His ends and gain and retain the reverence of His subjects. He is faithful to make love for proper principles and the interests of His empire and of His subjects incite Him to ruling acts on their behalf; and this excludes every species of tyranny, cruelty and injustice from His rulership. His faithfulness keeps Him ever on the alert to plan, to initiate and to carry on in the interests of His kingdom and its subjects. He is the best and most successful of kings, because He is the most kingly of them all.

His kingdom is an orderly one. It has officers and subjects. These officers are in harmony with the King and His ideals. They are bound to Him by the most lasting bonds of devotion, appreciation, sympathy and harmony. For them to fail in these respects for any length of time would mean dismissal from His service. So devoted to Him and His interests are they that they willingly lay at His feet their all in His service, and demonstrate loyalty to Him, His cause and His people unto death. And His subjects have the same spirit of devotion. Hence His subjects excel those of other kings. They show much loyalty to Him, His cause and His people, better than the subjects of other kingdoms do to their rulers, countries and peoples. And they are bound to Him not by ties of self-interest; but of principle and love. So greatly have His

benign policies and deeds as Ruler enhanced Him to them that out of grateful and appreciative love they are devoted to Him, and they are happy and prosperous in such devotion to their great King. At the present time these subjects are comparatively few; but when the war is over that is now on between His and Satan's empire, the latter being destroyed, its subjects will become His subjects; and those that faithfully submit themselves to the Vicegerent that He will put over them in the Millennium will gain the favor of being everlastingly under His kingship, while all others who reject such a benign rulership, will be destroyed, all evil conditions being likewise with them destroyed. The result will be that all beings worthy of existence in heaven and on earth will in everlasting innocence, righteousness and blessedness acclaim Him in a universal hallelujah chorus of peerless harmony and sweetness, singing, "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth on the throne" of the Universe (Rev. 5: 13). And in the securing of this glorious result His kingliness will play a very large and important role. Surely Jehovah, our King, in His kingliness is worthy of our supreme devotion as subjects of His benign and beneficent reign. Blessed is the people whose King Jehovah is!

With this we will conclude our study of the lower primary graces of God's character. In both their forms, the selfish and the social, we have found them good, perfect, appreciable and worthy of our imitation. Our God is from every standpoint worthy of our love, praise, worship, adoration, devotion and service. In the highest sense His higher primary graces reflect credit on Him, and only in a less degree do His lower primary graces honor Him. And as we devoutly contemplate these, we are enabled to imitate them and thus become transformed into His likeness. To secure this end is one of the main reasons for these chapters on God's graces of heart and mind.

Holy, holy, holy! Lord God Almighty!
Early in the morning our song shall rise to Thee:
Holy, holy, holy! merciful and mighty!
God in the Highest, blessed Majesty!

Holy, holy, holy! all Thy saints adore Thee,
Casting down their golden crowns around the glassy sea;
Cherubim and seraphim falling down before Thee,
Which wert, and art and evermore shalt be.

Holy, holy, holy! Though the darkness hide Thee,
Though the eye of sinful man Thy glory may not see,
Only Thou art holy; there is none beside Thee,
Perfect in power, in love and purity.

Holy, holy, holy! Lord God Almighty!
All Thy works shall praise Thy Name in earth and sky
and sea.
Holy, holy, holy! merciful and mighty!
Son of the Highest, blest eternally.

CHAPTER V.

THE SECONDARY GRACES OF GOD'S CHARACTER.

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY GRACES.
MODESTY. INDUSTRIOUSNESS. LONGSUFFERING. FORBEARANCE.
FORGIVENESS. COURAGE. CANDOR. LIBERALITY.

IN THE preceding three chapters we have been studying God's attributes. In the second we discussed fourteen of His attributes of being, and in the third and fourth chapters we treated on the elements and the primary attributes of God's character. We learned that a primary attribute of character is a quality expressed by the direct activity of an affection-organ, *e.g.*, faith, a higher primary grace, is the quality exercised by the direct activity of the affection-organ called spirituality; and peace, a lower primary grace, is the quality exercised by the direct activity of the affection-organ called rest. Secondary graces do not have affection-organs which, by exercising themselves directly, express such graces. Rather, these act through the higher graces, laying hold on the lower affection-organs and suppressing their efforts to control us, *e.g.*, if self-esteem is permitted to control us, we will be exercising pride, arrogance, self-exaltation, etc., which are *disgraces*, not graces; but if the higher primary graces—faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love and charity—lay hold of and suppress self-esteem's efforts to control us, the result will be the expression of the quality, humility, a secondary grace. This illustration shows: (1) that humility does not exercise itself through the direct activity of the affection-organ of self-esteem, nor through the direct activity of any other affection-organ, as the quality expression of that organ; but (2) that it results from certain graces suppressing the efforts of the lower

affection-organ of self-esteem to control us; and (3) that the secondary graces sustain a negative relation to the lower affection-organs, arising as they do from higher primary graces suppressing the efforts of the lower affection-organs to control us. Thus the suppression of the affection-organ of love for rest from controlling us develops industriousness, of the affection-organ of combativeness from controlling us develops longsuffering, of the affection-organ of destructiveness from controlling us develops forbearance and forgiveness, and so with the other lower affection-organs. It is this suppressive feature connected with the expressions of the secondary graces that prompt some to speak of them, not as secondary, but as negative or passive graces.

Not only do the secondary graces have no affection-organs that are their direct agencies of expression, and not only are they derived, or dependent graces, but they are dependent graces from another standpoint. They cannot be permitted to control, but must act or not act as the higher primary graces dictate, if their action or non-action be proper; for if one should allow a secondary grace to control in what the higher primary grace demands that it should not act, wrong would result, *e.g.*, the husband and father who longsufferingly permits his wife and children to disregard his headship in the family to the displacement of him as the family's head and to the consequent moral injury of the wife and children, allows longsuffering to act controllingly in a situation where the higher primary graces forbid such action. And such exercise of longsuffering is wrong—it has ceased to be a virtue, and has become a fault. What such a situation requires is the suppression of such longsuffering by the higher primary graces laying hold on combativeness or destructiveness and using it as a servant of righteousness in making the husband's and father's headship in the family to be respected by the

recalcitrant wife and children. But while so doing he must not permit combativeness or destructiveness to control, but by the higher primary graces must exercise such control over combativeness or destructiveness as will permit the longsuffering necessary to make certain allowances for the weaknesses of the wife and children, so that proper conditions may be re-established as gently and peaceably as can be done compatibly with its re-establishment. The same principle, whose activity we have just illustrated in the case of longsuffering, applies to all the other secondary graces—they are not masters, nor equals, but servants of the higher primary graces.

The Scriptures, ascribing to God the secondary graces, prove that He has them. Many of them are expressly by name ascribed to Him in the Bible, and the others are implied there, as being in Him. Thus the Bible teaches that God has humility, modesty, industriousness, longsuffering, forbearance, forgiveness, bravery, candor, liberality, temperance, (symbolic) chastity, impartiality, etc. We will not discuss all of these in this article; but will take up most of them for consideration. While describing self-esteem as one of God's lower primary graces, we sufficiently discussed God's humility for the purposes of this chapter, and will therefore now pass it by and take up another as the first secondary grace for our study, the grace of modesty.

By modesty we understand the quality whereby one exercises reticence, and instead of feeling over-sensitive at reproach and unpopularity, conducts himself unostentatiously and unabashedly before others. This definition shows the negative relation of modesty to approbateness, and this proves the correctness of the definition; for proper modesty results from the higher primary graces suppressing the efforts of approbateness to control. Approbateness desires the good opinion of others, and when this

can be exercised in harmony with the higher primary graces, it is proper, and is thus a lower primary grace. But if it were allowed to control these higher primary graces, instead of being controlled by them, it would feel over-sensitive and too deeply hurt in feeling—touchy—when such good opinion is withheld, or when criticism and unpopularity arise; or to prevent such unpopularity or over-sensitiveness it would compromise principle; as also, if it were allowed to control these graces instead of being controlled by them, it would, to win others' approval, seek to show off in more or less affectation, ostentatiousness and vanity. Thus its rulership to the setting aside of the rulership of the higher primary graces, results in the *disgraces* of touchiness, ostentatiousness and vanity. But the suppression of its efforts to control by the higher primary graces produces the secondary grace of modesty, which remains unabashed amid criticism and unpopularity, unspoiled and simple amid praise, and properly reticent before others at all times. God has this quality in perfection.

God has been much misrepresented and criticized and has been more or less unpopular. Those who represent Him as cruel, through the teaching of eternal torment, the consciousness of the dead and the absolute predestination of some angels and the human family to sin and death, the absolute reprobation of the non-elect to eternal torment and the damnation of infants, idiots and unenlightened heathen to eternal torment, certainly misrepresent Him and give Him a bad reputation among many of our race. Those who represent Him as non-existent, or as an impersonal force, as nature, or as weak, unwise, unjust and loveless, certainly misrepresent Him and give Him a bad name among those whom they can convince. Those who blame Him for their lot in life, their troubles and misfortunes, or who are full of murmuring and complaint, certainly criticize Him. And who will deny

that such misrepresentations and criticisms have not made Him unpopular among many? In many cases they have led people to despise and dishonor Him and to bring Him into scorn, ridicule, mockery and execration. For over six thousand years He has been thus reproached, but amid such reproaches and unpopularity He has remained modest. He has not allowed Himself to feel over-sensitive about this evil treatment. Touchiness has not characterized Him amid such experiences. We do not say that He has not felt these criticisms, misrepresentations and infamies; for God certainly has the quality of approbateness whereby He desires the good opinion of others; but His not having gotten it has not hurt His feelings overmuch. Never has He stooped to compromising His principles to gain the good opinion of His creatures. He has ever remained loyal to His principles and course, however unpopular they have been; and they certainly have been such among the heathen and among His nominal people. He has been content to be misunderstood and misrepresented and to suffer the consequent unpopularity, since the principles of wisdom, justice, love and power called upon Him to undergo these. So He has maintained modesty in its reticence and unabashedness.

Nor has He allowed the facts, that He desires the esteem of His creatures, and that He has received it from the better of these, to make Him put on affectation and ostentatiousness and feel vain. He knows that the good angels hold Him in the highest esteem. He also knows that the faithful among men regard Him highly. But to get this He has not put on affectation and ostentatiousness. Nor does the fact that He receives this make Him vain and pompous. He receives it, because He knows that it is in the best interests of those who give it, and He rejoices with them in the blessing they receive by giving it to Him. Thus He, from this standpoint, exercises a glorious

modesty in unostentatiousness. Therefore, by remaining unabashed and uncorrupted amid misrepresentations, despisings and unpopularity, by remaining unaffected and unostentatious amid His desire to receive the approval of His creatures and by keeping free from vanity while getting the latter's approval, He shows a most noble exercise of the quality of modesty, which is kept active by the graces of wisdom, justice, love and power, perfectly controlling His desire for the approval of others. And in this He gives us an example most worthy of our appreciation and imitation.

Certainly, if God were over-sensitive, He would have been having an exceedingly disagreeable time from His experiences with misrepresentations, criticisms and unpopularity. And if there were anything of vanity and ostentatiousness in Him He would have elaborated systems of ceremonies and successions of spectacles revolving about Him as a center in such a way as to give ostentatiousness and vanity full play. Instead, we find Him to be modesty itself. Where is the elaborate ritual directing every motion, word, tone and look connected with an approach to Him? On the contrary, in modesty and simplicity He is pleased with those who worship Him in spirit and in truth, regardless of forms, ceremonies, rituals, rites, etc. God's modesty and simplicity enable Him to dispense with these and with elaborate temples where they are in vogue, and to dwell with the poor and contrite in spirit, full of reverence for His Person, Character, Plan and Work, and to make them, however despised by man, His temple, in which holy qualities offer the sacrifice and the incense.

The next of God's secondary graces that we would consider is His industriousness. This quality, being a secondary grace, must result from the higher primary grace suppressing the controlling activity of some lower affection-organ. The affection-organ here concerned in the suppression of its control is

love for ease. This affection-organ properly exercised in its activities by Divine wisdom, justice, love and power, manifests itself in restfulness and peace in God. And the suppression of its controllership produces industriousness. The *disgrace* that we would develop, if we allowed the love of ease to control us, is laziness. There is no laziness in God; on the contrary, its opposite is in Him—industriousness, and that because His wisdom, justice, love and power, suppress the controllership of His love for ease. God is very active. Great was His industriousness in planning for, in assembling the materials, and in doing the work of creation, which includes every law, force, sun, planet, etc., of the universe, as well as the created beings therein. And this vast universe is the sphere of His providential work, whereby He preserves, supports and governs all things therein. Some of His activities have spent themselves in making the Divine Plan of the Ages. In the outworking of this plan, He performed the work of emptying the Logos of His prehuman nature, honor and work, and of making Him a perfect human being, whereby He might become God's agent in the work of redemption. In the carrying out of that work He recreated Him to another plane of being—the Divine—while sacrificing His human nature for mankind.

And God's activities have also embraced the Church. He has by Christ taught the Church, as due, the Truth that shines for them on the height, depth, length and breadth of the Divine person, character, plan and works. He likewise effected as one of His works the justification of believers, and working on them by His Word and providence He brought them to consecration and spirit-begetting in the time for that work. Further activities of His have enabled His past Faithful and are now enabling His present Faithful to lay down their humanity sacrificially for His Plan, while His industriousness has throughout the Gospel Age

been recreating them as new creatures for the Divine nature. Similarly, He is working on the Great Company to prepare them for a change of nature; and He is working on the Youthful Worthies, in the same general manner as He wrought on the Ancient Worthies, to make them perfect human beings on earth for the Millennium. He will finish such creative work for these four elect classes in the beginning of the Millennium by bringing them to perfect existence on their three planes of being; and at the end of the Millennium, so far as the Ancient and Youthful Worthies are concerned, He will add the finishing touches of His creative work on them by raising them to spirit existence. Much and constant and varied work must be done on these four elect classes to fit them for their final planes of being, millennially and post-millennially.

But this is not all, so far as God's plan respecting man is concerned. There is a larger, though less exalted, feature of it as respects the non-elect. Creatively He is permitting evil to afflict them, so as to teach them by experience the terrible nature and fearful effects of sin. To bring this experience about, He timed man's creation so as to bring a sufficient number of humans into existence while the earth is in a condition unprepared to support perfect life, and this insures the experience with evil for the fallen race. But this is only a preparatory step to a greater one—the experience with righteousness, amid which man will undergo a regeneration unto perfection, for which experience with righteousness the earth will be prepared unto perfection. These two experiences are but the two features of a creative process as respects mankind, whereby a perfect race will be brought into existence, illustrating the reign of moral law forever; while those who will refuse to use such a creative process in harmony with this reign of moral law will be destroyed forever. A similar activity marks God as respects those of the angels who have fallen into

sin. Thus we see that He has been active and will continue to a completion His activity as respects His plan for man and angels. The making and executing of this plan demonstrates God's industriousness.

The Scriptures indicate further fields of God's activities, so far as the creation and preservation of other beings not yet created are concerned. In telling us that in the Ages to come God will show forth the exceeding riches of His kindness in and by the Elect, in speaking of them as Heirs of God and Joint-heirs with Christ as respects the universe, and in speaking of their kingdom increasing without end, the Bible implies that in the Ages to come they will develop their inheritance. This implies not only the perfecting of the various worlds about us, but the bringing into existence of various orders of beings as their inhabitants and fitting them through their remaining in harmony with moral law for eternal existence. Thus a separate plan or feature of a plan will be for each distinct order of beings, and the making of such plans, as well as the carrying out of them, will be manifestations of God's industriousness. His love of rest will be suppressed from controllership, and as a result His industriousness will be active through the controllership of His love of ease by His higher graces.

The character of God's works is seen in the following passages: Gen. 1: 10, 18, 21, 25; Deut. 32: 4; Ps. 26: 7; 33: 4; 40: 5; 66: 3; 86: 8; 92: 4; 111: 2, 4, 6; Eccles. 3: 11, 14. His creative works are treated on in the following passages: Gen. 1: 1-31; 2: 1-4, 7; Neh. 9: 6; Job 9: 8, 9; 12: 7-9; 28: 23-26; 37: 16, 18; 38: 4-38; Ps. 104: 2, 3, 5, 6, 24, 30. His works of providence are described in the following passages: Gen. 1: 29, 30; 8: 22; 49: 24, 25; Lev. 25: 20-22; 26 4-6, 10; Deut. 7: 13-15; 32: 11-14; Job 5: 6-11; Matt. 5: 45; 6: 26, 30-33; Rom. 8: 28. The following passages show His redemptive work: John 3: 16, 17; Rom. 8: 32; 2 Cor. 5: 18; 1 Tim. 4: 10; 2 Tim. 1: 9;

Tit. 2: 10; 1 John 4: 9, 10. The following passages set forth His teaching work: Is. 55: 13; Dan. 2: 20-22, 28; John 8: 26, 28; 12: 49, 50; 14: 10, 24; 15: 15; 17: 18, 26. The following passages treat of His justifying work: Rom. 3: 21-30; 4: 5-25; 8: 30-33; 1 Cor. 1: 30; 6: 11; Gal. 3: 8; Tit. 3: 7. The following passages treat of His sanctifying work: John 17: 17; Acts 26: 17; Rom. 6: 1-11; 15: 16; 1 Cor. 1: 2, 30; Eph. 1: 3, 4; Col. 2: 11, 12; 1 Thes. 4: 3, 4; 5: 23; 2 Thes. 2: 13; 2 Tim. 2: 11, 12, 21; Heb. 2: 11; 1 Pet. 1: 2; Jude 1. The following passages show that He delivers: Matt. 6: 13; 1 Cor. 1: 30; 2 Cor. 1: 10; 12: 8, 9; Gal. 1: 4; Col. 1: 13; 2 Tim. 3: 11; 4: 17, 18; 2 Pet. 2: 9. Thus we see that the Bible teaches that God is active—industrious.

Longsuffering is the third of God's secondary graces that we will study. The word is almost self-explanatory. If asked for a definition of it, we might suggest the following: Longsuffering is a calm and unresentful carriage of oneself amid naturally exasperating conditions. It characterizes both the internal feelings and the external acts. It exercises itself amid untoward and disagreeable conditions. These conditions naturally are oppositional or exasperating to their subjects. The average man amid them loses his temper and becomes angry, because they provoke his resentment. This fact shows that one's combativeness has been aroused by these oppositional or exasperating conditions to the resenting of them in anger and displeasure. Hence longsuffering bears a relation to combativeness. This relation is not that longsuffering is an expression of combativeness, for it is not. None of the secondary graces has an affection-organ for its expression. Longsuffering is, generally speaking, the opposite of combativeness; and it results, when properly exercised, from the higher primary graces suppressing the controllership of combativeness. When people say or do things that tend to

arouse our opposition in combativeness, *i.e.*, to arouse our anger and displeasure, and we by faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love or charity, suppress the efforts of such anger to control us, we exercise longsuffering. It is one of the most passive of graces; and in a strong character it is one of the hardest to exercise. Indeed in a strong character it implies the presence of large balance of character.

God has this quality in richest measure. God's position as the supreme and absolute Ruler and the presence of sin among men and some angels, furnish the conditions that contain very many elements tending to exasperation in God. The ingratitude of men and demons toward God is one of these conditions. The fact that they fell into sin, though created perfect and averse to sin, is another of these. The substitution of other beings and things in His place as the supreme thing in their affections is another of these. The blasphemies of which they have been guilty in ascribing to Him characteristics, plans and works that are foreign to Him, in denying Him such characteristics, plans and works as are His, in ascribing to others such characteristics, plans and works as are exclusively His, and in speaking irreverently of Him, furnish another set of conditions tending to exasperation. Another of these is the unbelief that denies His existence or personality, that limits the scope of His interests and activities, that rejects His revelation and plan, that distrusts His character, word and works, and that trusts persons or things other than Him in matters wherein they should trust Him. Another of these is the insubordination of subjects to higher powers in family, state, school, business, etc. Another of these is demoniacal and human unkindness to fellows, expressing itself in minor forms of unkindness, increasingly so in its worse forms and culminatingly so in the worst form—of taking life. Another of these is the violation of solemn vows made to God,

or to man in general, or to husband and wife in particular. Still another of these is the violation of the property rights of others, increasingly from petty objects to empires. Another of these is the violation of veracity, with respect to self or others, gradually descending from "white lies" to the worst forms of misrepresentation and perjury. Another of these is the greediness that seeks, regardless of others' rights, to possess oneself of what is others' at the latter's loss. And what shall we say more? For sin's ramifications are almost limitless, and every one of them is an affront to God, being, as they are, acts of rebellion against His authority and law. Yet, amid these conditions, how longsuffering God has been!

Many are the Scriptures treating of His longsuffering. He allowed antediluvian wickedness a long time before He set the limit of it 120 years further on, by a flood (Gen. 6: 3). He restrained for hundreds of years His anger against the Amorites, letting them fill up their iniquity before manifesting it (Gen. 15: 16). To Moses the Lord declared Himself longsuffering as respects sinners (Ex. 34: 6; Num. 14: 18). The Psalmist in highest poetic flights praises God's longsuffering (Ps. 86: 15; 103: 8-10). Isaiah takes up the strain and carries it to a high pitch (Is. 30: 18; 48: 9, 11). How pathetically God's longsuffering with Israel is described by Jeremiah as: "rising up early and speaking, but ye heard [heeded] not," and as: sending them the prophets, "daily rising up early and sending them" (Jer. 7: 13, 23-25). Ezekiel tells the same story (Ezek. 20: 17). Joel extols it as a reason for Israel's repentance (Joel 2: 13). Habakkuk shows that God is longsuffering with those who oppress His people and servants (Hab. 1: 2-4). Jesus declares that it was due to God's longsuffering that God permitted more than one ground for divorce in the Old Testament (Matt. 19: 8). God's longsuffering is parabolically set forth in Matt. 21: 33-41. Most

eloquently and pathetically is God's longsuffering with Jerusalem and Israel set forth in Matt. 23: 37, even to attempting to gather them as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings. Still in another parable, that of the barren fig tree, is the Lord's longsuffering set forth by Jesus (Luke 13: 6-9). St. Paul tells of God's Old Testament longsuffering with the nations (Acts 16: 16; 17: 30). Such longsuffering has shown itself even to those who have despised it and other noble qualities in God (Rom. 2: 4). It was exercised toward people in their past sins in view of the sacrifice of Christ (Rom. 3: 25). It also has characterized God in His dealings with those fitted for wrath and those fitted for mercy (Rom. 9: 22, 23). St. Peter calls special attention to it as it was exercised in the days of Noah before the flood (1 Pet. 3: 20). He also shows that its exercise is a reason for our hoping for salvation (2 Pet. 3: 9, 15). Even with the wicked papal church, as antitypical Jezebel (Rev. 2: 21), did God exercise longsuffering, giving her space to repent, as He has also done with Protestant sectarianism since the Reformation.

And does not history corroborate the teachings of these Scriptures as to God's longsuffering? The 6,000 years of the reign of evil mightily prove God's longsuffering. The iniquity of the antediluvians, of Sodom and the other cities of the plain attests it. Egypt's oppression of Israel and the gradual increase in the severity of the plagues testify to it. Israel's wilderness experience is replete with examples of it. The fearful and long-drawn-out iniquities of the seven nations of Canaan demonstrate it. The many and long oppressions of the Israelites by various nations in the period of the judges declare it. God's dealings with the Israelites desiring a king and the headiness of Saul, their first king, manifest it. How many occasions for its exercise were furnished by the wayward and checkered course of the Israelites under their

kings! How great was the longsuffering of God toward the Gentile nations in their 2520 years of treading down Israel, as it has also been amid the great wrongs that the Gentile nations have wrought upon one another in "nation rising against nation and kingdom against kingdom" in disregard of right!

But the greatest sphere in the exercise of God's longsuffering has been evidenced in His quietly permitting the injustice done by the nominal people of God against the real people of God. It was one of the hardest tests of God's longsuffering for Him to stand still at the mistreatment that His Son Jesus received from Israel. But this was not all; for during nearly forty years longer He quietly allowed the mistreatment that His Jewish Harvest people had to undergo from Jews and Gentiles. Mark His great longsuffering with the Roman Empire during its nearly three centuries' cruel persecution of the early Church. Even greater was His longsuffering that unresentfully stood the many more centuries' pressure on, and oppression of His people by Antichrist—the papacy. For Him to hear their wrongs crying out for vindication and yet waiting until the last one of them was put on the altar for sacrificial death in 1914 before His vengeance began to strike their oppressors (Rev. 6: 9-11) is a most marvelous piece of longsuffering. Let us not forget that God loves His faithful people as His dearest treasure. This treasure He could have permitted seeing so grossly mistreated without striking down their injurers, only by the exercise of the greatest longsuffering. His over 6,000 years' quiet carrying of Himself amid the oppositions of Satan and His nearly 4,500 years' quiet carrying of Himself amid the other fallen angels' opposition, will forever stand as the supreme example of longsuffering, containing as it does all forms of exasperating circumstances.

And to each one of us individually is God's longsuffering a matter of great moment. As all of us

look over our past life we note many a wrong, many a slip, many an omission, many a failure and many a lack, to remain quiet under which called upon God to exercise longsuffering with us. Some of us became His early in life, but have not profited as we should have done and have in some cases yielded almost no fruit. Some of us have perhaps spent the larger part of our life in the service of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, and the little that we have had left to give Him, compared with the much that we have wasted, seems almost negligible. Yet He has been kind and longsuffering toward us, waiting long and lovingly for us to respond to His drawings. Our best efforts are but lame and halt when measured by the rule of perfection. And it certainly takes longsuffering to count them perfect as He does in the merit of our Lord and Savior. If He should give up being longsuffering with us, our case would be helpless and hopeless. But He never does, as long as our hearts remain right with Him. And it is this glorious quality manifesting itself so unweariedly toward us that St. Peter encourages us to account as salvation (2 Pet. 3: 9, 15), because through its exercise we can gradually be developed unto salvation by grace Divine. Let us therefore laud and magnify God in His longsuffering, and let us allow it to work mightily in us such a spirit of gratitude and appreciation as will impel us to be more faithful and energetic to honor Him and to yield Him more fruit.

God's longsuffering, being a secondary grace, cannot be permitted by Him to control Him; for only the higher primary graces have the office of such control. He therefore keeps His longsuffering in perfect control. Hence at times He keeps it in abeyance, suspending its activity. This He does whenever the considerations of wisdom, justice, love and power call for it. Hence we read in the Scriptures of His being angry on certain occasions. This does not mean

that He loses self-control and surrenders Himself to the control of anger. Rather, it implies that He is displeased and in His displeasure in perfect self-possession He proceeds to enforce the requirements of wisdom, justice, love and power, through the exercise of His combativeness. We are not to think of God as being a putty-like character, who good-naturedly will accept every evil course with complacency. On the contrary, He exercises longsuffering only when it will work out some purpose of His wisdom, justice, love and power. But if such a purpose cannot be thereby effected and, on the contrary, if such a purpose would be negated by longsuffering, He immediately suspends its activity and sets into exercise another quality that will effect such a purpose, because under such circumstances longsuffering ceases to be a virtue—it becomes the reverse. Therefore, we read in the Scriptures of God ceasing to deal longsufferingly and of His taking the aggressive in punishing those whom further longsuffering would injure and whom punishment would advantage or whose punishment would prevent disadvantage to others. Accordingly, whether God will exercise or abstain from exercising longsuffering depends on the demands of wisdom, justice, love and power in each given case. This is proper and shows that God is ruled by principle and not by passion. As such He is all the more adorable, appreciable and imitable.

Therefore we find in the Scriptures many examples of God's ceasing to exercise longsuffering. When the antediluvians fully rejected Noah's Divinely given warning, God caused the flood to overthrow the wicked. It was only after the culmination of the sins of Sodom in their ungodly attempt on the two angels that Divine longsuffering ceased and the cities of the plains were given over to destruction. It was only after the unholy sexual excesses of the inhabitants of Canaan threatened to make syphilitic the then known

world that God commissioned Israel to extirpate them. It was due to Pharaoh's and Egypt's sins reaching their double climax that God inflicted death on the firstborn and on the Egyptian host. The same principle is seen as having operated in the history of Midian, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, Phoenicia, Syria, Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, Judea, Rome and in the ten-languaged nations into which Rome disintegrated. This principle was notably manifest in the World War as the first great feature of the great tribulation, through which, in its revolutionary and anarchistic phases, with accompanying famines and pestilences, not only will every nation as now constituted be destroyed, but also Satan's Empire will go down into irretrievable ruin. And in this supreme catastrophe of all history God's longsuffering with organized evil will have ended for ever, except for a little while after the Millennium it will be allowed a brief opportunity of asserting itself for a final test of the regenerated race. Thereafter iniquity will never be suffered again to open its mouth (Ps. 107: 42); and thereafter there shall be no more sin (1 Cor. 15: 24-26, 54-57); for God's longsuffering toward sin and sinners will forever have ceased, because wisdom, justice, love and power will have then decreed that longsuffering with them will no more be a virtue.

But doubtless God's longsuffering will thereafter find other spheres for its activities; yet in such spheres it will not be sin nor sinners that will call it forth; for they will be no more. Nor does the Bible reveal what these conditions will be, further than giving hints along lines of new creations, which, of course, without sin, will be at first immature and without crystallized character. And, mindful of the fact that the things not revealed do not belong to us, but to the Lord, we do well not to speculate on what and how those conditions will be, contenting ourselves with the knowledge that they will be sinless, even though

temporarily immature, so far as the newly-created moral agents of those times are concerned. But what He has so graciously revealed to us of His longsuffering greatly enhances Him in our appreciation and veneration. Truly Jehovah is good and worthy of infinitely more than we are able to give Him; but let us out of devotion to, and appreciation of Him be wholly and always His for His praise, glory and honor.

God's forbearance is the next of God's secondary attributes of character that we will study. This attribute and longsuffering are to the average mind the same, but there are differences between them, which the Bible indicates by using them co-ordinately with one another and other qualities (Rom. 2: 4; Col. 2: 12, 13). In the first place they differ as to the affection-organs whose control—suppression by the higher primary graces—produces them. When the higher primary graces suppress the efforts of combativeness to control us, longsuffering results; but when these same graces suppress the efforts of destructiveness to control us, forbearance results. Longsuffering is the opposite of anger, while forbearance is the opposite of rage. Longsuffering excludes resentfulness; forbearance excludes vindictiveness. Longsuffering is exercised amid exasperating circumstances; forbearance amid enraging circumstances. Longsuffering makes one quiet; forbearance makes one mild. We are now by these contrasts prepared to see the difference between them in a definition of each, given one after the other: Longsuffering is a quiet and unresentful carriage of oneself amid naturally exasperating circumstances; forbearance is a mild and unvindictive carriage of oneself amid naturally enraging circumstances. In God this implies that He, by His wisdom, justice, love and power, amid naturally enraging, circumstances suppresses the controllership of destructiveness.

Varied are the circumstances conducive to wrath or rage. Those that inflict real or supposed wrong on one naturally tend to arouse his wrath. Frequently oppositional tactics on the part of others have the same tendency. Then, the observation of these things exercised against persons, principles or things of more or less interest to us, naturally prompts to the exercise of the same quality. Wrongs are continually done to God. His person is wronged by practical and theoretical atheism, agnosticism, pantheism, materialism and polytheism, as well as by the ascription to others of things exclusively belonging to His person or of His exclusive qualities to others or by denying to Him qualities that are His. His character is wronged by refusal to ascribe to it the qualities that belong to it, by ascribing to it qualities that do not belong to it and by ascribing to others qualities that belong exclusively to it. God is further wronged when His Word is perverted by false translation, by misrepresenting its actual teachings and by ascribing to it teachings that it does not contain. Under this head come all the false teachings of infidelism, heathendom, Mohammedanism, Jewry and Christendom on faith, practice and organization. Chiefly this has been done by the doctrines that make God the cause of sin, the doctrines of man's immortality, of the consciousness of the dead, of eternal torment and of the consubstantiality, co-equality and co-eternity of any other being or thing with God. Sin in devils and humans has furnished innumerable circumstances greatly tending to wrath in God. Nevertheless, He has restrained His wrath until it became wrong longer to do so. And whenever He expresses His wrath at the demand of justice, it is always tempered by being controlled as a servant of His wisdom, justice, love and power. He never allows it to control Him. He always controls it, making it His servant and not His master. Thus He always uses it aright.

When we consider the many wrath-tending circumstances amid which God has found Himself, we stand astounded at His forbearance. Never has any other being, not even our Lord, been so wronged in Himself or in the persons, principles and things in which he has been interested, as our Heavenly Father. When we consider the manifold benefits with which He has blessed His creatures and then realize how many of these have proven ungrateful, rebellious and malicious toward Him from whom they received nothing but good, we gain a slight idea of the many and varied circumstances of Jehovah's life naturally tending to arouse wrath. A few examples of these will show the matter in its true light. Satan's course is pre-eminently the example of wrath-tending circumstances. Created a cherub, one of the highest, most powerful and most favored of God's creatures, perhaps next in rank, power and favor to our prehuman Lord, he failed to remain grateful and appreciative toward his almighty Creator and Benefactor. Not only so, but ingratitude, envy and covetousness filled his heart against God. Plotting, he hatched a gigantic conspiracy that had as its object the establishment of himself as God's equal and rival and of a kingdom equal to and rivalrous of God's. This conspiracy did not only involve himself, but many of the angelic host and the whole human family. To maintain his ambition he has stooped to disobedience, rebellion, deception, murder, misrepresentation, counterfeit, blasphemy, self-exaltation, idolatry, unbelief, exploitation, theft, perjury, slander, degradation of self and others, persecution and every other kind of wrong. Particularly has he with evil intent and boundless stubbornness practiced these things in his efforts to blacken God's person, character, word and works and to thwart the execution of God's plan for the recovery of fallen men and angels. The over six thousand years since the start of Satan's rebellion have been

daily and hourly filled by the above mentioned and indicated wrongs on Satan's part. To bear with these things has called for the greatest exhibition of forbearance from God ever exemplified and perhaps ever to be exemplified. We stand lost in wonder, love and praise when we consider it. How truly sublime and beautiful is this attribute in God's character, as it has been expressed toward Satan's person, character, plans and works during these over 6,000 years!

Great, too, has been His forbearance toward the fallen angels. After man's fall into sin, and before the flood, the Lord gave the good angels charge of the human family. Their efforts before the flood to reform sinful men failed; and in their bewilderment over their failure Satan, pointing out that man's degeneracy was due to an evil heredity, suggested that they use their power of creating human bodies and of appearing in them as men, to propagate a sinless race, by their imparting their sinless and perfect powers to their offspring by women. Some of the angels refused to do this as being unauthorized by God; but, alas, others, so intent at stopping human degradation as not to scrutinize carefully the methods recommended therefore, fell in with Satan's suggestion and hence generated, not perfect and sinless humans, but a hybrid giant race that added to human sin (Gen. 6: 1-4). Too late, after sinning, they found out that, like Mother Eve, they had been deceived into sin by her deceiver. Their sin debarring them from God's presence and leading to their confinement within the atmosphere of this earth, they have been further entrapped by Satan to become his associates in the administration of his empire, and as a result have supported him in the evils that he has committed against God and men. Indeed, we have reason to believe that not a few of them have gone so far in their opposition to truth and righteousness as, like Satan, completely to have undermined their

characters so that they are proving incorrigible. Others of these, sickened by their sin and its unhappy consequences, seemingly are strenuously seeking to regain their former rectitude. For these the Bible holds out hope of a restoration to God's favor through the operation of the Millennial judgment. But these seem, only after Christ finished his work on earth, to have started to arise from the pit of sin and the mire of iniquity. Accordingly, from at least 120 years before the flood (Gen. 6: 1, 3, 4, 2) until after Pentecost, a period of about 2,600 years, all of them supported Satan and many of them have continued to do so ever since. Well can we comprehend in a measure how much of forbearance on God's part was called for by their unholy course. But His forbearance was equal to the task of giving Him all the mildness and unvindictiveness that their wrongs against Him, and the persons, principles and things in which He was interested, called for Him to exercise in order to bring victory out of the chaos of sin and the curse.

So, too, has man's course toward God and the persons, principles and things in which God has been interested, called upon God to exercise forbearance in order to effect His purpose with reference to man. Eve's deception called for some exercise of forbearance on God's part; but Adam's willfulness called for more; and this forbearance showed itself, not in withholding the sentence that justice required to be inflicted, but in the manner, method and purpose of its infliction. The gradualness of its infliction shows God's forbearance in its infliction. Permitting man to make the best of his death-producing surroundings during its infliction is another example of God's forbearance therein. His educative purpose of teaching man by its infliction the bad nature and fearful effects of sin, in order to bring about his hatred and avoidance of sin, is still another evidence of God's forbearance therein. Not only was the antediluvian wickedness

of mankind an example of God's long-suffering, it was even more so an example of His forbearance. Then to have forborne for 120 years the climacteric forms of antediluvian transgression strikingly exemplifies God's forbearance. The development of heathen religions after the flood, so blasphemous as to God, so degrading as to man and so harmful as to Truth, was another stage for the play of God's forbearance toward man; for as the Apostle in Rom. 1 assures us, the introduction of such religions among mankind was due to the increasing human depravity—a thing taken advantage of by Satan as the occasion and the means of their spread. How expressive of God's forbearance with the Amorites is the statement that wrath delayed to express itself, and that for nearly 500 years, because their iniquity was not yet full (Gen. 15: 16)!

Certainly the wrongs committed against Jacob and Joseph called for God to act forbearingly toward the oppressors of His faithful servants. The over-a-century-long oppression of Israel by the Egyptians and the formers' groans and cries to their covenant God, bring to mind another major example of God's forbearance. The manner, the kinds and the occasions of the ten plagues in Egypt and the circumstances of the overthrow of Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea, also strikingly illustrate Jehovah's forbearance toward obstinate man. Israel's waywardness, greediness, idolatry, discontent, murmursomeness, disobedience, and unchastity, one and all furnished occasions for the exercise of God's forbearance. Their repeated apostasies during the period of the Judges and Kings, their persecution of God's prophets, their espousing of false religions, their unbelief as to God's covenant protection, their prohibited association with heathen nations and peoples and their increase in sin, one and all were very forbearingly endured by God. And when the Lord did arise and punish them, it was

forbearingly done, and He was quickly moved to mildness and non-vindictiveness toward them. His returning of them from their many captivities to His favor, especially from Babylon, were acts of forbearance. And greatly did He forbear the corruption of real religion among them into an external ceremonialism by the scribes and Pharisees. His bearing with them for 1,845 years in spite of their many wrath tending activities remarkably shows His forbearance.

One of the greatest exhibitions of forbearance on God's part is His attitude amid the mistreatment that His Christ class has received. The Christ class consists of Jesus and His faithful followers. Of all God's creatures, these are the closest to His heart. A mother may forget her sucking child, but He never can forget these. Heaven and earth will pass away, but His love for, and delight in these abide eternal, unchangeable and unalloyed. Whoever touches these touches the apple of His eye. We can form no adequate conception of the height and depth, length and breadth of God's love for these. But of all His creatures they have been the most hated, despised and mistreated, and that because of their loyalty to Him, His principles, His cause and His people, and because of the enmity of those who are out of harmony with the course that such loyalty makes them take. When we see the baiting that Jesus endured for over three years from the Jewish clergy and consider the final harrowing experiences through which He passed because of His loyalty and their consequent enmity, and then remember how God felt toward Him, we can form a faint idea of the forbearance of God, who could contain Himself amid such scenes. The long-drawn-out, untoward experiences through which Jesus' faithful followers have passed because of their loyalty and because of the enmity of God's and their foes, present us with another very remarkable exhibition of God's forbearance. The persecution of the Jewish Christians

by their Israelitish brethren furnishes many examples of God's forbearance. The ten pagan persecutions of the Christians in the Roman Empire, coupled with the fiendish tortures, blood-thirsty cruelties, prolonged agonies and devilish revilings that Roman hardheartedness inflicted for nearly three long centuries, furnished innumerable occasions for vindictiveness on God's part; yet He was forbearing throughout them, compatibly with perfecting His saints amid suffering.

But the climax of human, yea, fiendish cruelty, was reached in the papal persecutions of the saints, through which the apostate Church of Rome spotted her garments with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus. As if excommunication, outlawry, interdicts, curses, exile, infamy, imprisonment and wars, were not enough of evil with which to afflict them, Rome must needs institute the Inquisition for their special torture. The following are some of the things that the Inquisition, under sanction of "infallible" popes, did to God's saints: scourged them, stretched them on racks six to eight inches longer than their natural sizes, disjointed their bones, broke their teeth with hammers, cut out their tongues, sliced off their cheeks, cut off their ears, lips and noses, gouged out their eyes, poured melted lead into their empty eye sockets, into their ears and down their throats, pulled out their nails with hot pincers, cut off their fingers, toes, hands and feet, cut off the breasts of women, ripped open pregnant women, tearing from them their unborn infants, which they sometimes burned at the stake with their prospective mothers, tortured with special instruments the most sensitive parts of the human body, skinned, boiled, roasted and burned them alive, forced urine and glass-mixed excrement down their throats, broke their arms by suddenly raising and letting them fall not quite to the floor, with chains attached to pulleys in the ceilings and fastened to their hands, which were back of them and with heavy

weights attached to their feet, forced them to submit to the embraces of a machine called the "kissing virgin," which was covered with horse-shoe nails and knife-blades, whose points entered the bodies pressed against the machine, and to a "crushing virgin," inside of which the victims were similarly pierced while being crushed, applied to them thumb screws and "Spanish boots" made of iron, the former crushing their thumbs at the nails and the latter, with their iron wedges pounded by sledge hammers between the boots and the legs very shortly reduced their feet and legs to the knees to pulp, made them sit on the Spanish donkey, whose sharp point entered the body, heavy weights being tied to their hands and feet, impaled them, pulled their legs out by tying their feet with long ropes to two horses which were made to run at full speed in opposite directions, tied them naked to fleet horses which dragged them until dead over rocky fields, made them sit naked astride narrow straddles with heavy weights attached to the arms and legs, cast them off precipices upon spears below, where they hung until dead, beheaded, dismembered, disemboweled, burned, drowned, hanged them, buried them alive, tortured and murdered their nearest relatives before their eyes, made their children infamous, outlaws and exiles, etc., etc., etc. These things were done, not for a day, a week, a month, a year, a decade or a century, but for many centuries.

These are the main things the "Holy" Inquisition did against them, but the papacy used other means: stirring up kings and nations to war on them. Innocent III, mightiest of the popes, by the promise of a plenary indulgence raised a crusade of 500,000 French, Italian and German soldiers against the French Waldenses and Albigenses. These devastated entire provinces, slaughtering at Beziers 60,000 men, women and children, at Lavaur, a slightly smaller number, and in one day, after attending a morning mass,

slaughtered 100,000 Albigenses, as well as laid waste the fair province of Languedoc, the clergy publicly thanking God for "this glorious victory" over the heretics. Charles V and Philip II, at papal instigation, martyred 100,000 Protestants in the Netherlands alone. The French kings, Francis, Henry, Charles and Louis XIV, at papal instigation, fiendishly persecuted the Huguenots in France, slaughtering them with great cruelty by the hundreds of thousands and exiling over a million of them. Papacy boasted over, struck a medal for, and made an approving painting of, the massacres of "St. Bartholomew's" times, when from 70,000 to 100,000 of them were treacherously slain as a result of papal intrigue and duplicity. The papacy, in order to exterminate the Protestants, stirred up the Thirty Years War, one of the major curses of the human family. The papacy stirred up the religious war of 1641 that destroyed 154,000 Protestant men, women and children in Ulster alone. The above are only the leading evils that papacy brought upon God's saints in the way of violence. Almost everywhere and always was it for more than a thousand years seeking to root up and destroy the Faithful. As to all of this God was able to bear and forbear. His purpose of perfecting in character the Faithful like our Lord, through suffering, for the high and responsible offices of Kings and Priests for the world, kept Him in this forbearing attitude. But even so, we stand astounded at the strength of character that enabled Him to continue such forbearance amid such, to Him, heart-touching scenes of His children's sufferings.

Just one other sphere wherein God's forbearance has greatly exercised itself—the sphere of Truth and right principles. Jehovah is the God of all Truth and right principle. He has been pleased to reveal to us His Truth and its principles. These are calculated to free men from the power of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness—the four foundations of Satan's power

and empire. Satan recognizes such to be the function of God's Truth and its principles of righteousness, and therein rightly recognizes them to be a menace to his purposes and empire. Therefore he has set himself to the work of suppressing them and their exponents. His efforts to suppress the Truth and its principles have expressed themselves especially in the ways: (1) of suppressing their exponents, so that having no defenders they would perish from men's minds; and (2) of counterfeiting them and palming off these counterfeits, as the genuine, and thus also seeking to make them perish from men's minds. In working out his first purpose he brought the persecutions, tortures and wars above-mentioned, against the exponents of Truth and its principles, and in working out his second purpose he sought to seduce from their loyalty the exponents of these, and has succeeded more or less with all except the Faithful. Through those thus seduced he palms off error for truth and truth for error, right for wrong and wrong for right. This accounts for the false religions in the world, particularly in Christendom. Satan was one of the most attentive hearers that Jesus and the Apostles had; and when from their teachings he had learned the real plan of God, he worked out a counterfeit for each of its features. Thus he perverted every feature of God's plan and perverted the principles of Christian life that it teaches. This counterfeit he palmed off on the world through the measurably disloyal teachers of God's Word, who, among others, are pictured forth by Balaam, greedy for honor, power and wealth, and willing to compromise Truth and righteousness to gain these. Satan has used the very brightest minds that he could get to work skillfully on his counterfeit and to make it appear the genuine article. God's faithful servants, to the degree that they perceived various features of the counterfeit as such, set themselves in opposition to it and sought to vindicate as against it the Truth

and its principles which were counterfeited by it. This has been carried on for centuries—yea, ever since Satan started out to palm off his counterfeit in its various features. The Faithful's fighting to gain or retain a footing for the Truth and its principles is called the controversy of Zion in the Scriptures (Is. 34: 8). Many a saint has worn himself out unto death in this struggle. God was pleased in His forbearance to allow them and the Truth and its principles for which they contended to be crushed temporarily to the earth and seemingly to suffer defeat. But their seeming defeat was a real victory, because their faithfulness to death qualified them for kingship and priesthood in the Millennium, when under Christ they will crush the head of him (Satan) who in this life bruised their heel—made it so hard for them to walk the narrow way. But "Truth, crushed to earth, will rise again," and in this case has risen again and is triumphantly holding the field against every counterfeit of the true. But this treading down of Truth and its principles has furnished God with untold circumstances calling for Him to exercise forbearance. And with a steadfast holding in His heart and mind of His purpose in leaving His Faithful so hard a warfare to wage for Truth and its principles, He has always exercised the requisite amount of forbearance, and thus has revealed to us in His acts, as well as in His Word, the marvels of His forbearance.

But God is not forbearing under all circumstances. He exercises this quality at the direction of wisdom, justice, love and power; so, also, at their dictation, He refrains from its exercise. This accounts for His many punishments of sin and sinners. These are abundantly exemplified in the curse, in the deluge, in the judgment upon the cities of the plain, upon Egypt, upon the seven nations in Canaan and the surrounding nations, and upon Israel, Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, Rome and the nations into which the

latter has disintegrated. We are now living in the Day of Wrath, which began specifically with the World War, will proceed through a world revolution and come to a climax in world anarchy. This wrath will strike all nations, particularly of Christendom, and in Christendom will especially be poured out on papacy, ending in its eternal ruin. In this wrath time, God has ceased to exercise His former forbearance toward evil institutions. The purposes of their permission having been about accomplished, their downfall will be as a result and as an expression of God's wrath, which will burn unto a completion. Thus we see His wonderful forbearance when required by wisdom, justice, love and power; and thus we see His wonderful forbearance held in abeyance as required by these same qualities. Praised be our God for all His works: for those of forbearance and for those of wrath; for all of them are done in wisdom, justice, love and power for the ultimate good of all!

Forgiveness is the next secondary attribute of God's character that we desire to study. By forgiveness we understand the quality of heart and mind whereby one ceases to cherish displeasure or resentment and to inflict punishment for wrong done him and in their place puts pleasure at and friendliness toward the offender and remits any punishment that may be due for such wrong. According to this definition, forgiveness consists of two elements: (1) an internal active characteristic, and (2) an external act. It presupposes that one has been wronged and that this wrong has worked the displeasure and resentment of the wronged person who, in some form or other, holds something against the wrongdoer. The thing held against the latter is punishment for the wrong. The punishment that he enforces or seeks to enforce against the wrongdoer may be simply a mental one, or it may be a verbal one, or it may be one expressed, in act. The punishment may consist in the negative withholding of some benefit or

the positive infliction of some injury. Forgiveness acts under such conditions. It puts aside the displeasure and resentment held against the wrongdoer, takes on the attitude of pleasure in, and friendliness toward him and remits the negative or positive punishment due or thought due for the wrong. In every real forgiveness the above things will be found. Accordingly, when we say that God is forgiving we thereby imply that, while He has been wronged and such wrong displeases Him, arouses His resentment and He punishes or arranges to punish the wrongdoer, yet for certain reasons He ceases to cherish displeasure and resentment at the wrongdoer and, on the other hand, cherishes pleasure and friendliness toward him and ceases to arrange for his punishment or desists from inflicting it, or He would not forgive.

Certainly God has been greatly wronged. Sin is the form that all such wrongs take. Sometimes these wrongs are done Him directly and sometimes they are done indirectly. Direct wrongs against God are done when He is refused the place of supremacy in our dispositions, thoughts, motives, words and acts, or when such supremacy is accorded others with or apart from Him, especially so when these others are inimical to Him. Again, God is directly wronged when His person is denounced or traduced, His character is misrepresented or detracted from, His plans are disbelieved, misbelieved, misrepresented, corrupted or vilified and His works are denounced, renounced, misrepresented, resisted or vilified. So, too, is He directly sinned against when He is disbelieved, despaired in, hated and disobeyed. Frequently direct sin against God takes the form of ingratitude, inappreciation and impiety, as they may also be omissions of duty toward Him. Whoever does any of these or kindred things directly sins against God. Such things displease Him, arouse His resentment and lead to the infliction of some just punishment. On the other hand, God is indirectly sinned

against when wrong is done to His creatures, especially those of His creatures who become His sons and servants. Dishonoring parents, civil rulers, teachers or, other superiors is a sin against God, though indirect. So, too, to hate or injure or kill one's neighbor, to violate his home, to injure him in his property rights or reputation, or in any unfair way to seek to divert anything of his from him, are sins against God, none the less real by being indirect. The reason for this is that God has given all certain rights and demands of all respect for such rights, hence to violate these is an attack on God's laws, ordinances and creatures, and hence it arouses His displeasure, resentment and consequent punishment against the wrongdoer.

Sometimes such punishment takes the form of God's hiding Himself from the offender, whereby He makes him feel His displeasure and resentment. Sometimes it takes the form of depriving him of evidences of former favors, *e.g.*, taking Truth, graces and opportunities of service from him, taking physical blessings from him, like health, friends, business, position, relatives, etc. Indeed, the entire curse is an expression of punishment for sin, culminating in death. It is seen in the driving of our first parents from Eden, in Cain's vagabond life, in the flood, the confusing of tongues, the scattering of the nations, the destruction of the cities of the plain, the ten plagues on Egypt, the destruction of the Egyptian host in the Red Sea, the plagues on, and the wanderings of Israel in the wilderness, the destruction of the seven nations of Canaan, the oppressions of Israel during the periods of the judges and kings, Israel's various calamities, captivities and dispersions among the nations, the evils that persecutors endured, the afflictions of sectarianism and the present troubles in the world beginning with and resulting from the Word War. Yea, in its very nature sin brings some kind of punishment upon the sinner.

God, as the Source, Expounder and Maintainer of justice, must punish sin, as He must feel displeasure at, and resentment toward it. His justice is unbending and therefore exacting. But, blessed be His name, His love also operates and has under the direction of wisdom made it possible in harmony with justice to cease cherishing displeasure at, resentment toward, and punishment for our sin. We are not to think that God, as it were, ignores the dictates of justice when He exercises forgiveness. This would make Him unjust, which He is not. Rather He gives His justice full sway while giving His love full sway and thus, without violating His justice, He in love forgives. This brings us to the most amazing expression of love ever so far manifested and, so far as our knowledge goes, the most amazing expression of love that ever will be manifested: God gave up His own well-beloved and only begotten Son to meet the sentence of His own law against sinners so that He might remain just while forgiving them (Rom. 3: 24-26). And our Lord Jesus in the loyalty of His heart was also equal to the meeting of the situation by facing for us the demands of justice for the world's sin, that He might thus redeem us from the sentence of justice, and thus make it possible for God's love to forgive us in harmony with His justice (Rom. 5: 6-11; 2 Cor. 5: 18-21). Herein we glory and hereby we attain forgiveness (Rom. 4: 24-5: 1). Thus we see that God does not become unjust while forgiving us. Having justly sentenced the sinner, He could not forgive him unless the sinner were made good for to God's justice. And God Himself made the hard sacrifice—surrendering His Son unto death for enemies—and Jesus willingly carried it out, so that we might enjoy forgiveness from God for Christ's sake.

To enjoy such forgiveness we have something to do. Not that we can merit it; for being condemned to utter bankruptcy we have nothing of worth, nor can

have anything of worth that is not forfeited. All the merit is our Lord's and all the grace is God's and Christ's. Yet, for us fully to receive God's forgiveness, there are certain conditions that we must fulfill. These are three: (1) repentance toward God, (2) faith toward our Lord Jesus and (3) consecration of ourselves to God fully. The first implies that in addition to being sorry for sin, especially because it displeases God, we hate and forsake it, seeking to make amends to all concerned, and that we heartily love and practice righteousness toward God and man. The second implies that we distrust our own ability to commend ourselves to God's approval and heartily trust and act upon the trust that Jesus' righteousness makes up for all our lacks and sins before God for our justification before God. The third implies that we heartily give up self-will and world-will and heartily accept God's will as ours. Those who so have done during the Gospel Age have received fully and actually God's forgiveness, *i.e.*, God ceased to cherish displeasure, resentment and punishment toward them and cherished pleasure, friendliness and remission of punishment toward them. Indeed, in a tentative way those who fulfilled the first and second conditions for forgiveness have during the Gospel Age enjoyed forgiveness from God.

God's purpose in forgiving sins is a manifold one. The chief purpose is to bring about full reconciliation between Himself and those who experience it. He desires to be friendly toward and pleased with them; and He desires them to be friendly toward and pleased with Him. Hence He is glad to exercise His quality of forgiveness on all who will respond to His conditions for forgiveness. Then, too, He wishes to uplift the fallen, and exercising His forgiving love is one of the most effective methods of making them willing to receive His uplifting help. Further, He has desired to draw the forgiven ones closer to Him along

selective lines so that they might become fitted for life eternal and in it be instrumental in helping others to come to God in reconciliation. Indeed, this has been the main practical purpose in God's exercising His Gospel-Age forgiving spirit. And out of this purpose will be developed three elect classes Who, together with the faithful of the Old Testament, will be wonderfully used by Him as His Millennial agents to help the rest of mankind to draw near to God in reconciliation. Doubtless there is forgiveness with God, that His name, character, may be revered. By showing us His forgiving love, not only when we were first justified, but all through our lives in the almost infinitude of our lacks, faults, mistakes and sins, God has been revealing to us a most merciful, kind, long-suffering, forbearing, patient, self-controlling and generous disposition; and when we contrast our many shortcomings with His perfections and tireless forgiveness of our sins of weakness and ignorance, the longer and more devoutly we contemplate Him in these respects, the more do we grow in reverence for Him—a reverence that expresses itself in gratitude, praise, worship, adoration, honor, devotion and service. And this, in turn, makes us more like God, more responsive to Him and more helpful to our fellows. Another of God's purposes in exercising forgiveness is to encourage those not yet forgiven, but desirous of forgiveness, to seek it by taking the necessary steps thereto. Then, too, He exercises it so that when the world comes in the Millennial Age to see its privileges, it will be encouraged the better to profit from God's past dealings with His people in pre-millennial times. Such forgiveness has also the purpose of reflecting credit upon God and Christ and to make us all the more hate sin and practice righteousness. Accordingly, God's purposes in connection with forgiveness is not an encouragement of sin, but the

reverse—a most effectual discouragement to sin and an encouragement to righteousness.

The qualities that characterize God's forgiveness are worthy of our study. It is pitiful. God deeply feels for the sinner in the misfortunes that immerse him. Man's degradation, physical, mental, moral and religious, deeply touches God's heart. God feels for him at his losses, disappointments, lacks and pains, incidental to his sin. God pities him because of sin's alienation of him from God. God's sympathy is keen toward him because of the sufferings that sin brings on him; and God pities him because ultimately sin must accomplish his destruction. Therefore pity certainly characterizes God's forgiveness. Also God's forgiveness is characterized by His love. His heart is full of good will, both the good will of justice and the good will of charity, and these express themselves in forgiveness. God loves the sinner himself, not for a profit that God would make out of him for Himself, but because He delights to bless him. He desires to see him get the advantages that will accrue to him, if he receives God's forgiveness. God desires him to enjoy the pleasures and profits of reconciliation with God. God desires him to be elevated, ennobled and hallowed, because this will profit him intrinsically. Then, God desires him to become a blessing in the ennoblement, elevation and hallowing of his fellows. God ardently longs for him to make an everlasting success of himself for himself and others. Therefore He greatly desires to forgive him as an essential step for these good things. Surely, His forgiveness is full of love.

Then, too, it is liberal. God does not have to be bribed into it by our supposed good works. He does not have to be constrained into it by physical, mental, moral or religious force. He does not give it grudgingly, unwillingly, upbraidingly and threateningly. He bestows it more freely than the air that we

breathe, more unctuously than the most gracious heart of man can feel, more heartily than the most spontaneous lover can favor his love, and more readily than the most beneficent of benefactors can bestow his favors. His forgiveness is full. He does not forgive the little weaknesses and hold against us our large ones. He does not forgive part of our forgivable sins and hold against us the rest of them. He does not forgive our sins against man and hold against us those against Him. He forgives all our sins. He removes all of them as far from us as the East is from the West. Be they ever so many or few, ever so large or small, ever so gross or refined, ever so strong or weak, ever so monstrous or trivial, He stands ready to forgive them all, as He knew all about them and arranged to forgive them long before we applied to Him for forgiveness.

His forgiveness is unchangeable. Some people forgive for awhile and then become displeased, resentful and injurious over the wrongs that they forgave, but not so Jehovah. He forgives forever. He remembers the forgiven sins and iniquities no more. Our lives after forgiveness are a new copy book to Him, with none of its pages having any imperfect and mistaken writing. He chides us not for the sins of the past. He does not remind us of them. He treats us as though they were never committed, and He does not hold them to our disadvantage. Even in the case of those who after becoming His forsake Him, He does not hold against them the sins He forgave, but those only that they impenitently love and practice afterwards. He forgives graciously. He delights to forgive. His heart overflows with joy at forgiving. The chief joy in heaven over one sinner that repents, or over one erring child of God who turns again to the Lord, is that which God's own heart feels. He makes the one whom He forgives feel at least in a measure the pleasure that God feels at His forgiveness

of others. While to the impenitent God turns His back, to the penitent He turns His face, beaming with a graciousness that is indescribable and all pervasive. And, finally, His forgiveness is costly—costly to Himself and to His Son. It is not as though God has been at no pains to be able to forgive. He made the supreme sacrifice, of which He, the Infinite One, was capable, in order to be able to forgive—He gave the most precious possession that He might be able to forgive, even His only begotten and well beloved Son, and that, not for friends, but for enemies. O, come, let us adore Him for His forgiving grace! Let us bow down before Him and worship and praise Him who alone is so supremely good as to merit more than any of His creatures are able to give Him, when giving their best!

The Scriptures give us many testimonies as to God's forgiving sins. When the Lord proclaimed a number of His attributes to Moses on Mt. Sinai, He included forgiveness among them (Ex. 34: 6, 7). He arranged the typical sacrifices in a way to illustrate various phases of His forgiveness (Lev. 4: 20, 26; 5: 4-10). He makes known His forgiveness in suitable manners (Num. 14: 20). He exemplified it in His forgiving His servant David (2 Sam. 12: 13). Repeatedly did He forgive Israel; and at the dedication of the temple the prayer offered there indicates His readiness to forgive them (1 Kings 8: 33, 34). Even hidden or secret sins are not beyond His forgiving power (Ps. 19: 12). The sins of youth as well as of age He alike forgives (Ps. 25: 7). Their greatness and accompanying afflictions are no bar to His forgiveness (Ps. 25: 11, 18). An honest confession accompanied by resolution of amendment, with faith in God's grace and mercy, meets ready forgiveness from God (Ps. 32: 1, 2, 5). God's people, though overcome by sin, still find room for forgiveness (Ps. 65: 3). God's honor and character

are a guarantee of forgiveness (Ps. 79: 9). His forgiveness does not only embrace individuals, but also His people as a whole (Ps. 85: 2). Even amid punishment for sin He stands ready to forgive, on the conditions therefore being fulfilled (Ps. 99: 8). He makes a thorough work of forgiveness (Ps. 103: 12). His forgiveness is in order to the betterment of the sinner (Ps. 130: 4). He stands ever ready to reason with the sinner in order to bring him to repentance (Is. 1: 18; 43: 26). He forgives so thoroughly as to forget our forgiven sins (Is. 43: 25). He pleads with His backslidden people to return and obtain forgiveness (Is. 44: 22). He invites people to seek His forgiving love while it is possible to obtain it, encouraging them by a gracious and forgiving reception (Is. 55: 6, 7). He asks for reformation as a condition of forgiveness (Jer. 5: 1, 7; Ezek. 33: 14, 15). Unlike many people who forgive, yet remember and upbraidingly make mention of the wrongs done them, God not only forgives but forgets and never mentions the forgiven sins upbraidingly (Jer. 31: 34; Ezek. 33: 16). His forgiveness embraces all sins, iniquities and transgressions (Jer. 33: 8). Thus we have given a summary of the main Old Testament passages that treat of God's forgiveness, acting toward human beings.

But the New Testament has much to say on this subject. Its opening chapter tells us that God sent Jesus to be the Savior of God's people from sin (Matt. 1: 21). God promises to forgive us as we forgive others, but refuses to forgive us unless we forgive others (Matt. 6: 12-14; Mark 11: 26). He illustrates the fact of His forgiving us as an inducement to us to forgive others, and of His withholding forgiveness from us, if we refuse to forgive others, in the parable of the two debtors (Matt. 18: 23-35). The New Testament more clearly than the Old Testament shows the meritorious cause of God's forgiveness—

the ransom sacrifice of Christ (Matt. 26: 28). He requires the exercise of faith in Jesus for the attainment of His forgiveness (Mark 2: 5, 7; Acts 10: 36, 43). He forgives all kinds of sins except that against the Holy Spirit (Mark 3: 28). God caused John the Baptist to make the forgiveness of sins the main subject of his preaching (Luke 3: 3). And Jesus charged that it should be preached in His name along with repentance among all nations (Luke 24: 47). Graciously did the Lord forgive the woman taken in adultery (John 8: 11). The Lord empowered His faithful people to act as His mouthpieces in announcing His forgiveness (John 20: 23). He forgives that He may bestow the Holy Spirit (Acts 2: 38). God has arranged for the forgiveness of sins through Christ's sacrifice because there is no other way to gain it (Acts 13: 38, 39). One of the purposes of the ministry of God's Word is to bring forgiveness to the repentant believers and consecrating hearers (Acts 26: 16-18). It is indeed a blessing to obtain forgiveness from God (Rom. 4: 7, 8). We are encouraged to copy God's and Christ's gracious example in forgiveness (Eph. 4: 32). God forgives us that we may live (Col. 2: 13). Sins cannot be forgiven except by the sacrifice of Christ (Heb. 9: 22, 28). It is the privilege of God's people to help erring brethren and other people to come to the Lord for forgiveness (Jas. 5: 20). The blood of Christ works before God the cleansing of all our sins of weakness and ignorance (1 John 1: 7, 9). We should not sin; but if we do, we should not despair, but go to God through Christ, who as our Advocate is our propitiation for the forgiveness that will be ours (1 John 2: 1, 2). It is our privilege, not only to seek for the forgiveness of our own sins, but also to pray for the forgiveness of others' sins (1 John 5: 16). And in all our enjoyment of forgiveness let us not fail to give God the honor of giving us Christ

as our Savior, through whom we have forgiveness of our sins (Eph. 1: 7; Col. 1: 14; Rev. 1: 5) from our Heavenly Father. We have just given a brief digest of the main New Testament passages on God's forgiveness. Certainly both parts of the Bible finely describe this subject and give us great comfort and peace in the consciousness of God's willingness to forgive.

God's forgiveness is a very fruitful thing. It results in putting away His enmity toward the sinner; and it makes the sinner friendly toward God. The consciousness of being forgiven takes away from our hearts the keenest sorrow of which we are capable—remorse—and in its place brings comfort from, and peace with God. Not only so, but our hearts are filled with joy through having it. To receive it we must change our attitude from one that loves sin and hates righteousness to one that hates sin and loves righteousness. Instead of former doubt of God we must have faith in Him to obtain forgiveness, and we must also give Him our hearts in consecration. It fills our hearts with thankfulness to God and appreciation of the great goodness of God and Christ in making possible and actual our forgiveness. It is precedent to our receiving the Holy Spirit and all the benefits of sonship toward God. Accordingly, God's forgiveness is to each one of us a very beneficial thing. But our receiving forgiveness benefits others; for it prompts us to seek to help them to the same benefit. Our own hearts having been blessed by its reception, naturally and spontaneously we seek to have others gain these same blessings; and those who respond to our efforts to help them to repentance toward God, faith toward our Lord Jesus and consecration to the Lord, receive the above-indicated blessing of heart and mind to the degree that they make this a motive of their very beings. Then, it is fruitful to God and Christ. It brings them the very results that they sought when the Father gave

up His Son to become a sacrifice for sin and when the Son freely surrendered Himself to death so that God and man may become reconciled. Certainly the Father and the Son rejoice over men reconciled with God. They know the value of a human soul, and therefore know the worth of a saved soul. They love to see people turn to the better, and therefore greatly desire the deliverance of people from death. God and Christ deserve the praise, worship, adoration, love, service, thanksgiving and appreciation that those give Them who heartily receive God's forgiveness. God and Christ are thereby enriched by receiving more and more willing and loving hearts as theirs, made so by a proper reception of God's forgiving grace and love.

What we have said of God's forgiveness and its exercise we are to understand as referring to the Adamic sin and all the sins that result therefrom, *i.e.*, all sins of weakness and ignorance. There is a sin that never is forgiven. This sin is the sin against the Holy Spirit, which means a willful sin against knowledge and ability. The sin against the Holy Spirit is any deliberate and willful sin committed, not from ignorance and weakness, but from the love of sin, fully knowing it to be sin and being fully able to avoid it, yet wickedly committing it. There are two forms of this sin, but neither of them is forgivable. The first form of this sin is committed when there is a measure of weakness or a measure of ignorance present, yet on the other hand there is also a measure of willfulness against some knowledge and ability as respects the sin. Such a sin we call a partially willful sin against the Holy Spirit. While God through the ransom forgives the weakness and ignorance in it, He does not forgive the willfulness in it. But such a partially willful sin is not the form of the sin against the Holy Spirit that puts one into the second death—the sin unto death, as St. John calls it (1 John 5: 16). How, then, does God deal with one who has committed partially willful

sin, so far as its willfulness is concerned? He punishes this willfulness and thus makes the partially willful sinner expiate his own sin by stripes. While Christ died for the sin of Adam and its resultant sins, He did not die for the willfulness in any of our sins. Hence, the willfulness must be striped out of the person, *i.e.*, he will receive such chastisement as will take away from his character the willfulness that prompted the sin. The Scriptures teach this to be the Divine arrangement with such sins (Luke 12: 47, 48).

But when the sin is totally willful, *i.e.*, without any weakness or ignorance and against full knowledge of the nature and quality of the act and against full ability to avoid the act it is expiable only by eternal destruction. But such a sin is never committed by a sinner unless he has previously had the following five experiences: (1) He must have been enlightened as to the Truth in general, and particularly with reference to the act in question; (2) he must have been justified; (3) he must have been spirit-begotten; (4) he must have appreciated the deep things of God's Word or Plan; and (5) he must have appreciated the privilege of becoming one of the Kings and Priests of the next Age. In other words only advanced Christians are capable of committing this sin. If such fall away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance. For them is reserved eternal destruction (Heb. 6: 4-8). For them there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, since they have sinned away the merit of the one sacrifice with utter willfulness. In three ways this sin is committed: (1) by their repudiating the ransom sacrifice; (2) by their repudiating their share in the sacrificial sufferings of the Christ and (3) by their destroying the Holy Spirit in their hearts (Heb. 10: 26-29; 6: 6; 2 Pet. 2: 1; Jude 4; 1 John 5: 16). These things, however, cannot be done by one unless he has been an advanced spirit-begotten son of God. Frequently, taking advantage of the ignorance

of those who have not had the five experiences of Heb. 6: 4, 5, Satan deceives them through their ignorance and tender consciences into believing that they have sinned the sin unto death, and thereby most grievously torments them. In not a few cases he has tormented them into insanity and suicide. One of the surest evidences that one has not committed this sin is great grief over what he thinks is it. Satan fails so to torment those who understand the situation. In almost every case those who have committed this sin are so hardened that they never come to remorse. Let us, therefore, turn a deaf ear to Satan's suggestions that we have committed this sin. Those who have committed it have so corrupted themselves as to be incapable of repentance, and God never forgives them. Since they are irreformable God mercifully destroys them, in order to prevent their becoming an eternal curse to themselves and to others. Their sin is expiable only by eternal annihilation. "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, even things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak."

Apart from the sin against the Holy Spirit, let us remember that there is forgiveness before God for all sins. Let this thought comfort us in our transgressions of weakness and ignorance; and let it lead us to prize our God with supreme appreciation for His wisdom, justice, love and power, which suppress the control of His combativeness and destructiveness, and which thus make Him longsuffering and forbearing and forgiving as to our sins. Hallelujah! What a Savior! And let this praise arise as holy incense to God out of every heart that has experienced God's forgiving grace in Christ!

The next secondary attribute of God's character that we will study is courage—the quality of heart and mind that faces dangers and difficulties with fortitude, calmness, firmness and perseverance. The sphere in which it acts is the dangerous and the difficult.

Some quail before the dangerous and are depressed in spirit before the difficult. Their quality of heart and mind is in contrast with courage, or at least evinces a lack of courage. The opposite of courage is cowardice, which results from a habitual exercise of fear. Fear, as we have already noted, operates through the affection-organ of love for safety. God has this affection-organ and its resultant quality of cautiousness, or carefulness. But He fears no one and no thing. He does not have fear for His own personal safety. He exercises carefulness or cautiousness with respect to His dependents, His word and His works. If love for safety would control Him, He would become cowardly. He never allows it to control Him. He by His higher primary graces suppresses the controllership of His love of safety and thereby exercises the courage that faces dangers and difficulties with fortitude, calmness, firmness and perseverance. In this course there is no depression of spirit in Him. On the contrary, He is spirited and undaunted in the highest sense of these words. Therefore courage is an attribute of God's character; and it is a secondary attribute of His character, because it results from His higher primary graces suppressing the controllership of the lower primary affection-organ of love for safety and is worthy of God.

God Himself could never come into any circumstances in which He would personally come into danger. Hence when we studied God's lower primary grace of cautiousness or carefulness, we saw that it was exercised, not in the interests of His own personal safety, but in the interests of His dependents, like His servants and His new-creaturely and angelic sons, and of His plans and works, to secure their safety. Accordingly, God's courage does not exercise itself in the presence of personal danger; for He has and can have no personal danger; but His courage acts in relation to the dangers and difficulties

which His servants and sons, His plans and works, have had and do have. We do see that frequently the faithful Worthies of the Old Testament and of the Epiphany have been in dangerous and difficult situations. We do see that His angelic and new-creaturely sons have also been in dangerous and difficult situations. Furthermore, there have been phases of God's plan and features of His work that have been in the presence of dangers and difficulties. And amid these God has always shown courage, never quailing, never fearing, never feeling panic-stricken; but facing them with a fortitude that knows no trembling, a calmness that knows no ruffling, a firmness that knows no irresolution and a perseverance that knows no pause.

The agents that occasion God's exercise of courage are inimical to His dependents, His plans and works; and against the purposes and works of these God shows His courage. Satan is the chief of these agents. He seeks the seduction and perversion of God's dependents. He plans and works for the overthrow of God's angelic and new-creaturely sons' loyalty to God, His cause and His people. He plots to thwart God's plans and purposes and to put others into operation for the displacement of these. He tries to corrupt, bury in oblivion or counterfeit God's works. Against such fell plans, purposes and works, in connection with the dangers and difficulties that they involve, God sets Himself courageously, never fainting in His fortitude, calmness, firmness and perseverance. Satan finds support in His putting dangers and difficulties in the way of God's dependents, sons, plans and works, in his associates—the fallen angels—who in every way of iniquity have sought to help him endanger and beset with difficulties God's servants, children, plans and works. The world, too, in proportion to its varying degrees of selfishness and sinfulness, which make it amenable to Satanic uses, has rendered Satan more or less efficient support in his endeavors to endanger

and make difficulties for God's servants, sons, plans and works. And not 'the least efficient of these supporters of Satan is the flesh of God's new-creaturely sons. For in its very nature and relation to them, because of its sinfulness, selfishness, worldliness and erroneousness, it is a standing menace to their safety and a constant source of danger to them. Accordingly, it is because of the activities of Satan, the fallen angels, the world and the flesh, endangering and making matters difficult for God's servants, sons, plans and works, that God must exercise bravery on behalf of the latter against the former.

When we look at the experiences of God's dependents and sons and the circumstances of His plans and works, both in Biblical and post-Biblical times, we find many illustrations of God's courage. Indeed, to have conceived the plan for bringing the universe into existence and for maintaining its existence, as well as of filling it with, and preserving in it appropriate living creatures, is a remarkable display of courage on God's part, especially when we remember that God's foresight enabled Him to see how fraught with danger and difficulty such plans would be. Nor did His foreknowledge of the dangers and difficulties connected with the Plan of the Ages stay in fear His hand from the work of making and carrying it out. Connected with it were many dangers and difficulties. He did not allow the thought of Satan's rebellion to make Him fearful, but courageously He pressed on in spite of Satan's usurpation and direful works. The fall of the angels into rebellion against Him did not cause Him to lose heart and give up; but He kept up His fortitude, calmness, firmness and perseverance, despite their combined efforts to thwart Him. Much less did the rebellion of man discourage Him. If the sentencing of the race to the experience with evil unto death was a hard thing to do, He nevertheless did not lack the courage to put it into effect. The

need of wiping out practically the whole human family by the flood to prevent universal corruption nerved His arm to the necessary work. When Satan sought through proud Egypt's power to destroy the earthly seed, God courageously put Himself into battle with the hosts of darkness and earth's mightiest empire and conquered in the battle of plagues and of the sea. Time and again His courage fought His way through in the opposition of the nations of Canaan and the neighboring nations. In His conflicts with earth's mightiest empires—Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Greece and Rome—in their efforts to destroy His people, He always courageously entered and victoriously came out of the fray. No matter how great were the dangers that His servants faced and no matter how appalling were the difficulties that beset them, He minded not the dangers, He heeded not the difficulties, and in the end He emerged victorious and brought them to victory. It was His courage that made brave in danger such heroes as Abraham against Chedorlaomer, Moses against Pharaoh, Joshua against the seven nations, Barak against Sisera, Gideon against Midian, Jephthah against Ammon, Samuel against the Philistines, David against Goliath, Jashobeam, Eleazar and Shammah against the Philistine garrison at Bethlehem, Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego against the fiery furnace and Daniel against the lions.

But the greatest expressions of God's courage are found in connection with His risks related to His endangered sons, chiefly His firstborn Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. To change Him from a high spirit being to a human being was a dangerous procedure. Yet God was equal to the danger therein involved. To put Him on double trial for life—as a human being and as a new creature—with the risk that but the slightest imperfection would lose for Him His best beloved Son and wreck His entire plan for men, new creatures and angels, required a very rare courage

indeed, perhaps the supreme example of courage of all times. Yet the pertinent courage God exercised, and came out of that battle with the greatest of all booty—a Son on the highest plane of existence, and a Vicegerent that could be depended upon under all possible dangers, difficulties and temptations to take God's side and successfully vindicate it. Rare, too, and only next in supremacy to that shown in the dangers and difficulties attendant on His First-Begotten's trial, was the courage that God has been displaying in connection with the trial of Christ's Body; for here are persons that are weak and more or less out of the way, and to risk their lives and hopes in the sore trials amid which they must prove true to gain the Divine nature and Joint-heirship with His Chief Son, called upon Jehovah to manifest rare courage; and His courage has been equal to the prolonged warfare incidental to their conflicts. When we think of the very testful experiences that these have had, and when we think of the many complete failures that some have made, of the partial failures that others have made and of the great likelihood of failure for the rest of them, we can more readily grasp the risks that God ran in developing a plan in connection with such subjects. Rare indeed has been His courage therein.

Look at it as it displayed itself in the martyr conflicts of Stephen and James, Peter and Paul, Ignatius and Polycarp, Perpetua and Felicitas, Pothinus and Lawrence, Huss and Cranmer, Savonarola and Servitus, Latimer and Ridley, who are but a few leading lights amid a great host of martyrs of Jesus. What courage was it that could run the risks involved in the loss of such noble souls as these! The names of the martyrs and multitudinous others and their deeds and sufferings are unique in human annals, with dangers and difficulties in proportion; yet God's courage in these circumstances did not fail Him; His bravery was not overcome by any of these. On the

contrary, with a bravery unexampled, with a fearlessness that knew not the least trembling, with a courage that could suffer the risk of the greatest losses, God went onward in the course that He laid out for Himself to go, and is now emerging from the final scenes of the present warfare with the laurels of the greatest victory of the Ages. Courageous indeed is our God.

Shortly the conflict with evil and its agents will take on another aspect, its Millennial aspect; and by a combination of mercy and force applied as needed, all His enemies will be subdued for a thousand years, while He delivers their captives from the ruinous effects of the reign of sin. Thereby He will put the human race into a position to meet the final onslaught of sin, whose dangers and difficulties God will have the requisite courage to meet. The battle will last about forty years and will end in the eternal triumph of righteousness and the eternal defeat of sin and its supporters. Then will become fully known the real quality of God's courage, as based upon love for righteousness and hatred of iniquity. Then will the real courage of God shine out in the results attained by His permitting evil. It was a great risk undertaken by God, to allow evil to enter a moral order of affairs and to permit it to work even though restricted, within certain bounds. Knowing the power of Truth toward the faith class, and the power of experience both with evil and good as a teacher imparting hatred for sin and love for righteousness toward the unbelieving class, Jehovah had all the courage necessary to run the risks involved in carrying out the Plan of the Ages, in connection with which there were the greatest dangers and difficulties imaginable. Courageous indeed is our God. In this, as in all His other characteristics, Jehovah is supreme. And for it, as well as for His other graces, He perfectly deserves our gratitude, appreciation and worship.

God's courage has been and will be very fruitful. Great indeed have been and will be His gains in the risks that He has taken in carrying out His Plan. So far it has gotten for Him the Ancient Worthies, Jesus and the bulk of the Little Flock, some of the Great Company and some of the Youthful Worthies. Before many years it will bring to Him as booty the rest of the Little Flock, Great Company and Youthful Worthies. With these four elect classes as gains from the risks connected with the elective features of His Plan, God will have been very fruitful in the results of His courage; for in these He will have won for Himself four dependable classes, the one, the Little Flock, dependable in the most exacting possible conditions; for these will be fitted in the endless succession of future Ages to fulfill all God's good pleasure. Then there are the rich gains that the Millennium will bring to His courage, a perfected human race forever firm in truth and righteousness as the inhabitants of this paradisaic earth, and the restored angels, delivered from their fallen condition and forever glad for their deliverance, and forever loyal to God, their Deliverer. Fruitful indeed will also be that feature of His courage that blots out of existence those who will not sever themselves from sin and its terrible effects. Thus from every standpoint will God be fruitful in the results achieved by His courage. So, too, will His exercise of courage be fruitful to others. To our Lord it will be fruitful in that He will forever have the Divine nature as His and the office of vicegerency for God in the execution of all Jehovah's plans and purposes. To the Little Flock it will be fruitful inasmuch as it will result in their having the Divine nature and Joint-heirship with our Lord in all His offices. To the Ancient and Youthful Worthies and the Great Company, God's courage will be fruitful inasmuch as it will result for them in their obtaining spiritual natures lower than the Divine, but much

higher than the perfect human nature of the restitution class, and in their obtaining the office of the chief assistants of Christ and the Church. For the fallen angels God's bravery will result in their restoration to their former station and privileges; and for the obedient of the world it will result in their restoration to human perfection in God's image and likeness and in their having success in eternal life in Paradise. The fruitfulness of God's courageous course will be manifest in future creations, who will learn wisdom from the brave course of God in the risks involved in carrying out His glorious Plan of the Ages. Praised be our God for His great courage!

God's candor is His next secondary attribute that we desire to study. The grace of candor results from the higher primary graces laying hold on our affection-organ of love for hiding—secretiveness—and suppressing its efforts to control our conduct. By using this organ as a servant of truth and righteousness we develop tactfulness as a lower primary grace, which with the other main primary graces we have already studied. But there are circumstances in which tactfulness, with its accompanying secretiveness, would be out of order, and which require in the interests of truth and righteousness frankness of speech and action. The grace shown under such circumstances is candor. We may define candor as the quality of heart and mind that frankly tells what should be told in the prevailing circumstances. To hide the needed truth would be a misuse of secretiveness. To do so under some circumstances would result in evil to others—be the evil physical, mental, moral or religious, while the telling of the needed truth will often prevent evil to the person or to others. Candor is, therefore, a quality that is more or less associated with telling unpleasant or uncomplimentary things. Hence the prelude, *to be candid*, or, *to speak candidly*, is almost always used to introduce a statement of an unpleasant

thought. But when it is necessary for another's welfare that such an unpleasant thought be expressed, and when it is frankly done, candor, in the good use of that word, is being exercised. But sometimes people are brutally candid. They tell the disagreeable thing in a way to make it sting unnecessarily. This is certainly an abuse of frankness. Even while candid we are to be tactful, lest we work evil by our candor.

God has this quality of candor. He is too tactful to be brutally frank. He tells the unpleasant or uncomplimentary truth because He aims at accomplishing good by telling it. He never needlessly tells people unpleasant and uncomplimentary things. He does it to rebuke and correct people who have gone into wrong, or to announce coming punishments for wrong, necessary to vindicate righteousness and truth, and to set aside wrong and error. Hence God's candor is a good quality. It results from His higher primary graces suppressing the controllership of secretiveness. In its exercise He ever keeps in mind, and works to realize, the purpose for which He exercises it. Therefore He suppresses every statement that would prevent His candor from being fruitful. People often flatter others wherein the proper exercise of candor would require a rebuke or correction. This God never does. He uses His candor as a servant of truth and righteousness and not selfishly, as many people do.

The commission of sin, the presence of faultful characteristics, the spread of error and the indulgence in selfishness and worldliness, afford God many opportunities to exercise candor for reformatory purposes. The lack of truth, righteousness, love and heavenly-mindedness furnish God with another set of conditions that calls for His exercise of His candor. So, too, the imperfect development of such qualities afford God another occasion for the use of frankness. As we study the Scriptural illustrations of God's frankness we find it manifesting itself in activity under

just such circumstances. This candor marks Him in His dealings with friends and foes alike. God was candid with Adam and Eve before their trial, telling them just what to do and what to avoid; and when they disobeyed He was frank in pointing out their sin and their punishment. He was frank with Cain, both before and after his killing of Abel. He was candid with Noah in warning him of the coming flood and in His taking proper precautionary measures against it, as He was also candid with the other antediluvians, warning them to repent of their sins and threatening retribution on their failure so to do. He was aboveboard in warning both Abraham and Lot as to the coming punishment upon the cities of the plain. God frankly warned Pharaoh of the wrongs and dangers of his course of obstinacy. God was frank with Israel in offering the Law Covenant to them and in explaining its various provisions to them. When Israel sinned, *e.g.*, in lusting after evil things, in idolatry, in illicit unions at Baal-peor, in complaining against the weariness of their pilgrim journey and in murmuring against Moses and Aaron and in becoming fearful at the evil report of ten of the spies, God in each case clearly set before them their wrong and frankly announced His displeasure.

He was just as candid with individual wrong as with national wrong. He candidly announced His displeasure with the evil sons of Eli and with Eli for permitting their wrongdoings. He did not hide from Saul His disapproval of his wrongs that finally led God to destroy him and take the kingdom from his family. To David He plainly said through Nathan, the prophet, "Thou art the man," when He by a parable told of the unjust course of David toward Uriah and Bathsheba. Through the other prophets He repeatedly sent plain rebukes for the sins of Israel as a nation and of individual Israelites, and often accompanied these with announcements of condigned punishments.

Note the course of Jeremiah with Israel and its rulers and teachers, especially with Coniah and Zedekiah and the false prophets and corrupt priests of his day. Daniel did not hide the Lord's mind from Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar when their iniquities called for their correction and admonition to righteousness. Neither did Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi as God's servants remain silent in the presence of wrongdoers, regardless of whether they were great or small. They candidly as God's mouthpieces pointed out the wrongs committed, advised correction of the misconduct and announced the Lord's judgments pertinent to the several cases.

We find the same candor marking the Lord's New Testament dealings with His servants and enemies, especially as He spoke through Jesus and the Apostles. Some illustrations from New Testament history will show this. In considering these illustrations we are to remember that God exercised His candor through Jesus and the Apostles as His Agents. God's candor is marked in the plain preaching of repentance by John the Baptist, wherein sin and sinners are clearly rebuked. Jesus showed the Father's candor in the fact that He spoke very plainly in rebuke of sin, especially the sins of the religious leaders of His day. Matt. 23, containing Jesus' rebuke of the scribes and Pharisees, is a remarkable example of candor in rebuking the sins of religious leaders. Jesus' telling plainly the truth against Judas' treachery, Peter's officiousness and boasting and the disciples' forsaking Him, are examples of God's candor. Jesus' telling of the difficulties of the narrow way and urging all prospective consecrators to count the cost, is another example of candor. Our Lord's acknowledging His Messiahship and Divine sonship before the Sanhedrin and His kingship before Pilate, are other illustrations of His candor. On Pentecost by Divine inspiration St. Peter frankly told the Jews that they had murdered

the Prince of life. A little later he and John candidly told the Sanhedrin that the Lord Jesus whom they crucified was the one through whom they would have to seek salvation, if they were to attain it. Peter candidly upbraided Ananias and Saphira for their wrong, Simon, the sorcerer, for his wrong heart's attitude and attempt to purchase Divine powers and the exclusive Jewish brethren for not admitting that Gentiles as well as Jews were acceptable for high calling purposes. The Lord, acting through St. Paul, likewise manifested His candor. St. Paul furnishes us a stinging example of it in dealing with Elymas, the Sorcerer, a humble example of it in dealing with the heathen who attempted to worship him and Barnabas and a fearless example of it when he reasoned with Felix on righteousness, temperance and the judgment to come. St. Paul's refusal to accede to Barnabas' desire to take Mark along as a helper, after the latter had defaulted in that capacity on their previous trip, is another notable example of it. St. Paul's preaching and epistles, as well as the other writings of the New Testament, are splendid examples of candor. God's plain messages to persecuting Jews, heathen and nominal Christians, furnish us with many more examples of God's candor, just as His plain speech to His consecrated people throughout the Age, exemplifies the same quality. The book of Revelation, especially its first three chapters, markedly evidence God's frankness. Certainly the Bible and history since Bible times prove candor to be an attribute of God.

As such, it has been fruitful in staying sin within certain grooves, in keeping sinners within certain limits, and in leading responsive ones to repentance and faith in justification, to consecration and to the faithful carrying out of consecration. It will show similar good fruits in the next Age also. In this, as well as in every other quality of God's character, we may, therefore, well rejoice and praise our God.

The next of God's secondary attributes of character that we will study is liberality. We have already studied the lower primary grace, providence, in contrast with which liberality stands. We recall that providence as a lower primary grace results from using as a servant of righteousness and holiness our love for gaining and retaining, which operates through the affection-organ of acquisitiveness. When acquisitiveness is allowed to control, it makes one covetous and miserly; but when wisdom, power, justice and love suppress its efforts to control, we become liberal, *i.e.*, generous in our desire to see others prosper and bountiful and in bestowing of our possessions on others, especially on the needy. Liberality is, therefore, a quality both of the feelings and of the acts. In our feelings it makes us pleased with the prosperity of others. It does not permit us to envy their prosperity, to covet their gains, to seek to draw to ourselves the acquired possessions that they enjoy and to injure them by unfair competition. It makes us feel generous toward them, glad that they are prospering, helpful to them in increasing their prosperity and bountiful in bestowing of our means on them in their needs, *i.e.*, on deserving and needy persons. Liberality, therefore, makes us generous and benevolent in spirit as well as generous and beneficent in action. From such generosity we freely give of our time, talents, strength, means, influence, etc., in order to bless and further others. It prevents our becoming misers, as well as self-seekers. This quality is especially active in the philanthropically and charitably inclined. It lavishes its gains on civic improvements, on benevolent institutions, like asylums, hospitals, etc., on the higher things of life, like religion, education, art, science and reform and uplift movements, as well as on the supply of more private need. It is preeminently the quality of the devotee of a cause; the philanthropist and the

reformer. In the very nature of the case, it is one of the qualities of a truly consecrated Christian.

As in the case of every other good quality, its supreme exemplification is God. God is very liberal in His sentiments and acts. His benevolence makes Him rejoice in the prosperity of others. There is no envy in Him; covetousness finds no place in His heart; He does not plot and scheme to draw to Himself the possible or actual gains of others; and unfair competition finds no expression in His acts. He is generous in the highest significance of that word, and beneficent in the supreme sense of that quality. Owning all things as their Creator and Preserver, He is always giving and never weary in His beneficences. This we see in nature and in grace. He manipulates the laws of nature that they may bestow blessings upon those who would use them aright. He has put the idea of self-giving service into active operation throughout nature. The moon and stars give their light at His bidding to afford guidance to the benighted traveler. He made the sun to give light, warmth, health and strength to man and beast, fish and fowl, reptile and insect. He makes the seasons His servants in bestowing good upon His creatures, all of them contributing the sum total of means of subsistence, though in different ways. He makes water contribute to the comfort and support of His creatures. He causes the air to support their life, the ocean currents to make various agreeable and useful climatic changes, the oceans, lakes and rivers of earth to facilitate men's commercial and other needs, the soil to minister food and clothes for their bodies, the building materials of the earth to furnish man a variety of structures and homes, the metals to supply his practical and ornamental needs, the forces of nature to minister to man's enrichment and comfort. He has stored the bowels of the earth with treasures of metals, precious stones, coal, gas, petroleum, etc., for man's enrichment, comfort

and support. He has stocked its waters, prairies, forests, fields and gardens with food for men's bodies. He has filled nature with scenes of beauty, grandeur and sublimity, to delight men's artistic senses. He has filled the universe and earth with such things, beings, conditions and laws as to give men's higher intellectual powers fruitful and pleasant occupation. He has, in a word, so constituted nature as to be His agent in constant giving of manifold blessings for the good of His creatures. And this proves that He is generous in bestowing the benefactions of nature, and that thus liberality is one of His secondary attributes of character.

But we can see this quality in God's character much more clearly as it displays itself in His works of grace. The whole plan of God, as well as every feature of it, displays His generous heart and beneficent deeds. His choosing to bring free moral agents into existence was an expression of generosity, since it implied His giving an endless succession of benefactions on all of them found worthy of everlasting life, as it also implied a more or less temporary continued giving to those who will not be found worthy of everlasting life. He is the Source of life as its Giver and the Source of the spiritual substances of which spiritual bodies consist, as well as the Source of the material substances of which material bodies consist. Accordingly, from His storehouse of spiritual and material substances and life, God gave the constituent elements for spirit beings and human beings as the things needed for their creation. Then He gave of His time and talents for their creation and thus had given a variety of beings existence. He gave them such powers of being and environment as were conducive to their happiness and continuance, which was another example of His generosity. After some of the angels and the human family fell into sin, He gave them conditions conducive to their learning ultimately to benefit from their experiences and at the same time arranged to give them

later such experiences as would insure these benefits to those rightly exercised by these experiences. Thus we see His generosity in this feature of His plan.

When we consider God's revelation of Himself and His plan, we see His generosity again displaying itself. To Adam and Eve under sentence the Lord gave a message of hope in His prophecy of the outcome of the conflict between God's children and Satan's children and Satan himself. Thus amid a condemnatory sentence His generosity gave some hope. It was His generosity that revealed to Noah the coming flood and a way of escape from it for the best part of the race, needed for a new start this side of the flood. In the main blessing, the one upon Shem, God revealed the blessings of the coming Elect, in the subordinate blessing, the one on Japheth, God revealed the blessing of the restitution class, and in the curse upon Ham God revealed the blessing of a universe clean of those who would mar it. In revealing the Abrahamic Covenant God gave in epitome a statement of His glorious plan that was to be a comfort to many and a blessing to all. In His dealings with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, the Lord gave in the form of types elaborate pictures of the general features and main characters connected with His plan. This was indeed a generous gift. It was His generosity that revealed further unfoldings of His plan in the Law Covenant, and that from a variety of standpoints. In the history of Israel in Egypt, in the countries of their wandering and in their conquest of Canaan, the Lord gave us other typical pictures of future features of His plan. In the events of the periods of the judges, kings, exile and return, we have other pictures unfolding different views of God's plan. The writings of Moses, the Prophets and Holy Men of the Old Testament, are the depository of these and other revelations of God's plan, and, as the Old Testament, constitutes a generous book-gift of incalculable value.

Then came the New Testament revelation as another great gift manifesting the generosity of God. The Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles and the Revelation, with the Old Testament revelations, give us the whole revelation of God to date. This part of God's revelation contains a richer, fuller and higher set of truths than those of the Old Testament, and constitutes a rare gift indeed, bestowing as it does the main doctrinal, preceptorial, promissory, hortatory, prophetic, historical and some important typical features of God's plan. Thus the New Testament is a most generous gift in the way of a revelation. Summing up the revelatory gift of God in the Old and New Testaments, we might say that the Bible is one of the most generous, rich and important gifts that God ever bestowed, whose value is all the more enhanced when we consider the great cost of its giving in the way of time, talent, thought, feeling, effort and the giving of its agents and servants, on God's part. Well may we sing of the generosity of this gift:—

Blessed Bible, precious Word!
Boon most sacred from the Lord;
Glory to His name be giv'n,
For this choicest gift from heav'n.

Then, too, God was very generous in the gifts that He has bestowed upon His Old Testament servants and friends and upon His New Testament servants and sons. To Abel He gave the gift of sacrificial acceptance; to Enoch the gift of fellowship and translation; to Noah the gift of knowledge of the coming flood, of deliverance and an unbreakable covenant. To Abraham He gave, apart from great wealth, the gift of the all-embracing covenant—the Abrahamic Covenant—as well as jointly to him and his seed the gift of the Oath-bound Covenant. He gave him the gift of constant protection and guidance, as well as the gift of personal friendship and privilege of typing some of the finest characters and things of God's plan.

To Isaac He gave, apart from great wealth, the privilege of being the seed typical, as well as being a part of the earthly seed. Hence He gave him the privilege of typing in the main parts of his recorded career the Christ, Head and Body, as well as favored him with the covenant promises. Similar gifts He bestowed upon Jacob and Joseph. How generously God dealt out gifts of privilege, of office and of service to Moses, as well as used him signally as a variform type! God gave Israel, not only a share in the Abrahamic promises, but also the blessings of the Law Covenant and all its implications, *e.g.*, God as their covenant God and them as His covenant people, with the teachings and other benefits of the Law Covenant, the land of Israel, the priesthood, the royalty and the prophetship. Centered in these blessings were myriads of gifts of love and favor. Certainly God's gifts of hope to His Old Testament servants and friends display great and abounding generosity whereby He delighted to bestow good on its subjects.

But God's liberality is even more patent in His dealings with His Gospel-Age sons and servants. To the Logos He gave the privilege of attaining the highest of all creaturely exaltation as the Supreme Agent of God's plan. This implied His carnation. And to Him came as gifts of love from God the privilege of offering His humanity as a sacrifice to God and His begetting to the Divine nature, the anointing of the Holy Spirit, the High-priestly and the Prophet office. On His proving faithful unto death, God gave Him exaltation to the Divine nature, Headship over the Church and Vicegerency over the universe. Thus for mankind He has been given the offices of Priest, Prophet, King, Judge, Mediator, Physician and Father; and for the Church, Priest, Prophet, King, Judge, Advocate, Physician and Bridegroom. And God has in His exaltation given Him a position, honor and nature above every other created being. Surely

God has been liberal in sentiment and act toward His Firstborn, our Lord Jesus Christ. So has He also been liberal toward His other Gospel-Age sons and servants. His liberality is manifest in the fact that, despite the fallen natural condition in which He foresaw this class as a whole, He yet prearranged for there being such a class, as well as for its glorious destiny. How astoundingly liberal was He toward them in giving up for them His only begotten Son to become a human being and as such to become a sacrifice unto death amid the most crucial sufferings, physical and mental! Jesus, a gift of gifts, was one of God's most liberal benefactions to them.

But, beside this redemptive gift of Jesus as their Ransom, God has given them the gift of the Truth, not simply the truth on the surface things of God's Word, but on its deepest and most confidential truths; and thereby He has shown them His confidence in them, and thereby has revealed to them the secrets which He keeps from all others. Such truths are exceedingly valuable and desirable, and are among the richest and most liberal of God's gifts. Additionally He gives them gratuitous justification through the merit of God's Son, God Himself providing it for us. This is a rich possession. The liberality of this gift can be seen from an analysis of what it is and does. It consists of the forgiveness of the Adamic sin and all its resultant sins (Rom. 3: 24-26; 4: 5-8), whereby we are freed from the Adamic death sentence, and of the imputation of Christ's righteousness as our own (Rom. 10: 4; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Phil. 3: 9). Thereby we are forever perfected in God's sight from all Adamic weaknesses and sins, as well as sentence, so that no more can we die the Adamic death. And this makes us acceptable and keeps us acceptable to God in our humanity even to death. It implies that God regards us as though we really have perfect bodies, with the right to life and its life-rights, as well as perfect

characters. Accordingly, our gratuitous justification is a very liberal gift from God.

Furthermore, God liberally gives us sanctification with all that it implies, *i.e.*, He gives us the privilege of being set apart from self and the world unto Him. As to our human all, this implies that He gives us the privilege of diverting it from selfishness and worldliness with all their unsatisfactions and disappointments, and of applying it to the most privileged service this side of heaven. Some consider it a great privilege to give their human all in the interests of education, reform, science, art, philosophy, social uplift, home, friends, relations, country, party, sect, fame, riches, position. But *none* of these, however good some of them are, is comparable to the privilege of giving our human all in the interests of God's plan—the greatest, best and noblest of all causes. It is to such a cause that God gives His faithful consecrated people the privilege of yielding their human all in service, and thus they spend and are spent in the best and most fruitful and most lasting of all causes. Truly God has been liberal in giving so great a privilege. But the gift, privilege, of sanctification implies more and greater privileges than those consisting of yielding our human all in God's service. It implies many things connected with our spirits, new creatures. In the first place, it implies our receiving the new creature—the Holy Spirit. This is one of the three highest and greatest of God's gifts, the others being Jesus and the Truth. It is the beginning of the Divine nature and is the pledge of its completion in the Faithful. It makes us sons of God, heirs of God and Joint-heirs with Christ. It gives us the privilege of membership in the Christ, with all the blessed prospects of glory, honor and immortality as ours. Moreover, God gives us as new creatures increased knowledge of the deep things and the privilege of making these known to fellow new

creatures according to our ability, spirit and position in the Body of Christ.

He gives us in our new creatures the privilege to grow into more and more of His character likeness, and thus gives us all the graces—the higher and lower primary, the secondary and the tertiary graces. Therein He gives us the privilege of detaching our affections from earthly things and attaching them to corresponding heavenly things. And in these character features, after they are developed, He gives us strength, balance and crystallization. Not only does He give us these and thus gives us the best of all personal possessions—a perfected spiritual character—but He also gives us the privilege, according to ability, opportunity and spirit, to assist other new creatures to develop into the same kind of perfected spiritual characters. Then, too, He gives us the privilege of deliverance, thereby in our conflicts with the devil, the world and the flesh, enabling us, as we battle faithfully, to come off conquerors and to help other new creatures to the same kind of victories. And if we persevere faithfully in these conflicts unto death, He will give us the crowning feature of deliverance—victory over death unto the Divine nature in the first resurrection.

But these are not all the gifts that His liberality provides for His faithful Little Flock. Beyond the veil He has great gifts in reservation for them. They will as Divine beings have immortality—life in themselves, *i.e.*, a death-proof condition—which will make them independent of all external conditions for existence. They will be given powers so great that they will be able to pass through any object, move worlds or make new ones and serve under Christ in the rulership of the universe. During the Millennium they will from God receive as gifts the privilege of being members of the world's King, Priest, Mediator, Judge, Physician, Prophet and Mother, which offices they will

use for the awakening of the dead, establishing God's Kingdom, overthrowing conditions conducive to sin and error, introducing conditions conducive to righteousness and truth, blessing all mankind with favorable opportunities of coming into harmony with God and receiving gradual healing from the effects of the curse and gradual bestowment of restitution as they obey, until they will have ministered perfection to the obedient. Then God will give them the privilege of presiding over a final trial of mankind, which they will bring to a conclusion by giving life everlasting to the faithful in the paradisaic earth, which they will prepare, and death everlasting to the unfaithful. Thereafter God will give them the privilege of being an ever extending kingdom throughout the universe as their eternal employment. Surely the richness of His liberality toward the saints is beyond anything that man could think or ask.

Though in a smaller measure than to the saints, God has been exercising and will exercise His liberality to the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. To the first of these classes He liberally gave His Old Testament revelation with such of its truth as was due to them to see, gave them the privilege of a faith justification in view of Christ's coming sacrifice, and amid trials of faith and devotion to righteousness gave them the training fitting them for princship throughout the earth in the Millennium (Ps. 45: 16). He will give them a resurrection better than the world will get (Heb. 11: 35), better because it will be 1,000 years ahead of theirs, because it will give them princship, ruling in blessing over mankind, while the others will be their subjects under the Christ, and because it will give them at the end of the Millennium the privilege of becoming spiritual and receiving a heavenly home, which the world never will get. For them will be reserved a set of eternal privileges very high indeed, though inferior to those given the Little

Flock. A contrast of their Millennial offices will prove this. The Little Flock will be Kings, they princes; the former Priests, the latter Kohathite Levites; the former the Mediator, the latter servants of the Mediator; the former the Physician, the latter nurses; the former the great Prophet, the latter subordinate prophets; the former the judge, the latter His deputies; the former the Mother, the latter children of this Mother, the nurses of the Mother's other children. The Little Flock's superiority to the Ancient Worthies will be eternal, but, though the latter will be the former's inferiors (Heb. 11: 40), they will nevertheless be very highly exalted as an expression of Jehovah's benevolence and beneficence.

What we have said of God's liberality to the Ancient Worthies applies in a less degree to the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. The Great Company, consisting of those who fail to qualify for the position of the Bride of Christ, through failure to sacrifice faithfully in the interests of the Lord's cause and through failure to develop a character like Christ, naturally fail of the Kingdom; but repentant of their course and later proving loyal, they will have as gifts from God a position as spirit beings in subordination to the Bride in the Kingdom and inferior in honor as Kingdom representatives to the Ancient Worthies. They will be noblemen in the Kingdom and Merari Levites to the Priests and the world, assisting the great Mediator, Physician, Prophet, Judge and Parents of mankind in a less honorable position of service than that of the Ancient Worthies, who were more faithful in this life than the former. Nevertheless, their position, nature and works will be wonderful expressions of God's liberality, especially considering that they were, under trial, found unworthy of Little-Flockship. The Youthful Worthies, consisting of those who consecrated too late to have opportunity to stand trial for Little-Flockship, but standing trial for a position inferior to the

Ancient Worthies, are being given many liberal gifts of grace, mercy and truth by God, and millennially will be given the privilege of being an inferior order of princes in the earth, with all pertinent privileges, and post-millennially will be raised with the Ancient Worthies to a spirit nature and a heavenly home. Accordingly, we see that God has been and will continue to be exceedingly liberal to all four elect classes of His plan.

God's liberality toward the non-elect world also has been exercising itself while the curse has rested on the race, and will in the next Age be manifest in a much clearer way. Remembering that the human family is by God's sentence through heredity from Adam a race of convicts doomed to death, we are in a better position to recognize how liberal God is by considering His kindness to *convicts*. Under certain restrictions compatible with the execution of His sentence on the race, He has been very generous and beneficent toward mankind. He has given them many blessings for body, mind and heart. The blessings of nature to the degree that they would be able to obtain them He freely sends them; for He makes the sun to shine on the evil as well as on the good, and sends the rain to the unjust as well as to the just. Man's main evils come to him through the keeper of his penitentiary—Satan—who selfishly uses his position to work evil on the convicts over whom he rules. When we consider the physical and mental blessings that the convict world has gotten in health, wealth, home, society, state, finance, industry, education, art, science, literature and law, all of which in the good they contain are due to God's liberality, we must admit that God is very benevolent and beneficent to His convicts. Nowhere is there His equal.

But His liberality appears in richer forms when we consider how richly He has given and will give in order to rescue the world from its fallen condition.

His dealings with the Elect are to prepare them to deliver the non-elect! So greatly did He love the world that He gave up His Son to become a human being and to die, that they might gain eternal life by complying with its terms and conditions. And not only has He given His Firstborn—our Lord Jesus—unto death that the world might be rescued from the Adamic death and thus gain an opportunity of winning eternal life; but in the same liberal spirit He has been giving up the rest of His faithful Elect children even to death in the interests of His plan, that the world may get the benefit of their millennial ministry. The same liberality prompted Him to prepare the subordinate elect—the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. Thus God's preparing the administrators of the Kingdom in order that they might administer its blessings to the whole race in the Millennium, is a glorious expression of His liberality toward them. This same quality of liberality will mark God's millennial deeds toward the world. Giving them thoroughly wise, just, loving and powerful helpers for their uplift is certainly an act of great generosity and beneficence. Forgiving them all their sins and remembering them no more against them, is another deed of the same kind. Putting them into the hands of a sheltering Mediator, who will shield them in their imperfections from the strict justice of God, is a work of the same character. Giving them the truth on every subject is a first class expression of liberality.

Raising the dead world and putting them under the same conditions, further demonstrates His liberality. Giving them every deterrent from evil and every encouragement to good, further exemplifies this noble quality in God toward the world. As they obey, His healing their physical, mental, moral and religious infirmities will in another way show His abounding liberality toward them. Pouring out His Spirit for all and giving it to the obedient will further prove His

liberality. Helping the willing and obedient to grow in grace, knowledge and fruitfulness in service by giving them the necessary helps through His Spirit, Word and providence, gives another indication of His wonderful liberality. Giving man a paradisaic earth with perfect climate and fruitfulness is a stroke of God's liberality. Varying the kingdom conditions, opportunities and demands, according to the needs and abilities of each, will show how kindly disposed God will be to them. Even the stripes of that time will be for the reformation of all concerned, that they might thus be helped to everlasting life, and will thus be another evidence of His liberality. The same remark applies with reference to God's restraining during the Millennium evil angels and men from tempting and wronging any member of the human family. Thus His millennial dealings will be on a most magnificent scale of liberality toward the human family, all intended to restore it to perfection and life everlasting, as it obeys.

It is liberality that will mark God's post-millennial acts toward the world. He will not permit the trial of the Little Season to transcend the powers of perfect sinless human beings. Thus He will give all a fair and liberal trial, for which He will have been liberally preparing the race. Liberal will be His gift of grace sufficient to the faithful, delivering them in and from the trial, as they are loyal therein, and after they will have demonstrated loyalty therein to the end. And His crowning them with everlasting life in the paradisaic earth after the faithful have demonstrated loyalty to the end, will be the climax of His liberality to the world. Even the destruction of the incorrigible angels and men will be generous and beneficent to them, saving them from an eternity of sorrow; as it will also be generous and beneficent to the faithful for the incorrigible to be destroyed; for the continued existence of these would be an eternal menace to the righteous, as well as a constant source of trouble and sorrow to

themselves. Accordingly, the final rewards and punishments at the end of the Little Season will be expressions of liberality.

And what shall we say of God's liberality in the Ages that will follow the Millennium in endless succession? We can say this, that with a perfect earth and perfect sinless human beings as a basis for Jehovah's post-millennial dealings, His wisdom, power, justice and love, in contact with such a set of conditions, may be depended upon to lavish with utmost liberality His bounties on His beloved earthly children. Is. 65: 17-25 describes the post-millennial conditions and it warrants us in declaring that as from a cornucopia God will pour out such an abundance of good things upon perfect humanity as will fully satisfy every exaction of their minds, every craving of their hearts and every need of their bodies. He will anticipate their every desire, even as verse 24 declares: "Before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear." He will give them every opportunity for the gratification of their every need and for the application of their every power. And what a wonderful world that will be; for if fallen man under imperfect conditions has in many individual cases accomplished so great things now, what will be the attainments and achievements of perfect men under God's liberal tuition! Surely God's liberality will then be one of the grounds of the human family joining in the general hallelujah chorus of Rev. 5: 13: "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb, forever and ever." And we who have tasted of His liberality to the Elect and know of His coming liberality to the non-elect, may well, in present enjoyment of our portion of His liberality and in anticipation of His future liberality to us and the world, sing the high praises of our God and the Lamb; for they are, worthy of "power and riches

and wisdom and strength and honor and glory and blessing."—Rev. 5: 12, 13.

Liberality, being a secondary grace, arising from the higher primary graces suppressing the controllership of love for gaining and retaining, does not control God's acts. He never exercises it contrary to His wisdom, power, justice and love; but always in subordination to these. Hence when these forbid its exercise God keeps it in inactivity, *e.g.*, God is always just before He is generous, and will not be generous, if His justice forbids. It is especially through the Ransom satisfying His justice that God can in harmony with justice be so very liberal as He is and will be to the Elect and non-elect. Hence to become in the full sense the beneficiaries of God's liberality we must approach Him through Jesus Christ as our High Priest and Advocate. Accordingly those who so do get immeasurably more from God's liberality than those who do not so do.

Impartiality is the tenth and last of God's secondary attributes of character that we will discuss in this connection. Hitherto we have discussed as God's secondary attributes of character His modesty, industriousness, longsuffering, forbearance, forgiveness, candor, courage and liberality; and in the chapter on God's Lower Primary Attributes of Character, in connection with God's self-esteem, we discussed His humility, a secondary grace. We trust that our study of Gods virtues and praises have not only helped all of us intellectually, but also morally and religiously; for to minister the latter two ways of help is our main design in writing these articles on God's attributes of character. Impartiality is a secondary grace, because it results from the higher primary graces laying hold of and suppressing the control of certain lower affection-organs; but it differs from the other secondary graces in this: Whereas each of the other secondary graces so far considered results from the higher primary graces suppressing the efforts, at controllership,

of but *one* lower *selfish* affection-organ—the pertinent one in each case—impartiality results from the higher primary graces suppressing the efforts at controllership of any *one* or *more than one* of our *social* affection-organs.

This leads us to describe the sphere within which the grace of impartiality works—the social affection-organs, which connect us with our fellows as members of the same human or spiritual relations as ourselves. And it is within this sphere where the *disgrace* of partiality exercises itself. Thus, as against others, we are prone to exercise partiality toward the opposite sex, our spouses, parents, children, relatives, friends, associates, acquaintances, countrymen, co-religionists, etc., all of whom are united with us by one or another social tie. And such partiality expresses itself frequently toward all in each of these classes as against others, or toward certain individuals of most of these classes as against other individuals of these classes; for partiality is nothing less than the quality that feels and acts toward some individuals and classes as distinct from other individuals and classes, not from the standpoint of the character worth of those concerned, but because of some reason not connected with the character worth of the pertinent person or class. Thus if we should as against the character worth of an individual make him experience untoward things in order that favor may be shown to someone else on account of the latter's appearance, birth, education, rank, office, title, wealth, station, influence, popularity, relation to us, etc., we would be showing partiality. But it is along such lines that we more or less allow partiality to mark our thoughts, feelings, words and acts with respect to those toward whom our social affections act. Partiality is almost exclusively exercised along the lines of the objects of our social affections—toward the opposite sex as such, our spouses, parents, children, relations, friends, associates, acquaintances,

countrymen, co-religionists, etc., as well as toward certain ones as distinct from other ones in these classes.

These considerations better prepare us to understand and appreciate the quality of impartiality. It may be defined as the quality by which we think, feel, speak and act as to others from the standpoint of their character deserts, and not from the standpoint of other things, such as their appearance, birth, education, rank, office, title, wealth, station, influence, popularity, etc. Certainly God's thoughts, feelings, words and acts toward others are not based upon their appearance, birth, education, rank, office, title, wealth, station, influence, popularity, etc. The following Scriptures clearly show this: "He regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward [bribes]" (Deut. 10: 17). "But the Lord said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature ...; for the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance" (1 Sam. 16: 7). "He respecteth not any that are wise of heart" (Job 37: 24). "God is no respecter of persons" (Acts 10: 34). "There is no respect of persons with God" (Rom. 2: 11). "God accepteth no man's person" (Gal. 2: 6). "There is no respect of persons [with God]" (Col. 3: 25). "The Father, who without respect of persons judgeth" (1 Pet. 1: 17).

On the other hand the Scriptures teach that His varying thoughts, feelings, words and acts as to others are entirely dependent on their varying characters, in that He shows favor to the good and disfavor to the evil, but in every case acting in harmony with the principles underlying the case. God's acting from principle and not from any other consideration makes Him impartial as the following Scriptures show: "Man looketh on the outward appearance; but the Lord looketh on the heart" (1 Sam. 16: 7). "Behold, God is mighty, and despiseth not any" (Job 36: 5). "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he

that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him" (Acts 10: 34, 35). "He will render to every man according to his deeds" (Rom. 2: 6). "Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free" (Eph. 6: 8). "But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done" (Col. 3: 25). "Call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work" (1 Pet. 1: 17). Thus these passages show that God does not regard persons from the standpoint of their external advantages, but from the standpoint of their hearts—their characters.

God's impartiality does not mean that He treats everybody alike; for He certainly does not so do. Nothing is plainer, both from the standpoint of the Scriptures and experience than that God does not treat everybody alike. Neither in the realm of nature nor in the realm of Grace, neither in the expressions of His justice nor in those of His love, does He treat everybody alike. Indeed, superficial thinkers, reasoning on the differences of treatment that some receive from that which others receive from God, deny His impartiality altogether. Among other things, the doctrine of election and its practical operation are the clearest of proofs that God does not treat all alike. But superficial thinkers, quoting passages like this: "There is no respect of persons with God," deny election. These people err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the character of God as Sovereign. While God is not a respecter of persons, He certainly is a respecter of character (Acts 10: 34, 35; Rom. 2: 6; Eph. 6: 8; Col. 3: 25; 1 Pet. 1: 17). And God accordingly is not partial when, upon the basis of character differences in various people, He treats them differently, favoring those who reverence Him and work righteousness, and disfavoring those who are impious toward Him and work unrighteousness. On the contrary, such varying

attitudes and acts in God are an expression of impartiality, because they prove that He variously regards people from the standpoint of their varying relation toward proper principles; for as we saw above, impartiality is the quality by which we think, feel, speak and act as to others from the standpoint of their character deserts, and not from the standpoint of such things as their appearance, birth, education, rank, office, title, wealth, station, influence, popularity, sex, work, party, etc.

Nor do the facts that God deals so variously with those whom He favors with elective blessings, and permits the rest to fare so differently from one another under the curse, prove that God is partial. The reason that He deals differently with some from what He does with others of His children is that their dispositions and attainments vary and that some must have different experiences from others on account of their character needs for their present and future place in His plan; and this proves His impartiality toward, great love for, and practical attitude to each of His children. And the reason that there are differences among the members of the world is in part that the Lord has *permitted*, not *wrought* these differences, in that He has given up the race under condemnation and deals no more with it on covenant basis. It is also in part that different experiences are needed by different characters in learning the lesson of the exceeding sinfulness of sin. It is finally in part that in the Age following this an adjustment of accounts will be made in those cases wherein, if they had been made in this life, the lesson of the exceeding sinfulness of sin would not have been universally learned. Hence there is no partiality in God in His varying acts toward His children and in His permitting varying conditions and experiences to come to the world under the curse. There is nothing in these two courses in God that is arbitrary or against principle, or flowing out of favoritism as

against principle. Indeed, in and through it all God is seeking in harmony with good principles the best interests of each and all concerned, according to their character deserts in relation to good principles. Certainly He who gives the wisdom from above, which among other things is without partiality, is, as the source of that wisdom, impartial.—Jas. 3: 17.

If we examine God's acts we find that they are impartial. His rewards have always been along the lines of character fitness. His punishments have been along the lines of character unfitness and have been impartial, both as to His servants and non-servants. Notice how His rewards and punishments toward His servants and non-servants have been along lines of character expressions. The righteous Noah and his family were saved in the flood period, while the unrighteous world perished therein. Tested Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were blessed with the covenant promises, while their unfit relatives were passed by. Loyal Joseph was honored with the ministry of delivering millions from famine deaths, while his evil brethren were humiliated. Faithful Moses and Aaron were honored with the leadership of their people, and proud and rebellious Moses and Aaron were punished with exclusion from the holy land. Faithful Israel received the land in peaceful inheritance; backsliding Israel was punished with various oppressions and captivities, and penitent Israel was reinstated in God's favor. Faithful David prospered in the kingdom, while disobedient David received condigned punishment. Loyal Ruth and Rahab were incorporated into Israel and into ancestralship of Christ, while apostates were cast off from the commonwealth of Israel. Devoted Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego were preserved in the fiery furnace, while their tormentors perished thereat. Uncompromising Daniel was preserved in the lions' den, while his traducers perished therein. Dependable Elijah was preserved amid the famine and rewarded with leading the

nation back to the Divine service, while wicked Ahab and Jezebel miserably perished. Kings and prophets, nobles and plebeians, priests and people, in Israel, are in their varying experiences so many proofs of God's impartiality.

God's sending His Son to become the Savior of *all* is a remarkable expression of His impartiality. His selecting some because of their possession of the faith quality, which fits them for a trial for life now, and His rejecting others from the election because their unbelief unfits them for a present trial for life and His reserving them for a trial when the faith quality which they lack will not be indispensable, are very impressive evidences of God's impartiality—proving that He is actuated by the pertinent one's character fitness or unfitness and not by external considerations in mankind in the bestowal of His favors. His selecting the poor of this world, full of faith, as against the wise, the mighty, the noble, and prudent, shows the same quality (Jas. 2: 5; 1 Cor. 1: 26-29; Matt. 11: 25-27). God's rejecting disobedient Israelites and selecting God-fearing Gentiles, *e.g.*, the scribes and Pharisees, etc., on the one hand, and Cornelius, Titus, etc., on the other hand, evidence the operation of the same quality. The same principle showed itself in the period between the harvests in a multitude of examples for both elective and non-elective individuals. Remarkably did it show itself in the Parousia—the great, the wise, the mighty, the rich being passed by and "the *shirt seller*" given chief place, because, impartiality acting on proper principle, God saw that this was best for all concerned. Then, too, only the loyal of Christendom were honored with the Harvest Truth, and the disloyal were allowed to wander away into all sorts of vagaries. The faithful He preserved in the Truth, while He permitted the unfaithful to fall in the Harvest siftings, always restoring the penitent on their repentance. The same principle is working in the Epiphany: the rebellious being

relegated to the Great Company, the utterly faithless remanded to the second death, while the Faithful are kept standing and are rewarded with the advancing light. Always and everywhere is God proving that His thoughts, feelings, words and acts as to others are based, not upon respect of persons, but upon respect of character.

This thought certainly is comforting. For one thing, the bulk of God's people do not have those things that man so highly regards. Hence if God made these His criterion of judging and dealing with us, the bulk of us would stand no chance of blessing from, and dealing with Him in the elective part of His plan. Moreover, this would give the advantage to the least responsive and base it on the accidental as distinct from the real worth. God's ways are equal and therein may we have comfort. Do we lack earthly beauty, strength, wealth, position, title, education, popularity? Well, what of it? These do not commend us to God, nor make Him favorable to us above others. His attitude is expressed in these words: "To this man will I look [show favor], even to him that is of a poor [humble] and contrite [crushed for sin] spirit and trembleth [is reverent] at My Word." This passage expresses both the heart of impartiality and the substance of grace. Herein may we rejoice and glory; for herein lies our hope for every good gift and every perfect gift. We therefore praise our God for His impartiality, mellowed by His grace; for herein is our hope grounded, that if we approach Him with true hearts through Jesus Christ, He will receive us, one and all, impartially; and that if we abide in such a true heart's attitude, He will impartially help us, one and all, to the very best of which we are capable in the way of development for our eternal inheritance.

High in the Heavens, eternal God,
Thy goodness in full glory shines;
Thy Truth shall break through every cloud
That veils and darkens Thy designs.

Forever firm Thy justice stands,
As mountains their foundations keep;
Wise are the wonders of Thy hands,
Thy judgments are a mighty deep.

Thy providence is kind and large;
Both man and beast Thy bounty share;
The whole creation is Thy charge;
But saints are Thy peculiar care.

My God, how excellent Thy grace!
Whence all our hope and comfort springs;
Mid earthly woes we sweetly rest
Under the shadow of Thy wings.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TERTIARY GRACES OF GOD'S CHARACTER.

THE NATURE AND NAMES OF THE TERTIARY GRACES. MEEKNESS.
ZEAL. MODERATION. MAGNANIMITY OR GOODNESS.
FAITHFULNESS.

WE HAVE come in our study to the tertiary graces of God's character. This book began with a chapter entitled, "The Existence of God." It proceeded with chapters on God's attributes. Of these we first discussed fourteen of His attributes of being; thereafter we began to discuss His attributes of character, treating first of His four higher primary attributes, then of fourteen of His lower primary attributes and finally of ten of His secondary attributes. There remain yet for our study of God's character His tertiary attributes, which we will now take up for discussion, praying the Lord's blessing upon our study of the tertiary attributes of God's character.

In the outstart of this study we are confronted by the question, What is meant by the tertiary attributes or graces of character? Properly to appreciate the answer to this question we should first refresh our minds as to what is meant by the primary and secondary attributes or graces of character. As we have already learned, a primary attribute or grace of character is one that is developed by the direct action of one or two of the affection-organs; and a secondary grace or attribute of character is one that is developed by the primary graces laying hold of and suppressing the efforts of the lower affection-organs to control us. Several of the higher primary graces, *e.g.*, piety, brotherly love and charity, are the direct products of the activity of several higher affection-organs. Thus, piety is the direct product of conscientiousness and veneration; brotherly love is the direct product of conscientiousness

and benevolence; while charity Godward and Christward is the direct product of appreciation and sympathy on the one hand and of veneration on the other hand, and charity manward is the direct product of appreciation and sympathy on the one hand and of benevolence on the other hand. The only affection-organs that operate in the production of the higher primary graces are the higher affection-organs. While several of the higher primary graces are produced by the direct action of more than one higher affection-organ, the lower primary graces are in each case the product of but one lower primary affection-organ. So, too, the secondary graces in each case are limited to the effect of the suppression of each lower affection's efforts to control our motives, words and acts.

The tertiary graces result from the combination of higher and lower primary graces and secondary graces. A higher primary grace is never the direct product of a lower primary affection-organ; nor is a lower primary grace the direct product of a higher affection-organ; but whenever the products—graces—of both of such organs combine with one or more secondary graces, then the resultant grace is a tertiary grace. *E.g.*, meekness is a tertiary grace, and exercised Godward it is a combination of the higher graces, faith, self-control, patience, piety and charity on the one hand, and of the secondary graces, humility, longsuffering and forbearance on the other hand, along the line of a mild submissiveness of heart and mind; for in the exercise of meekness toward God the above eight graces blend with the five higher primary graces in control of the three secondary graces along the lines of mild submissiveness of heart and mind, which is what the Bible means by meekness. Manward, meekness is a combination of self-control, patience, brotherly love and charity with the above-mentioned three secondary graces in a mild submissiveness.

An examination of the other tertiary graces will show such a combinative feature in each of them. The other six tertiary graces are: zeal, moderation, magnanimity or goodness, gentleness, joy and faithfulness. Zeal results from a combination, first, of faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love and charity (higher primary graces), second, of combativeness, aggressiveness and industriousness (lower primary graces) and, third, of bravery, self-denial and liberality (secondary graces), along the lines of ardent and active devotion to a cause. Moderation results from a combination, first, of faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love and charity (higher primary graces), second, of tactfulness, restfulness, thoughtfulness and friendliness (lower primary graces), and, third, of humility, longsuffering and forbearance (secondary graces), along the line of balance of mind and heart. Magnanimity or goodness results from a combination, first, of faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love and charity (higher primary graces), second, of agreeableness, peaceableness, and friendliness (lower primary graces) and, third, of generosity, longsuffering, forbearance, forgiveness and leniency (secondary graces), in thought, motives, word and acts, in favor of proper persons, principles and things. Gentleness is a combination, first, of faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love and charity (higher primary graces), second, of agreeableness, friendliness, restfulness, peacefulness and tactfulness (lower primary graces) and, third, of generosity, longsuffering, forbearance, humility and modesty (secondary graces), along the line of leniency or mildness in manner of action. Joy results from the proper activity of any single grace or of a combination of any two or more or all of the graces along the lines of delight of heart and mind. Faithfulness results from the activity of any single grace or of a combination of any

two or more or all of the graces along the lines of loyalty to principles, persons or things.

The above descriptions and analyses of the seven tertiary graces prove that they are a combination of higher and lower primary graces and of secondary graces. It because of their being compounded by certain features of other graces that they are sometimes called compound graces. Those who so call them speak of all the other graces as simple graces. This method of classifying the graces is fairly good; but not so good, we believe, as the method used in our pertinent series of chapters; for the classification of primary, secondary and tertiary, sets forth their nature, originating organs, relations and functions, while the other has respect to their ingredients only. We trust that the preceding remarks on the three classes of graces will help us, one and all, better to appreciate the nature and function of each class, and thus better fit us to understand and appreciate God's tertiary graces of character. The first of these that we will discuss in this chapter is God's meekness.

Meekness is a mild submissiveness of heart and mind. It is not enough to define meekness as submissiveness; for there are many expressions of submissiveness that are not expressions of meekness. The convict who has in his stubbornness been subdued by a severe chastisement into submissiveness could hardly be called meek. The necessity for his chastisement—his stubbornness—proves him not to be meek. We could rightly speak of him as subdued, but that very expression proves him not to be meek. There is, therefore, more than mere submissiveness implied in meekness. It implies that the submissiveness be one that flows from mildness and must come from the heart and mind. A truly meek person is always mild; and if one lacks mildness he lacks an essential ingredient of meekness. The mildness of meekness makes us refuse

to ascribe meekness to all characters that must be subdued by force or fear before they become submissive.

But the kind of mild submissiveness of which we treat exercises itself in activities of both heart and mind. Its activities of mind have as their essence docility—teachableness—and its activities of heart have as their essence leadableness—tractability. The unteachable are not meek, nor are the intractable meek. To be meek one must be both docile and leadable. But true meekness is not docile and leadable as to everybody and everything. It is docile as to truth and righteousness only, and leadable as to truth and righteousness only. It refuses to be docile and leadable as to error and unrighteousness. Hence, true meekness only then exercises itself toward others when this is in harmony with truth, righteousness and love. This accounts for meek Christians refusing to exercise meekness toward those who have sought to dissuade them from their loyalty to the Lord, as during persecutions, time and again, efforts were made to induce them to renounce the Lord, the truth and the brethren. In such cases their meekness exercised itself, not toward their persecutors, but toward the Lord, the truth and the brethren, as was very proper.

Nor should we, as many do, confound meekness with humility, which is a proper self-estimate, and hence in us is lowliness of heart and mind. The reason for this mistake is on the surface; for humility being one of the ingredients of meekness, of course, wherever we have meekness we will find humility. But we sometimes find humble persons who are not meek; for there are some who have a proper, hence a lowly self-estimate who, however, are not mildly submissive in heart and mind. On the other hand, humility is conducive to meekness, as it must be, since it is an ingredient of meekness. It is also very apparent from their definitions that they are not the same, for one is a proper self-estimate, *i.e.*, in us lowliness of heart and

mind, and the other is a mild submissiveness of heart and mind. Furthermore, their Scriptural uses show that they differ, *e.g.*, when our Lord said, I am meek and lowly in heart, He certainly did not mean that He was humble and humble, or meek and meek (Matt. 11: 29). Again, when St. Paul exhorts us to "put on ... humbleness of mind, meekness, etc.," he certainly means not one thing, but two different things. Eph. 4: 2 is another passage to the point. Accordingly, we do well to avoid confounding humility and meekness.

But how can we say that God is meek—that meekness is one of His tertiary attributes of character? Certainly we can not say that God is meek toward His creatures; for none of these teach Him anything, nor can He be taught anything by them. None of these lead Him, nor can He be led by any of them. Hence He does not exercise meekness toward any being in the universe. Can He, then, be meek at all? Yes, we answer. How, then, is it possible for Him to be meek, if He does not have or exercise it toward anyone? We reply, He is meek as to good principles; for. He is mildly submissive to His own law of truth, righteousness and love. It is a great mistake, yea, a blasphemy, to say that God is not subject to His own law of truth, righteousness and love, as those mistake who teach that He predestinated some angels and Adam and Eve and all their descendants to sin, and gave them such dispositions and placed them into such circumstances as forced them to sin. Had God done such a thing, He would have violated His own law, and by that very fact would have sinned against meekness—would have made Himself stubborn—the opposite of being meek. He would thus have denied Himself—a thing that the Scriptures say is (morally) impossible of Him (2 Tim. 2: 13). Hence we know that He did not predestinate anyone to sin.

That God is meek toward the principles of truth, righteousness and love, the following Scriptures abundantly

prove: "God is not a man that He should lie ... hath He said, and shall He not do it? Or hath He spoken, and shall He not make it good?" (Num. 23:19). "All His ways are judgment; a God of truth ... is He" (Deut. 32: 4). "All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth" (Ps. 25: 10). "Thou hast redeemed me, Thou God of truth" (Ps. 31: 5). "All His works are done in truth" (Ps. 33: 4). "I have not hid Thy righteousness ... and Thy truth" (Ps. 40: 10). "God shall send forth His mercy and His truth; for Thy mercy is great ... and Thy truth" (Ps. 57: 3, 10). "O Lord, Thou art ... plenteous in mercy and truth" (Ps. 86: 15). "Mercy and truth shall go before Thy face" (Ps. 89: 14). "His mercy is everlasting and His truth endureth to all generations" (Ps. 100: 5). "Thou hast magnified Thy word above all Thy name, [*i.e.*, subordinated Thy character to Thy truth]" (Ps. 138: 2). "Who keepeth (obeyeth) truth forever" (Ps. 146: 6). "Thy counsels of old are faithfulness and truth" (Is. 25: 1). "I will direct their work in truth" (Is. 61: 8). "All whose works are truth" (Dan. 4: 37). "But He that sent Me is true" (John 8: 26). "Let God be true" (Rom. 3: 4). "O Lord, holy and true" (Rev. 6: 10). "Just and true are Thy ways" (Rev. 15: 3). These passages, one and all, show that God is subject to His law of truth and some of them show that He is subject to His law of justice and love.

We will now quote some showing that He is subject to His law of justice: "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" (Gen. 18: 25). "Shall one man sin and shalt Thou be wroth with all the congregation?" (Num. 16: 22). "Just and right is He" (Deut. 32: 4). "Judge Thy servants, condemning the wicked ... and justifying the righteous" (1 Kings 8: 32). "There is no iniquity with the Lord" (2 Chro. 19: 7). "Far be it from God that He should do wickedness and ... iniquity. Surely God will not do wickedly ... He will not lay upon man more than is right" (Job 34: 10, 12, 23).

"The righteous Lord loveth righteousness" (Ps. 11: 7). "Thou shalt judge the people righteously" (Ps. 67: 4). "Justice and judgment [truth] are the habitation of Thy throne" (Ps. 89: 14). "The Lord is upright ... There is no unrighteousness in Him" (Ps. 92: 15). "His righteousness hath He openly showed in the sight of the nations" (Ps. 98: 2). "The Lord is righteous in all His ways, and holy in all His works" (Ps. 145: 17). "The Lord, our God, is righteous in all His works which He doeth" (Dan. 9: 14). "The just Lord ... will not do iniquity" (Zeph. 3: 5). "Is God unrighteous? ... God forbid; for how then shall God judge the world?" (Rom. 3: 5, 6). "Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid" (Rom. 9: 14). "God is not unrighteous" (Heb. 6: 10). "He is faithful and just" (1 John 1: 9). "Thou art righteous, O Lord. righteous are Thy judgments" (Rev. 16: 5, 7). These passages prove that God is subject to His law of justice.

We will now quote some passages that prove that God is subject to His own law of love: "Thy lovingkindness is better than life" (Ps. 63: 3). "The Lord loveth the righteous" (Ps. 146: 8). "Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of destruction" (Is. 38: 17). "I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee" (Jer. 31: 3). "I have loved you, saith the Lord" (Mal. 1: 2). "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3: 16). "The Father loveth the Son (John 5: 20). "He that loveth Me shall be loved of My Father ... if a man love me ... My Father will love Him" (John 14: 21, 23). "The Father Himself loveth you" (John 16: 27). "Thou hast loved them, even as Thou hast loved Me ... that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them" (John 17: 23, 26). "Beloved of God, called to be saints" (Rom. 1: 7).

"God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom: 5: 8). "God loveth a cheerful giver" (2 Cor. 9: 7). "The God of love and peace shall be with you" (2 Cor. 13: 11). "God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins hath quickened us together with Christ" (Eph. 2: 4, 5). "God, even our Father, who hath loved us" (2 Thes. 2: 16). "The kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared" (Tit. 3: 4). "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth" (Heb. 12: 6). "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God" (1 John 3: 1). "God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, that God sent His only begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins ... We have known and believed the love that God hath for us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him ... We love Him, because He first loved us" (1 John 4: 8-10, 16, 19). These verses show that God obeys His law of love.

Thus, according to these three sets of verses, God is subject to His own law of truth, justice and love. But a blending of truth, justice and love, produces a mild submissiveness of heart and mind, which is meekness, and, therefore, since these qualities blend in Him, they make Him meek—mildly submissive in heart and mind to His own law of truth, righteousness and love. This proves that God has the meekness of wisdom which He commends to us for our practice (Jas. 3: 13). But it proves that His meekness is not exercised toward any person, *i.e.*, any of His creatures, since it is exercised only toward the law of His own being. This last remark should be given its due weight; for the law to which God is subject is not something external to

Himself, but is the law of His own being. It is His own character. Hence it expresses itself in all His thoughts, motives, words and acts, which are but the outflow, the expression and the revelation of His character, especially in wisdom, justice and love.

God's meekness, as just described, naturally warrants His expecting and requiring meekness of us. He is not unreasonable and unjust to ask of us good qualities lacking in Himself. Meekness, being in us a part of the image of God, self-evidently is a part of His character—the law of His being—whose images we are. And laying this requirement upon us, by His exercising meekness toward truth, justice and love, He gives us an example, encouraging our imitation of Him. This example shines out repeatedly in His acts as they display themselves in His Word and plan. As the requirements of truth, justice and love call for expressions of meekness on His part toward these qualities in His dealing with the opponents of, and sinners against His plan, He has exercised it most markedly. This can be seen in the way that He has borne with the opposition of Satan, the wicked antediluvians, the peoples of the cities of the plains, Laban, Joseph's envious brethren, Pharaoh, the murmuring and rebellious Israelites in the wilderness, the heathen nations with whom they had more or less contact, the backslidings of Israel during the periods of the judges and kings, the weakness, self-will and apostasies of some of their kings, nobles and priests, their and others' persecutions of His prophets and His other worthies, their making His religion a formalism and His teachings a background of traditions and manmade ordinances and their rejection and persecution of His Son and His messengers in the Jewish Harvest, *i.e.*, from 29 A. D. to 69 A. D.

His meekness toward the law of His own being can be seen in His Gospel-Age experiences with His opponents and with the weaknesses of His people. Satan's

oppositions have during the Gospel Age been much more subtle than his previous ones; the persecution of God's people has during the Gospel Age been more severe than in former times. Error has been decidedly more rampant than formerly. Sin has increased and abounded the more as the Age has advanced. Blasphemies against God and His Christ have been multiplied increasingly during this time above former times. God's plan has been caricatured, misrepresented and distorted as never before. But none of these things have turned God against acting with meekness toward the law of His being. Throughout it all has He been mildly submissive in heart and mind to the law of truth, justice and love, as these are written in His character. So, too, have the weakness, the unprofitableness, the slowness to hear, heed and do, on the part of His people, and their lack of more fruitfulness, not availed to detract God from exercising the meekness that mildly submits in heart and mind to His law of truth, justice and love. Always, everywhere and amid all conditions and experiences, has God preserved His meekness, as He will so continue to do.

From God's meekness toward His own law of truth, justice and love, we can learn many lessons. The first is that we exercise meekness to whomsoever and whatsoever we owe it. Always, everywhere and in all circumstances and experiences do we owe it to God and Christ. And the example of God's exercising it always, everywhere and in all circumstances and experiences, should arouse us to exercise it toward Them. Again, God's meekness toward the law of His being should arouse us to exercise it toward His law of truth, justice and love. Furthermore, His general example of mildly submitting in heart and mind to everything to which it is due that He so do, gives us the example of doing this, not only toward what He does it, but toward others to whom it is due to us so to do, even though it is not due for Him so to do to them. Here

His example lies in the principles and not in the external things concerned. We owe it to be meek toward many beings to whom God does not owe it to be meek; for meekness is a quality that works especially toward superiors, to whom it is impossible for God to be meek, because He does not have them. Accordingly, we should exercise meekness toward our parents, rulers, teachers, employers and elders, compatibly, of course, with our higher duty toward God and Christ. As servants of the Truth, we make ourselves submissive to the principles of service toward many who in God's sight are our inferiors. Thus, we will be "in meekness instructing those that oppose." Even when mistreated, reviled, persecuted and slandered, we are to be so mildly submissive in heart and mind to the principles underlying the experiences as to exhibit "the meekness of Christ."

Another good lesson that we may learn from God's meekness, is to trust Him as reliable in His words, plans and acts, as being always in harmony with and subordinate to His law of truth, justice and love. As God never deviates from a mild submissiveness in heart and mind to these, we may depend upon His exemplifying these in all His dealings with us. If we are His in justification and sanctification, we may be certain that in all His dealings with us He is acting in harmony with His own law, and ever will so do. Even when, for the time being, we are not able to trace Him, "faith can firmly trust Him, come what may," because it knows that truth, justice and love are the source, expressions and channels of all His promises, purposes and acts toward us. Hence we know that He will work and is working all things for our good in harmony with truth, justice and love. If meekness as above described were not a characteristic of God, we could not trust Him through thick and thin, in good days and in evil days, in sickness and in health, in sorrow and in joy, in pain and in pleasure and in

living and in dying. Then we would be in doubt at any turn of circumstances and experiences as to whether He would not forsake us, change His attitude toward us, cast us off and have nothing more to do with us. We could not be sure that He would keep His promises, observe His oath, continue to execute His plan and perform works of providence, instruction, justification, sanctification and deliverance for us. God's meekness is a guarantee against all such evils and is a shield and buckler to us in our fight with its incidental dangers on behalf of His cause. Therefore God's meekness is His pledge to us of the fruition of all His good purposes on our behalf. Hence we are by it given strong consolation. We, therefore, rest in faith on account of His meekness. It incites us to imitation. It gives us hope for present overcoming and of future inheritance. In it we may well glory; and for it we may well praise God; for all His qualities call for praise of Him; and meekness, next to His higher primary graces, does this perhaps above all others of His graces of character.

In the preceding portion of this chapter we have treated on the tertiary attributes in general, and on God's meekness, as the first of these, in particular. We will now proceed to treat of God's second tertiary attribute—zeal. As a rule people do not associate zeal with God. In fact, to most people He seems to be without zeal. They rather think of Him as so self-contained and self-restrained as to allow of no place for zeal in His character. This is certainly a mistake, as we will see. That the Scriptures attribute zeal to God is evident from a number of passages. Speaking of the various works of Christ in both of His Advents, particularly in His Second Advent, God promises, in Is. 9: 7, to bring them to a complete success: "The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." The same prophet (Is. 37: 32) in foretelling the discomfiture of Sennacherib and of the deliverance of

God's elect Israel, said: "The zeal of the Lord of hosts shall do this." Yea, and not only did the events fulfill the prophecy, but God made them a type of the greater discomfiture that He by His zeal would bring upon Satan as the antitype of Sennacherib and of the greater deliverance of His elect spiritual Israel shortly. The same prophet (Is. 63: 15), voicing the heart fears of God's fleshly and spiritual Israels at times when God seems to have forgotten to carry forward His plans and promises, cries out in language that implies that God has zeal, but seems to keep it in abeyance: "Where is Thy zeal and Thy strength ... are they restrained?" Ezekiel (5: 13) likewise gives testimony to God's zeal in the words: "They shall know that I, the Lord, have spoken it in My zeal, when I have accomplished My fury in them." In the following citations the same original root in various forms is translated as *jealous* and *jealousy*: Ex. 20: 5; 34: 14; Deut. 4: 24; Ezek. 39: 25; Joel 2: 18; Nah. 1: 2; Zech. 1: 14; 8: 2; 1 Kings 14: 22; Is. 42: 13; Zeph. 1: 18; 3: 8. In every case the meaning is *zealous* or *zeal*. Accordingly, we see that zeal is an attribute of God's character, and is needed for its perfection.

Above we saw that, as a tertiary grace, "zeal results from a combination, first, of faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love and charity (higher primary graces), second, of combativeness, aggressiveness and industriousness (lower primary graces) and, third, of bravery, self-denial and liberality (secondary graces), along the lines of ardent and active devotion to a cause." It will be seen that in the above statement on zeal we pointed out especially two things on the subject: its elements and its nature. This statement shows, first, the composition of zeal; and therefrom we note that all of the higher primary, some of the lower primary and some of the secondary graces are compounded as its elements. We might have mentioned some other lower primary graces as sometimes

entering into the make-up of zeal, like patriotism, friendship, domesticity and family love, which were not mentioned because they are frequently absent from zeal expressions. But not only did our statement on zeal previously given set forth its elements, but also its nature, and that in the words: "along the line of ardent and active devotion to a cause." There can be no zeal disassociated from a cause, nor can there be zeal without devotion, and that devotion must be both internal (ardent) and external (active). Thus all of the ideas in the expression, "ardent and active devotion to a cause," are implied in the nature of zeal. They make it what it is; for it is what it is because of its constituent elements.

God's zeal is, therefore, His ardent and active devotion to a cause. In Him it springs from, and is constituted of, the higher and lower primary and secondary graces mentioned above. But this must be kept in mind, that when we speak of piety and brotherly love in connection with zeal, we refer to them as they are in God's creatures. To accommodate to God our statement of these two higher primary graces as being elements of zeal in God, we must modify their pertinency by understanding piety in God as applicable to His duty-love to the principles of truth, righteousness and love, and brotherly love in God as applicable to His duty-love to His creatures. With this modifying explanation kept in mind, our statement of zeal above given is applicable to God as well as to His spiritual and human creatures. God's zeal, therefore, means His ardent and active devotion to a cause, springing out of, and consisting of a combination of the higher primary graces, faith, hope, self-control, patience, duty-love toward good principles, duty-love toward His creatures and charity; of the lower primary graces of combativeness, aggressiveness and industriousness; and of the secondary graces of bravery, self-denial and liberality (generosity).

The cause for which God's zeal, as an ardent and active devotion, exercises itself is, generally speaking, the creation, preservation and well being of the universe and its creatures, and is, specifically speaking, The Divine Plan of the Ages. Therefore the universe, its creatures and the Divine Plan are the sphere in which God's zeal works. This statement of the matter implies the immensity of God's zeal; for it concerns *all* His works and creatures. Therefore He is zealous as the Creator, Preserver and Benefactor of the universe and its creatures, and of His Plan with respect to His spiritual and human creatures. In the Ages to come, as He initiates one plan after another for the creation, preservation and development of other free moral agents, His zeal will exercise itself in the execution of each one of them unto a completion. Hence God's zeal is an eternally active quality. Hence its sphere of activity is as wide as the universe and as lasting as eternity! And this implies a never-ending and all-embracing activity. Certainly it must be a very strong quality to be never-ending and all-embracing in its sphere of activity. And before Him, as the Exemplar of such a stupendous quality, it is fitting that we bow down in praise, worship and adoration. All glory, praise and honor be to our God as the Exemplar of such an all-embracing and never-ending quality! It surely honors Him.

And be it observed that His zeal is one of wisdom, power, justice and love. Many are selfish and worldly in their zeal; some are sinful and erroneous in their zeal; and the majority of those who have zeal do not have it according to knowledge. But God's zeal, by virtue of His character and the sphere of its activity, is in harmony with His wisdom, power, justice and love. Never does it act independently of these; never does it act contrary to these; but it always flows out of these as its principal source and expresses itself along the lines of these as its principal ingredients. If

God's zeal acted independently of these or contrary to these, it would be a fault, not a grace; and He would consequently be sinful and not holy. Accordingly, we see that this quality in God must, like all lower primary, secondary and other tertiary graces, act in subjection to God's higher primary graces. The same principle applies to the activity of this grace in all of God's creatures. An unbalanced character and unbalanced conduct, as is often exemplified in zealots, bigots and fanatics, results from the failure to subject zeal to the control of the higher primary graces as its dominating ingredients. And the perfect balance that exists in God's character and conduct subjects zeal to the control of His character's chief ingredients—perfect wisdom, justice, love and power, all perfectly balanced with one another. Such a subjection of zeal to these qualities guarantees that God's zeal is always pure, holy and good, and acts accordingly.

And these qualities are also the main incentives to the exercise of zeal in God. God has no base motives for His active and ardent devotion to the causes that He espouses. All men may have, some men do have, and the devil always does have such incentives for their acts; but not so Jehovah. Purer than the light, holier than the best of His creatures, as loving as supreme love, as just as supreme justice, as wise as omniscience and as strong as omnipotent will, is God's zeal. If His zeal were not so, if it were like Satan's or fallen man's, we could not safely nor wisely attach our zeal to a cause championed by Him. We would forever be haunted by the fear that He was enlisting our zeal in a failing and injurious cause—catastrophic to itself and injurious to others and to ourselves. But with a zeal that is subject to His higher primary graces, and that flows out of them as its incentives, God engages only in wise, just, loving and powerful causes; and when He invites us to enlist zealously in the outworking of His plan, He honors us with an

invitation to participate in the execution of a holy, just and good cause. What cause could be holier, more just and better than the cause of the Divine Plan of the Ages? What cause calls for holier motives, better thoughts, more truthful word and nobler acts? Verily, none! And this is because of the character of Him who made and is executing it. Hence our faith in Him is justified in following Him in zeal, even when unable to trace Him; for "faith can firmly trust Him, come what may." Therefore we rejoice that the Divine Plan of the Ages was produced by Divine wisdom, power, justice and love, is supported by these and will completely, in its every feature, be enacted by these; for "the zeal of the Lord of hosts will accomplish it" in due time in each of its parts.

And yet to the natural man God seems to be without zeal in His conflict with Satan, sin and the curse; for the race looks back on over six thousand years of human history in which these have seemingly triumphed. It sees to this day sin on the increase and righteousness oppressed and baffled. It sees Truth crushed to the earth and fighting for a foothold with its back to the wall, and error raising its head in boasting triumph. It sees the curse multiplying its sorrows, suffering and deaths, and their stunting and injurious effects. "Where," it cries out, "is there evidence that God is working zealously against the oppressions of Satan, the corruptions of sin, the delusions of error, the exactions of selfishness and the degradation of worldliness? Where?" Ah, to him who sees not the Divine Plan all this seems but contradictory to God's zeal as enlisted in the cause of man's deliverance. "What man," the race cries out, "would allow sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, as manipulated by Satan, to triumph for more than six thousand years and would not overthrow them, had he the power, wisdom, justice and love to do so? Surely his professions without fulfillment would by now be regarded as

hypocritical and his promises without performance would by now be regarded as deceitful." To such we answer, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God" (Matt. 22: 29). Shortsighted man sees not the depth of the Divine Plan, which in its present operating features is accomplishing God's good pleasure, as its future operating features will do the same (Is. 55: 10, 11). Blind unbelief is sure to err and scan His work in vain. Hence all this seems to be an unsolvable enigma to those who have not faith.

But wherein the world is blind and sees not God's zeal outworking those features of His Plan that have been due for execution, those who have the necessary faith, hope, love and obedience see the complete success of those parts of the Plan so far due to be fulfilled. They see His zeal to execute His Plan in sentencing sinful man to death, to be undergone amid an experience of evil, well knowing that an experience with it in the present life, followed by one with righteousness (in the Millennium), will more effectively than any other method teach the race to hate and forsake the former and love and practice the latter, and thus exemplify forever the reign of moral law, to secure which is God's purpose in connection with these contrasted experiences for the unbelief class. Hence he can see God's holy zeal in the over six thousand years of sin's seeming triumph; for God will in due time cause the wrath of man, sin and the curse, to praise Him, and the remainder of wrath He will restrain (Ps. 76: 10). Again, he sees God's zeal in permitting evil to afflict the righteous; for he sees that through no other schooling could the righteous by their faith in God be better developed in character for their high future office than in the school of affliction, whereby they develop graces, and that to a degree of strength otherwise unattainable, so indispensable to their fitness for their future exalted office. He sees the zeal of God active throughout these six thousand

years in selecting and training His agents for the work of delivering the unbeliever class when their experience with evil will have been completed, and when they thereby will have been prepared for a proper reception of the experience of righteousness to be administered under the superintendence of those elect helpers who will, by their faithfulness in their experience with evil, have been qualified to deliver the others. He sees that in these six thousand years God has been zealously proceeding with the work of preparing four elect classes—the Little Flock, the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies—as the deliverers of the non-elect classes. He sees God's zeal, unchilled by six thousand years of effort amid utmost and subtle opposition, persevering, amid much weakness in these elect classes, in the work of selecting and developing them. He sees the work, so long and zealously persevered in, now approaching its completeness. He, therefore, does not at all doubt the activity of God's zeal in these over six thousand years. And in it all He sees that that zeal is all of what we described it to be and more than we could describe it to be; for it baffles adequate description.

Having seen so many features of God's Plan successfully carried out by God's zeal, he has the full assurance of faith that the unfulfilled parts as due will be zealously carried out by God. The prophetic Word assures him that the zeal of the Lord will shortly overthrow Satan's Empire, in its governments, religions, aristocracies and bourgeoisies, in the time of wrath, which had its start in the World War. He confidently looks for the zeal of God to establish God's kingdom at the hands of His Elect under Christ, on the ruins of Satan's Empire, to offer the Kingdom blessings, first to the living Jews, then to the living Gentiles, then to the non-elect dead from our times even to Adam's time, by canceling the death sentence, awakening them from the dead, giving them an accurate

knowledge of the Truth, putting them under conditions inconducive to error and sin, and conducive to Truth and righteousness, favorably influencing them Christward and bringing all of them to the door of consecration, inviting them helpfully to the highway of holiness and offering the Holy Spirit to all, teaching them by experience the desirability of righteousness as against the undesirability of sin, lifting up the obedient to human perfection and giving the faithful everlasting life on this earth, turned into paradise. This work will require the full Millennium to complete and will be an impressive exhibition of Jehovah's zeal. And in the Ages to follow the Millennium, God's zeal, in the plans that He has for new creations in the worlds about us, will find an eternal sphere of activity and will be equal to any demand put upon it; "for the zeal of the Lord of hosts will do this."

Moderation is the next tertiary attribute of God's character that will engage our study. Like the other tertiary graces, it is a compound quality. Previously we pointed out this fact when we stated that moderation results from a combination, first, of faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love and charity (higher primary graces), second, of tactfulness, restfulness, thoughtfulness and friendliness (lower primary graces) and, third, of humility, longsuffering and forbearance (secondary graces), along the line of balance of mind and heart. According to the above, moderation masses certain primary and secondary graces to the activity of securing and exercising a balance of thoughts, feelings, words and acts. It may be defined as the quality that avoids extremes of thought, feeling, word and act and strikes a happy mean of disposition and its expressions. No extremist is moderate. The moderate person avoids extremes. He pursues a middle course that balances him amid the various and conflicting relations of life. He takes an all-sided view of principles, circumstances, persons,

conditions, positions; demands, needs, etc., related to the matter at hand, and blends in his thoughts, motives, words and acts the above-mentioned qualities so as to secure balance in his mental states, words and acts relative to those principles, circumstances, persons, conditions, positions, demands, needs, etc. Thus he moderates, governs, himself so as to maintain a proper relation toward and amid them. And the quality by which he does this is moderation. This quality finds its supreme exemplification in God, whose moderation is manifest in all His thoughts, motives, words and acts, as the Bible shows.

The quality can be better understood, if its opposite is considered. We speak of a person as an extremist. What do we mean by that? We thereby understand a person to be meant who is radical in his thoughts, motives, words and acts, one who is unbalanced in his thoughts, motives, words and acts, one who overemphasizes or under-emphasizes principles, circumstances, persons, conditions, positions, demands, needs, etc., one who considers matters very one-sidedly and very narrowly and feels, speaks and acts accordingly. To him things are either the best or the worst; people are either paragons of virtue or personifications of vice; times are either the hardest or the easiest; pains are the worst ever or pleasures are the keenest ever; and their acquaintances are either the best of friends or the worst of enemies. Such jump from one extreme to the other and are never happy unless they are at one or the other extreme of the matter at hand. To them those who are otherwise minded seem cranky, zealless, conscienceless. Of course, such are really the cranks, however zealous and conscientious they may be. They usually make a mess of their social relations; for their extremes make them almost constantly fly off on some tangent and hurt those with whom they have to deal; and all the time they wonder at, and speak of others as peculiar and hard to get along with!

Exaggeration and belittling are their middle names; and their course frequently is a great trial to their fellows. No such, or other extremes meet in God, whose perfect rulership of Himself, through His wisdom, power, justice and love, guarantee His moderation in thought, motive, word and act.

Of course, there is a Divine necessity for moderation in God. The ruler of others, He must of course rule Himself. Moderation is needed to impart to Him that roundness, all-sidedness and balance of character for which His absolute perfection calls. If He were immoderate, this would not only introduce imperfection into His own thought, motives and qualities, but also into His Word and acts. A devout consideration and understanding of His Word shows that it is well rounded out, all-sided and balanced in itself and in its purposes and in its adaptability to its purposes. And this is so because of His moderation. If God were immoderate, His creation would express this fault; His providence would be replete with it; His redemption of us would manifest it; His instruction of us would be one-sided; His justification of us would be imperfect; His sanctification of us would be blemished; and His delivering of us would need amendment. Every detail of His creative works shows moderation; and the same remark applies to His providential, redemptive, instructional, justifying, sanctifying and delivering works. Thus His moderation is a necessary part of the perfection of the Divine character. And this quality is needed for the best interests of His creatures. If God were not moderate, neither the good nor the bad angels would be so favorably dealt with as they have been; nor would His future dealing with the fallen angels be so fruitful as we believe it will be. How greatly to the advantage of the fallen race now and especially in the Millennium is God's moderation! The same remark applies with special emphasis with reference to the Ancient

and the Youthful Worthies. Certainly His dealings with Satan and the second death class show very great moderation. The Great Company has and will have reason to extol God's moderation toward them. And the Little Flock will recognize in the highest measure the operation of this quality of God toward them. Thus moderation in God is a quality required by His perfection and by the needs of His creatures in all, their classes and planes of being.

The scope of God's moderation is universal. Hence it expresses itself in all His thoughts, motives, words and acts. If any of His thoughts, motives, words or acts could be shown to lack it, He would be proven imperfect. The fact that all of these are replete with this quality proves that He is the perfect Jehovah, whom we rightly adore for His perfection. We search nature in vain to find one expression of immoderation in God. We analyze grace in vain to find one intimation of immoderation in God. Everything, everywhere and all the time, manifests the presence of this quality in Him. Every feature of His plan and every act of His in connection with that plan unite in ascribing moderation to our God. A brief review of some of His chief pertinent Scripturally-described works connected with the outworking of that plan will show this to be true of this glorious attribute to God.

God's moderation is plainly manifest in the creation of the race perfect in Adam and Eve. Every faculty of theirs, every power and privilege of theirs ascribe honor to God's moderation. How well arranged were their capacities, surroundings and incidences connected with their trial for life! How moderate was death as the sentence on their disobedience, as compared with the immoderate alleged penalty of eternal torment! Moderation marks the infliction of the death penalty through a gradual experience with evil. Especially does this become manifest when we consider the purpose of its permission—to teach by experience the

unprofitableness and detestableness of evil, as a lesson instrumental for reformation; and also when we consider the transitoriness of its permission and its being followed by an experience with righteousness, calculated to teach the profitableness and loveableness of good, both experiences conjointly being designed by God to win for everlasting life more than could have been saved by any other method conformably with the blending of wisdom, power, justice and love. His moderation is manifest in His letting the antediluvians have such favorable environment, until evil had so increased that the watery canopy that in part made these favorable conditions had to be removed from about the earth, and thus bring about the flood; for when wickedness had increased so much as to make it necessary to reduce the race to but one family, God's moderation showed itself in choosing the easiest method of death for the race—drowning. And when it became necessary to furnish a type of the eternal destruction of the second death class (Jude 7), God's moderation limited the typical destruction to a small district, Sodom, etc., and to a few people whose wickedness well merited their exemplary punishment. Mark the moderation of the Lord in dealing with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and the latter's evil brethren. Certainly God showed great moderation in dealing with Pharaoh and the Egyptians in connection with their oppression and His deliverance of Israel from Egypt, and His later dealings with them.

This moderation shows itself in the ten plagues, the first being mild and the following nine arising by small degrees in severity as the willfulness of Pharaoh and the Egyptians arose in intensity, God at no time afflicting them with too great severity, but moderating each chastisement compatibly with the idea of efficiency in its use. Thus God spread over ten plagues an amount of severity that was more lenient than the average imperfect earthly ruler would condense into

one chastisement under the circumstances. And God's final punishment of the Egyptians at the Red Sea was as mild as compatibility with His deliverance of Israel from Pharaoh's murderous purpose would permit. God's moderation with Israel in the wilderness is manifest in many ways. He Himself charges them with the guilt of ten national rebellions against Him before He turned them back to wander in the wilderness until that generation of sinners died (Num. 14: 22). To endure ten rebellions was a great expression of moderation. To seek to reform the people so that they would be fit to enter the land after each one of the first nine, was certainly another expression of moderation; and then, after the tenth, not to proceed with harsher methods than simply to delay their entrance into the land until the willful sinners among them were dead was a still greater exhibition of moderation; and then to permit those rebels for the most part to die off by natural deaths was a still higher expression of moderation. To have borne with them during the untoward experiences of the remaining 38 years in the wilderness, reasoning with them, encouraging them, correcting them, delivering them, always distinguishing in His dealings between the weak and the ignorant on the one hand, and the willful on the other hand, and then between the measurably willful and the totally willful, and measuring out rewards and punishments accordingly, shows how very moderate God was to all of them. This is reassuring to us.

God's dealings with Israel during the period of the judges is likewise an exhibition of His moderation. He sanctioned no extreme measures for Israel's dealings with their enemies. His dispossessing the latter from the land was only after centuries of aggravated wickedness on their part coming to the full; and their being so depraved physically, morally and religiously as to make them a curse to themselves and an exceptional menace to others was ample reason for their

suppression, which was accomplished as mildly as possible. Moderate, indeed, were His methods in dealing with frequently backsliding Israel during this period. Their ever recurring apostacies during this time were dealt with by the Lord by no severer measures than were required to bring them to repentance and to a whole-hearted seeking after the Lord. And the chastisements that He meted out on their oppressors were limited by the amount of stress necessary to inflict on them for Israel's deliverance from their oppressions. This is seen in God's dealings with Israel and Israel's oppressors, through Othniel, Ehud, Barak, Gideon, Jephthah, Samson and Samuel. In the times of the kings the same moderation on God's part is everywhere and always evident. Mark His moderation with Saul, both while he was good and when he became evil. Certainly the career of David in its lights and shadows, in its ups and downs and in its reverses and victories, manifests God's remarkable moderation holding Him back from extremes and moving Him on in the golden mean. The same quality marks His dealing with the subsequent kings of Israel.

His dealings with the prophets show the same characteristic. No extreme measures did He take with Elijah nor with His opponents. He exerted only such influence or pressure as the circumstances, position and characters of the pertinent ones required, as can be seen in the pertinent account of Elijah, Ahab, Jezebel, Obadiah and Elisha. Elisha's prophetic course shows the same quality in God as to His relations to Elisha as the latter was connected with Elijah, Jehoram, Ben-hadad, Hazael, Jehu, Gehazi, the Shunammite, Naaman and Joash. How moderate were God's dealings with Jeremiah in his dealings with the wicked kings, priests, prophets and people, toward whom he acted as God's prophet. No extremes of thoughts, words or acts mark God's pertinent dealings. Always and everywhere He shows Himself as taking a moderate

course, even in managing the crisis of the exiling of His people from the land. He went only so far as effectiveness in the purpose at hand required. God's dealings with Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego and toward their friends and enemies are replete with evidences of God's moderation in encouraging, restraining, correcting, rewarding and using these. The same spirit characterizes His dealings with Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah and their friends and enemies. Certainly God's Old Testament acts are a remarkable evidence of His moderation.

And no less so are His Gospel-Age acts. No exaggerations, no belittlings, no extremes are found therein. Everywhere and always does He show Himself as exercising moderation. His dealings with His Son in His carnation, early life, consecration, ministry, sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension and glorification, are marked by an absence of exaggeration, belittlings and extremes. He pursued a balanced relation to Him in all these experiences, and to His opponents and friends. And this balanced state of heart and mind did not make Him indifferent to what time and occasion required of Him; but it did make Him moderate toward all concerned, even including unbelieving Israel and its wicked hierarchy. Moderate were His dealings with the Apostles and the early Church, as is manifest in His shielding them from too great evils and in His permitting untoward experiences only as they were ready for them, in His concealing from them too strong light and too exacting activities, and in His revealing to them the light as due and the work as practicable. Surely, as He did not suffer them to be tempted beyond their ability, neither did He allow any experience to become theirs beyond their ability. Moderation, therefore, has marked His thoughts, words and works toward them. And this same spirit was present in His activities toward His people all through the Age; and it will likewise be manifest in His activities toward the

Millennial world and in His Little Season and postmillennial dealings with all His creatures. All the descriptions found of these periods inculcate this thought; and this quality will eternally express itself in God's thoughts, motives, qualities, words and works, to His praise.

And great has been the fruitage of God's exercising this quality. It vindicates Him in His character, words and works before all His creatures. It has made mankind under the experience of evil fit candidates for, and, generally speaking, responsive recipients of the Millennial opportunities, as it will also inure to the perfection of the obedient and everlasting life for the faithful of those times. It has resulted in the winning and preparing of the Ancient Worthies for their Millennial office, as it will later result in their fitness for everlasting spiritual existence. During the Gospel Age it has helped to win many millions to faith justification and perhaps several millions to consecration. It has co-operated with others of God's qualities in winning the entire Little Flock and ere long it will inure to bringing them to glory. It has likewise helped with others of God's graces in winning the Great Company, and presently it will inure to their perfecting for the spiritual plane. It has operated in every stage of the development of these for their respective places and it will continue so to operate until they are perfected. Therefore it has in its effectiveness been exceedingly fruitful to all classes of the saved.

In this quality God is an example worthy of our imitation. Unlike God, we are more or less unbalanced in our characters, and more or less extreme in our thoughts, motives, words and acts. We often find it quite natural to jump from one extreme to another, and find it quite hard to draw back from these extremes and walk in the happy mean. Therefore we lack more or less the moderation so sublimely present in God's character, thought, motives, words and acts.

We, therefore, need just what He has in this respect; and He will gladly help us develop this goodly quality. A devout contemplation of His moderation, with a strong determination to imitate it, will prove one of the best methods of our developing this desirable quality. We may well rejoice that this example is so perfect, and that it calls so winsomely upon us to imitate it. We may also be sure that He will be pleased to help us in our every endeavor to develop it in imitation of His own moderation. Therefore let us think much and often of God's moderation as it is set forth in nature and in grace, especially as it is set forth in the Scriptures, and thereby will we be given strength to become like God in this respect. And to this glorious consummation may the Lord graciously help us.

The next tertiary attribute of God's character that we will here consider is magnanimity or, to use its Biblical name, goodness. This word is compounded from two Latin words: *magnus*, meaning *great*, and *animus*, meaning *soul*. It has retained this compound meaning—great-souledness—in the two significances given the word in English. Formerly this word in English referred to courage—a great-souled thing. Such courage centuries ago found its main exemplification in the nobility; and this occasioned the word to be used generally with reference to the nobility. Then, later, by reason of the fact that the nobility usually were characterized by a large-heartedness that ignored petty things, the word *magnanimity* took on its second meaning, in which it is now almost exclusively employed—large-mindedness and large-heartedness. It thus by association took on a meaning kindred to *nobleness* because of the relation of its use with the nobility.

In the beginning of this chapter we gave the following description of the quality meant by magnanimity, goodness: Magnanimity results from a combination, first, of faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly

love and charity (higher primary graces), second, of agreeableness, peaceableness and friendliness (lower primary graces), and third, of generosity, longsuffering, forbearance, forgiveness and leniency (secondary graces) in estimation of, sentiment toward, and dealing with persons and things. It is thus seen to refer to breadth of mind and heart in estimating, feeling toward and dealing with persons and things. It does not hold these to too strict an account. It makes many allowances for weaknesses, faults, lacks, ignorance and small attainment in knowledge, character and work. It is the quality that shuts one eye, and part of the other, if necessary, to imperfection and that construes things for the best. It gives others the credit of having the best of intentions, gives them the benefit of every doubt, and construes unjustifiable things and blemishes as due to lack of knowledge and unavoidable weakness, rather than to deliberate willfulness, as well as blesses them with kindness and beneficence. It therefore gives others many chances for betterment, all the time hoping for the best results from their endeavors, and rendering them needed help, all given with a full, noble, generous, cheerful spirit.

A glance at its opposite will help us better to understand it. Narrow-mindedness and narrow-heartedness are its opposite, or, as we might put it, little-souledness. This is the spirit that offered the unique prayer, "God bless me and my wife, my son John and his wife—us four and no more." It is the quality that thinks its sect or sectlet alone has the truth and contains all the saints, that sees nothing admirable in any other sect or in sectless religion, that feels that one's own nation is the only worthwhile one, that one's own family embraces all the worthwhile members of the race, and is sure that one's own political party monopolizes the essence of political wisdom and the only honest and able party members. It is, in brief, the self-centered and others-depreciating complex. It makes no allowance of time,

place, condition or attainment. It recognizes almost no weakness as forgivable, almost no blemish as excusable and almost no lack as ignorable. It holds one to the mark without pity and turns a deaf ear and an implacable heart to failure. It is the stickler for trifles and forms, and the rule-insister without exceptions. It exacts the last farthing and will tithe the smallest seed belonging to the poor, without reduction or exception, and always ends in straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel. It will insist on punctiliousness, despite great injury to others, and will put the rules and traditions of man above the laws and thoughts of God in their practices.

The scope of magnanimity's operation is the field of one's own privileges and of things permissible as respects others, not that of duty. That its scope is not the field of one's duty toward self or others is manifest from the fact that one dare not exercise it against the calls of duty; for that would be sin. In matters of duty, one must indeed be so narrow-minded and narrow-hearted as not to deviate from it in thought, motive, word or act; for to be magnanimous in that field will make one trample underfoot right and truth, violate conscience and play fast and loose with God's Truth and commands. Hence its field of operation cannot be that of duty and truth. But in matters of one's privileges, in matters of things that are not of moral obligation, *i.e.*, things morally indifferent, in things wherein we may do or leave undone, we find its theatre of action. If one's own rights are infringed upon by others ignorance, lacks, faults, weaknesses and blemishes, he with propriety, so long as avoidable injury is not thereby done to the trespasser, or unbearable injury is thereby done to himself, may well in magnanimity ignore the infringement, making all sorts of excuses for the trespasser. Thus we may be magnanimous at interruptions, discourtesies, insulting insinuations, unfair accusations, rebuffs, mistakes, personal

peculiarities and habits, differences of opinions and tastes, contradictions, inconveniences, etc., ignoring them as non-existent, or overlooking, without rankling and with sincerity of heart, whatever of disagreeableness they might naturally arouse in one's thoughts and feelings. At such acts we naturally are inclined to take a narrow-minded and narrow-hearted view of the trespasser; and if this inclination is acceded to, we lose our magnanimity; but if we are broad-gauged and generous amid such experiences, magnanimity exercises itself in its proper sphere of action in blessing to all.

It should be remarked that neither the word *magnanimity* nor the word *magnanimous* occurs in the Bible, its equivalent being goodness (Gal. 5: 22). But the idea underlying these words is of frequent occurrence there, and that with respect to God, Christ and others. Especially is God therein shown to have this quality in very large measure. The large scope of freedom that He allows Satan, the demons and fallen men, attests this fact. Giving freedom of will to His free moral agents and allowing them to exercise it is another proof of His having this quality. His giving liberally to the just and unjust without upbraiding likewise attests its existence in Him. The numberless occasions on which He has "winked" at human ignorance and weakness also show it. And the exceptional privileges and liberties that He allows the good crown this quality in Him. How far from Him is a fault-finding and censorious spirit! How lacking is He of the spirit of him who is a stickler for trifles and mere forms, an exacter of non-essentials, and an insister on needless and unfruitful rules. Pettishness and inconsequentialities find no place in His thoughts, motives, words and acts. His practicable nature makes Him overlook and ignore the morally non-essential, the trivial, the inconsequential, the negligible. And even where justice requires strictness in Him toward the sinner, He has

through the merit of Christ as a satisfaction of justice made it actual to excuse the wrongdoer and to remember that he is but dust, thus in love making all sorts of allowances for him before the bar of strict justice. How magnanimous He has been in the presence of dense ignorance and denser conceit, lacks, faults and weaknesses! How noble He has been in remaining unruffled, apparently oblivious and surely generous amid interruptions, discourtesies, insulting insinuations, unfair accusations, rebuffs, mistakes, personal peculiarities and habits, differences of opinions and tastes, contradictions, etc.! And how often He has, figuratively speaking, turned the other cheek to wrongdoers and then turned and blessed them as though they had never done Him a wrong! Certainly God is the highest exemplification of magnanimity!

Examples of His magnanimity meet us on all hands in Biblical and in extra-Biblical experiences. He was magnanimous toward His unfallen creatures, angelic and human. But His magnanimity shines out most in His dealings with sinners, angelic and human. Certainly in His allowing Satan and the fallen angels the degree of liberty that they have is magnanimous on His part. This becomes apparent when we consider their evil course of opposition to Him and their bad effects upon themselves and mankind. All the more does this appear so when we learn His benevolent design therein toward both fallen angels and mankind. Certainly, while sentencing man for sin, to give him the ray of hope in prophecy of ultimate victory and deliverance shows God's magnanimity. His protecting wicked Cain from unbearable punishment shows it also. His course toward the world through Noah before the flood proves it. His continual lowering of the required number of righteous souls in Sodom, etc., as conditional to saving all at Abraham's request exemplifies it. His generosity to Laban and Esau as respects Jacob evidences it. And His indulgence

toward Joseph's brothers through Joseph demonstrates it. How His magnanimity shines out in His repeated relieving of hardened and hardening Pharaoh from the plagues, despite His knowledge of the latter's wicked and treacherous heart. How magnanimous He was to Israel in their deliverance from Egypt, in their tenfold special and national bantering of God during their first year and a half in the wilderness, in His care and provision for them throughout the wilderness period, in His giving them Canaan as their inheritance, in their frequent apostacies from Him during the period of the judges and in their worse conduct toward Him during the period of the kings! Magnanimity marked His course toward Israel during their Babylonian exile, in their return to the land and in their protection and deliverances after their return to the land, even to the time of Christ.

The acme of God's magnanimity or goodness shows itself in His dealings with His saints, including the Chief of these, Jesus. To offer the latter, while He was in His prehuman nature, the privilege of becoming the Executor of God's plan and His Vicegerent throughout the universe, with the Divine nature as His ultimate mode of existence, shows a hitherto unparalleled magnanimity on God's part. To have given up His Son to the associated sufferings was indeed magnanimous. For Him to have endured the sight of His Son's great sufferings and injuries was a further demonstration of it. Probably the greatest expression of God's magnanimity was His offer to some of the fallen members of Adam's race—children of wrath, the curse, even as others—the privilege of becoming partakers in the Divine nature and in Christ's vicegerental office. If we reflect but a little on who and what they were, especially on who and what the bulk of them were, this becomes manifest even to the most obtuse. And what shall we say of the magnanimity that has throughout this Age been marking God's

various dealings with these whom He, as it were, found on the dunghill and exalts to His own family, nature and throne? Only in a less degree does the same glorious quality shine out in His dealings with the lower elect classes of mankind—the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies.

This same blessed quality shows itself toward the human enemies of His Old and New Testament elect. He was magnanimous in His blotting out the antediluvian world, the inhabitants of the cities of the plain and the nations of Canaan. How so? They had become so corrupt, all of them morally, and most of them physically, that it was a mercy to them to be put into the sleep of death until the Millennial Age would bring them the needed help out of their corruption. It was likewise a mercy to others that they should be so dealt with in order to preserve the former from the contamination of such corruption. And in dealing so with them God manifested His magnanimity, even though the unenlightened world of sinners does not understand it so. This same remark applies to God's judgments upon Israel's enemies during the period of the judges, kings, exile and return after the exile. With greater pertinency does it apply to God's Gospel-Age dealings with hardened Israel. And with the greatest pertinency does this apply to God's dealing with apostate Christendom throughout the Age and in the end of the Age when a full end will be made of it in the great tribulation. And, looking forward to those who will, after 100 years' or 1,000 years' trial, be remanded to the second death, the fact that such will be spared the evil of living eternally in sorrow and evil and the fact that the righteous will be spared the suffering of eternal contact with such, certainly show in a clear light God's magnanimity or goodness in blotting the incorrigible out of existence, after they demonstrate unfitness for life.

Then, too, the amazing riches of His goodness and generosity shown to the world of mankind in providing all the opportunities of gaining Restitution with its ministering blessings, throw a bright light on His magnanimity. When we consider the physical, mental, moral and religious corruption and degradation of the world, especially that of a very large part of them, and when we consider the oppositional course toward God that many of them exhibited in this life, we are astounded at so magnanimous a spirit as will permeate God's dealings with the world in the Millennium, all of whose arrangements on behalf of man's rescue, blessing and uplift will be on the most generous scale and in lavish abundance. And our minds stand simply dumbfounded at the magnanimity of the perfect and blissful conditions which God will provide for, and with which He will surround those of the world who will be faithful to truth and righteousness under the trials of the Millennium and its following Little Season. No wonder that all in heaven and earth will for such magnanimity join the hallelujah chorus of the universe in ascribing "blessing and honor and glory and power unto Him that sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb forever and forever!"—Rev. 5: 13.

Certainly, to us, there are valuable lessons to be derived from a consideration of God's magnanimity. Its first lesson surely is gratitude; for we are the beneficiaries of its exercise. Its second lesson is appreciation; for it deserves and calls forth our appreciation. Its third lesson is imitation; for it incites us to, and is worthy of our imitation; and its fourth lesson is commendation; for as its observers and recipients we would worthily respond to it by commending it to the consideration of others that they, too, with us, might learn and practice these four lessons.

There yet remain three of His tertiary attributes of character that have not been discussed: gentleness, joy and faithfulness. As in the case of God's attributes of

being and of His lower primary and secondary attributes of character we discussed only the more important, so will we do with His tertiary attributes of character. Considering God's joy and gentleness less important than the other five, we will omit a formal discussion of these and will conclude in this chapter on God's tertiary attributes of character with a discussion of His faithfulness, which is to us perhaps the most important of all His qualities. As the Lord blessed us in the preparation of this discussion on the Divine attributes, so we trust that He has blessed our readers also in the study of them.

In the beginning of this chapter we described the origin of faithfulness as follows: Faithfulness results from the activity of any single grace, or of a combination of any two or more or all of the graces, along the lines of loyalty to principles, persons or things. Faithfulness has, therefore, to do with principles, persons and things. So do other qualities. But that which distinguishes it from other qualities in its relation to principles, persons or things is loyalty. It exercises fidelity toward these, and such fidelity is exercised perseveringly, despite all untoward things, conditions and experiences in contact with which it comes. If there should be a break down amid such untoward things, conditions and experiences, there would be a lapse of faithfulness. If one does not maintain this quality perseveringly, faithfulness could not be truly ascribed to him. Hence only those who prove loyal to the end are faithful (Rev. 2: 10). The principles toward which faithfulness exercises itself in loyalty are those of truth and righteousness. The things toward which it exercises itself in loyalty are one's privileges, duties, engagements and promises. And the persons toward whom it exercises itself in loyalty are those to whom truth and righteousness bind one or to whom one has bound himself by an agreement or promise. From these remarks on, and descriptions of faithfulness we

may gather the following as our definition of it: It is the quality of character whereby one, despite all difficulties, perseveringly exercises loyalty to truth and righteousness and to the persons to whom and the things to which he has obligated himself. God's faithfulness, therefore, means His characteristic whereby, despite all obstacles, He perseveringly exercises loyalty to truth and righteousness, to His covenants and promises and to the persons to whom He makes these.

The idea of faithfulness can better be grasped by a consideration of its opposite, unfaithfulness, which is disloyalty to truth and righteousness and to the persons and things to which one has obligated himself, regardless of whether such disloyalty is exercised amid or apart from difficulties. The professed Christian who, to shield himself from earthly evil or to advantage himself with earthly good, compromises, forsakes or betrays truth or righteousness, his engagements, his promises and those to whom he is obligated, is unfaithful as a Christian. The citizen who, to shield or advantage himself, fails to support and defend his country, violates its laws, conspires against its peace and prosperity, rebels against its existence or betrays it to its enemies, is unfaithful as a citizen. The husband or wife who fails to be a real spouse, who violates his or her marriage vows and who forsakes the spouse on any pretext, is unfaithful as a husband or wife. The official who does not fulfill the duties of his office, and who, from cowardice or for gain, prostitutes or betrays his office, is unfaithful as an officer. The employee who does not fulfill his engagements or who uses his position to do evil to his employer or others, is an employee unfaithful to his employer. The policemen, magistrates or politicians, who use their office to protect favorites, or to wink at law violations, or who favor law breakers for graft, are unfaithful public servants. The man who violates valid contracts, agreements or promises, is unfaithful to his pledged word.

In short, every sin of omission or commission against truth and righteousness, and every avoidable failure to keep, or every avoidable transgression of, one's engagements or promises, are so many evidences and expressions of unfaithfulness.

Never has God been guilty of any of such things. Search His acts as the Fountainhead of Christianity, and none of them evidence a failure to exercise loyalty to truth or righteousness or to His obligations and promises, let alone a violation of these. As the symbolic Husband of the covenants, He has been without disloyalty to His symbolic wives. As the King of the universe, He has not neglected or violated the duties of such an office under any circumstance. No gain could bribe Him into neglecting the administration of the laws of His kingdom; and no fear of danger or loss could make Him relax such administration. As the Maker of covenants, He does not neglect to keep His parts therein, much less violate His obligations thereunder. As the Maker of promises, He does not prove untrue to them by violating them or neglecting to fulfill them. Unfaithfulness is further removed from Him than the East is from the West. If it were not so, He could not justifiably appeal to us to exercise faith in Him, nor would He do so. If He were unfaithful, everything that is the object of our faith and hope would become unreliable; and we might well despair and lapse into infidelity.

By four lines of thought the Bible stresses God's faithfulness. We will cite a list of Scriptures under each head, the looking up of which will prove a blessing to our readers. In the first list there is a general ascription of faithfulness to God as one of His characteristics. The following are some of these Scriptures: Deut. 7: 9; Ps. 36: 5; 40: 10; 89: 1, 2, 5, 8, 24, 28, 33; 92: 1, 2, 15; 119: 65, 89, 90; Is. 49: 7; Lam. 3: 23; John 8: 26; Rom. 3: 3, 4; 1 Cor. 1: 9; 10: 13; 1 Thes. 5: 24; 2 Tim. 2: 13; Tit. 1: 2; Heb. 10: 23;

1 Pet. 4: 19; 1 John 1: 9. Every one of the above passages proves Him to be faithful in general. A second set of passages follows, which proves Him to be faithful to truth and righteousness: Deut. 32: 4; Ps. 18: 30; 19: 9; 31: 5; 33: 4; 100: 5; 117: 2; 132: 11; 146: 6; Is. 25: 1; 51: 6, 8. The following set of passages shows that God is faithful to His covenants and promises: Gen. 9: 15, 16, 18; Ex. 6: 4, 5; 12: 41; Lev. 26: 45; Deut. 4: 31; 9: 5; 2 Sam. 7: 28; 23: 5; 2 Kings 13: 23; Ps. 89: 34; 105: 8; 111: 5, 7-9; Is. 54: 9, 10; Luke 1: 70, 72, 73; Rom. 11: 29; 15: 8; 2 Cor. 1: 20; 2 Tim. 2: 14; Heb. 6: 13-19; 2 Pet. 3: 9. And, finally, a fourth set of passages shows that God is faithful to those to whom He has obligated Himself: Gen. 24: 1, 27; 28: 15; 32: 10; Lev. 26: 44; Deut. 7: 8; Josh. 23: 14; 1 Sam. 12: 22; 1 Kings 8: 23, 24, 56; 2 Kings 8: 19; 1 Chro. 28: 20; Ezra 9: 9; Neh. 9: 7, 8; Ps. 9: 10; 25: 10; 37: 28; 94: 14; 103: 17; 121: 3, 4; Is. 44: 21; 49: 16; Jer. 31: 36, 37; 32: 40; 33: 14, 20; 51: 5; Ezek. 16: 60, 62; Dan. 9: 4; Mic. 7: 20; Hag. 2: 5; Luke 1: 54, 55, 68, 69; Acts 13: 32; Rom. 11: 2; Heb. 6: 10. These four lists of passages prove that God is faithful and prove that our definition of faithfulness for Him and others is correct.

Faithfulness is perhaps God's most widely applicable quality. Its scope seems to be universal, that is, it underlies and pervades all His thoughts, motives, words and acts. In vain would we search a thought, motive, word or act of Jehovah to find it devoid of this quality. Next to faithfulness God's self-control, patience and perseverance, are His most universal qualities; but since His faithfulness backs and projects His self-control and patience in all their activities, it is even more universal in its scope of activity than they. Certainly, this is an encouraging and comforting thought to us; and, held in our hearts and minds in our times of trial and difficulty, it will arm us with double strength, since it gives us the assurance of His

support, protection and guidance. Blessed be our God that He is faithful in all His works and ways toward truth and righteousness, toward His covenants and promises and toward those to whom He has condescendingly obligated Himself.

The Scriptures abound in examples of God's faithfulness. The above-cited passages give a partial proof of this proposition. Loyalty to truth and righteousness are manifested in His creation of angels and humans perfect in organ and disposition, in His trial of Adam and Eve for life and in His sentencing them to death and in executing that sentence upon them and the race in Adam's loins; for wisdom, justice, love and power in the interests of truth and righteousness required this. This becomes clear when we remember His design with the permission of evil in view of the ransom to give the race a more favorable opportunity of gaining life in the Millennium than Adam had. In permitting righteous Abel to suffer for righteousness at Cain's hands, and Cain to become a protected outcast therefore, we again see God's faithfulness to truth and righteousness, inasmuch as Abel's sufferings prepared him for Millennial rulership, and Cain's prepared him for Millennial reformation. From many standpoints God's judgments on the antediluvians and His rescue of Noah and his family show God's faithfulness to truth and righteousness; for certainly temporarily to blot out those who were increasingly depraving themselves and others, and to preserve those whose influence was morally and religiously elevating, were in the interests of truth and righteousness. The same remark in principle applies to the confounding of languages and the scattering of the nations; for this limited evil and furthered righteousness by segregating the evil and the righteous. The destruction of the cities of the plain with their inhabitants and the rescue of Lot was in the same sense in the interests of truth and righteousness as God's acts in connection with the

deluge. The same remark applies to God's judgments on the Egyptians and Pharaoh and His deliverance of Israel, His punishment of the unbelieving and blessing of the believing Israelites in the wilderness, His destruction of the nations of Canaan and giving their land to Israel, His punishment of wayward and blessing of repentant and obedient Israel and His judgments and blessings on the then Gentile nations.

The same principles apply in the history of Christendom, especially along the lines of spiritual punishments and rewards meted out to the pertinent classes. God's dealings with cast-off fleshly Israel and accepted spiritual Israel, viewed from the standpoint of His present and Millennial purposes with these two Israels, show God's faithfulness to truth and righteousness. Of course, the selection of the Ancient Worthies, the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, to develop them first in every good word and work, and afterward to use them to bless others with the same kind of a development, markedly manifests God's faithfulness to truth and righteousness. His rewarding these four elect classes according to their character development and loyalty to Him shows the same faithfulness, as also does every step that He has taken in their preparation for such rewards. Every one of His covenant arrangements for these four classes proves His faithfulness to truth and righteousness. Thus everything about His dealings with the four elect classes reveals God's faithfulness to truth and righteousness. When we contemplate His Millennial arrangements for the restitution of the world—the helpers that He has provided for them, the cancellation of the death sentence from, and the return of, the race from death, the world's Millennial environment as conducive to righteousness and inconducive to unrighteousness, the favorable trial amid corrections that He has arranged for them to have, the adaptation of all the helps to the varying needs of

the race, the requirement of obedience only according to ability, the giving correctly of the teachings of truth and righteousness to the world, the striping of the recalcitrant for reformation, the destruction of the incorrigible after 100 years of wasted and misspent opportunities for reformation and the rewarding of the responsive—all of these being calculated to suppress wrong and spread truth and righteousness—one and all show that all of God's Millennial arrangements are due to His faithfulness to truth and righteousness.

So, too, will God's post-millennial arrangements and works be an outflow of His faithfulness to truth and righteousness. That He will then require a final trial in harmony with truth and righteousness proves His faithfulness to these. That all will be required to act perfectly in harmony with perfect truth and righteousness, if they would gain life, shows His faithfulness to these principles. That those who fail to maintain loyalty to these principles must be blotted out so as to prevent the eternal continuance of sin and error, evidences God's faithfulness to truth and righteousness. And that those who maintain loyalty to truth and righteousness will be given everlasting life, to be spent in harmony with truth and righteousness, again proves that God is faithful to these principles. That God will forever surround the elect and the non-elect with conditions of truth and righteousness, in harmony with which they will remain, proves His loyalty to these principles. And that from the beginning of creation God has had these results steadfastly in mind, and that He perseveringly worked these thousands of years to realize them, prove that all along He has been loyal to truth and righteousness and He will so remain.

Not only do the above-cited examples of the Scriptures prove God's faithfulness to truth and righteousness; but many Scriptural examples prove His faithfulness to His covenants and promises. The first express covenants into which God entered bound Him no

more to destroy society by a flood (Gen. 9: 8-17). This covenant was made to every living thing on earth, as well as to man, and is one of the unilateral covenants—not one that is contractual, pledging two parties to certain conditions whose fulfillment gives each party to the covenant certain blessings, but one that is a simple promise, binding only one party to do certain things to others. The Abrahamic covenant is also such a unilateral covenant. So, too, are the covenants to the Seed and our covenant of consecration to God. The covenant to Noah has been kept by God. He has never since permitted a flood to destroy human society; and this proves His faithfulness to that covenant. While the Abrahamic, the Sarah and the rest of the parts of the Oath-bound Covenant to the various classes of "the Seed" (Gen. 12: 2—14; 22: 16-18) have not yet been fulfilled in their entirety, certain features of them being yet future, the parts of them that have already been due have been fulfilled and certain others of them are being fulfilled. Certainly, to the Ancient Worthies the parts of the Oath-bound Covenant due in their day were fulfilled, *i.e.*, they were developed in character by God for fitness for Millennial princship and were given victory over all enemies to such development. So to Abraham God in the past gave part and is giving now the rest of the Seed that is to do the blessing. During the Gospel Age God has completed the selection of the Christ class, part of the Seed, and is at work completing the development of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, also parts of the Seed. And this proves His faithfulness in carrying out these covenants, even if they have not yet been completely carried out. The progressive and continued working out of their fulfillment is a pledge of their complete fulfillment in due time, and thus is a proof also of God's faithfulness.

There are especially two conditional covenants revealed in the Scriptures: the Old Covenant (the Law Covenant)

and the New Covenant. Both of these are between God and Israel, the second of them not yet having been sealed, and therefore not yet operative, it belonging to the Millennial and post-millennial Ages. Both of these covenants are conditional, God in each of them promising Israel everlasting life on condition of perfect obedience to the law of these covenants. God stood ready to keep His part of the Old Covenant to any Israelite who obeyed it, and gave such eternal life to the only Israelite who kept it—our Lord Jesus—and at the same time made Him the Heir of the Sarah Covenant, whose inheritance He obtained by His fulfilling His covenant of sacrifice. Thus God's faithfulness in giving Him everlasting life through His obedience to the Law is manifest and is not at all set aside by our Lord's giving up that life sacrificially; for thereby He not only gained the power to redeem all from the Adamic sentence, but additionally to save Israel from the added condemnation of the Law Covenant. And even to Law-violating Israel God showed much grace and mercy in addition to faithfulness in encouraging and helping them to the best conditions conducive to reformation for keeping the Law, and compatible with fallen men's being under the curse. Therefore, during their trial period, the Jewish Age, He gave them the best laws and conditions on earth, gave them the best land and prosperity on earth, sent them the best teachers and teachings, surrounded them with the best providences, freely and perseveringly forgave them and reinstated them from their backslidings on their repentance and, finally, sent them His Son to offer them fitness for transference to the Sarah Covenant. In these acts He not only showed Himself faithful in keeping His part of the Law Covenant, but He additionally added grace and mercy to which He was not obligated by His part of the Law Covenant. And His faithfulness to truth and righteousness and to His past covenant engagements are a guarantee that

He will be faithful to fulfill His part of the New Covenant when it is set into operation.

Again, God has also been faithful to His promises. For the most part, these have been simply an elaboration of the general promises implied in His covenants. Isaac, as promised, was given to Abraham and Sarah, even though a miracle was necessary to work on the sterile parents to effect it. Expatriated Jacob realized God's promise to restore him to the promised land. God's promise, after 400 years (Gen. 15: 13), to deliver Abraham's descendants from Egypt's oppression, was fulfilled, and that to the very day. His promise to sustain Moses in the work of deliverance was fulfilled. His promise to give Israel the land promised their forefathers was fulfilled. His promises of victory over their enemies as long as they were obedient were always fulfilled whenever they exercised such obedience, as is evidenced in their victories over the Amalekites, Arad, Sihon, Og and the Midianites during their wilderness journey, over the seven nations of Canaan under Joshua and over their oppressors during the period of the judges under Othniel, Ehud, Barak, Shamgar, Gideon, Jephthah, Samson and Samuel. During the times of the Kings they were likewise victorious as long as they obeyed, as certain experiences in the lives of Saul, David, Abijah, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, etc., show. The deliverances that God wrought for David, the prophets, Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abed-nego, Mordecai, Esther, Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah, all prove the faithfulness of God to His promises to deliver those faithful to Him. Well could Joshua (Josh. 23: 14) and Solomon (1 Kings 8: 56) glory in God for not having failed in any particular to fulfill His good promises.

During the Gospel Age such faithfulness to His promises has characterized God's course. Every promise that He made to Jesus was fulfilled as due. The Apostles in their experiences found that His promises

were not yea and nay, but yea; for every one of them was kept. So have all the others of God's people in this Age learned by experience. Did He promise to raise up for them the Messiah? He kept His word (Acts 13: 22). Did He confirm the promises to them? He did so by Christ's ministry (Rom. 15: 8). Did He promise them fellowship—partnership with His Son? He has given it to them in its Gospel-Age aspects (1 Cor. 1: 9). Did He promise not to suffer them to be tempted above their ability? He keeps His promise (1 Cor. 10: 13). Did He offer them a genuine invitation to the high calling? He has realized the promise in their experiences (1 Thes. 5: 24). Did He offer them opportunity of gaining life? He has fulfilled it to the responsive (Tit. 1: 2). Did He promise to remember their good works and their labor of love? He has kept the promise (Heb. 6: 10). Did He promise to support them in life's storms? The promise has been fulfilled (Heb. 6: 17-19). Did He promise to stand by them in their sufferings? He has redeemed His promise (1 Pet. 4: 19). Did He promise them forgiveness and cleansing? He has performed His word (1 John 1: 9). In a word, has He as due fulfilled all His promises? We answer, Yes (2 Cor. 1: 20; Heb. 10: 24). Have any of His promises failed? We answer, No. We know by thousands of our personal experiences that none have failed us; and we have never heard a faithful Christian say anything to the contrary in connection with his experiences; but, on the other hand, every one of them, that we have ever heard or heard of, as touching this point, has testified that He has ever been faithful and never once has broken to them a promise of His.

Confidence in God's faithfulness has given unconquerable strength to God's people; and they have always found Him loyal to them. The heroes of faith cited by St. Paul in Heb. 11 were empowered to do, to dare, to suffer and to achieve by their confidence

in God's faithfulness. How otherwise would Abel have endured martyrdom, Noah braved the mockery of the antediluvians for at least 120 years, Abraham left native land and kindred and offered Isaac, Joseph borne his calamities, Moses endured as seeing Him that is invisible, and performed the onerous labor of leading Israel from Egypt to Canaan, Joshua conquered Canaan, Gideon defeated Midian, Amalek and the children of the East, Jephthah overthrown Ammon and Ephraim, Shamgar and Samson slaughtered the Philistines, David freed Israel from all their enemies, Jehoshaphat dispersed by the temple music the Ethiopian host, Hezekiah obtained deliverance from the Assyrians, Meshach, Shadrach and Abed-nego quenched the heat of the fiery furnace and Daniel stopped the lions' mouths? How otherwise would our Lord have faced Gethsemane, Gabbatha, Golgotha and the tomb, the Apostles their labors, hardships, sufferings and deaths, the confessors the dread examination of persecutors, the martyrs their tortures and deaths, the isolated dark-age witnesses have faced their papal opponents, the reformers met and defeated Rome's ablest defenders, the harvesters done their reaping work and the Epiphany saints endured the breaking of tenderest ties amidst all kinds of misrepresentation and misunderstanding? In a word, how could any one of the four classes of the elective Seed have made and carried out a more or less intelligent consecration, which means death to their humanity, unless they had full confidence in God's faithfulness to truth, righteousness, His covenants, His promises and His people? How could any of them carry out such a consecration faithfully unto death, amid the most taxing of trials, temptations and difficulties, unless they strongly trusted in God's faithfulness? It would be impossible. And they have consciously and confidently, amid the most harrowing experiences, walked up to and into the jaws of death, with the peace of God ruling their

hearts and minds, fully assured that God was faithful to them as His very own. If it were not for such a faith, they would all have gone to pieces amid the experiences that faith in His faithfulness called upon them to undergo. And their victories have been due to God's faithfulness to His people in their exercise of such a faith. And this confidence gave them the necessary peace, comfort and even joy to undergo these experiences to the glory of God, their own profit and the blessing of others. Hence they gloried in God as faithful and risked their all on His faithfulness; and He never left, forsook nor failed them.

To us, therefore, the thought of God's faithfulness should be exceedingly precious. It should prompt us, if not consecrated, to consecrate ourselves unreservedly to Him; and, if consecrated, faithfully to carry out our consecration. It will give us every mercy and every help in every time of need. It will relieve us when wearied, sustain us when faltering, energize us when faint, encourage us when fearful, quiet us when worried, cheer us when distressed, comfort us when bereaved, embolden us when attacked, make us victorious in our battles and, finally, bring us off more than conquerors when we reach the end of our warfare. Well may we rely upon God's faithfulness. It has never faltered and will never falter. No difficulties can overcome it; no obstacles can impede it; no foes can put it to flight; no combination can make it waver; and nothing ever has or ever will undo it. It is as eternal as eternity; as changeless as unchangeableness, as constant as constancy, as incorruptible as incorruptibility and, therefore, is as dependable as God, because it is the all-pervasive quality of His character, which, because of its perfection in all good attributes, is the glory of God and the magnet that draws all responsive hearts to devotion, praise, worship, adoration and service of the God of all grace and all faithfulness. Let us, therefore, bring devotion, praise, worship,

adoration and service to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus; for He is worthy of these, and that in a higher degree than we are able to render them to Him.

Surely our study of God's attributes of being and character should greatly enhance Him to our faith, hope, love and obedience; for it presents to us a God who is glorious in His person, holy in His character, wondrous in His plan and great in His works. And as we devoutly contemplate Him from these standpoints, such contemplation greatly enhances Him to our minds and hearts and thus effectively draws out toward Him our faith, hope, love and obedience, and blessed are those who permit and encourage these results by engaging in such contemplation! All things are theirs—God and Christ, the present and future with all their promises and fruitions are theirs!

My God, the Spring of all my joys,
The Source of my delights,
The Glory of my brightest days,
And Comfort of my nights!

In darkest shades, if Thou appear,
My dawning is begun;
Thou art my soul's bright Morning Star,
And Thou my rising Sun.

The opening heavens around me shine
With beams of sacred bliss;
And all these holy beams combine
My longing soul to bless.

First and Last of faith's receiving,
Source and End of man's believing,
God, whose might is all-potential,
God, whose Truth is Truth's essential,
Good supreme in Thy subsisting,
Good in all Thy works existing;
Over all things, all things' Wonder,
Touching all, from all asunder;
Center Thou, but not included,
Compassing and not intruded;
Over all, and not ascending,
Helping all, but not depending;
Over all, the world ordaining,
Over all, the world sustaining;
All without and all surrounding,
All within, in grace abounding;
Believed, yet not comprehended,
Stationed firm, and not extended;
Over, yet on nothing founded,
Inner, but by that unbounded;
Omnipresent, yet indwelling,
Self-impelled, the world impelling;
Force, nor thy predestination
Sways Thee to one alteration;
Ours to-day, Thyself's forever,
Not commencing, ending never;
Past with Thee had no beginning,
Present all the future winning;
For Thy counsel's first ordaining
Comes Thy counsel's last attaining;
Thou creation's work first starting,
At last perfection imparting.

CHAPTER VII. INFIDELISTIC FALSE VIEWS OF GOD.

ATHEISM. AN ATHEIST'S DIFFICULTIES WITH THE BIBLE.
MATERIALISM. AGNOSTICISM. PANTHEISM. DEISM.

IN THE September, 1925, issue of *The Herald Of The Epiphany* (No. 32) we answered Mr. Clarence Darrow's objections to the Bible, urged by him against Mr. Wm. J. Bryan in their celebrated encounter at Dayton, Tenn., and sent a copy of our answer, accompanied with a letter, to Mr. Darrow. This led to several exchanges of letters, in one of which Mr. Darrow stated that if he would believe in a God, he would see no difficulty in adopting our explanations of his difficulties with the Bible. This led us to prepare for the following issue—No. 33—an article on the question, *Is there a God?* which we have made Chapter I in this volume. In that article we did not examine the claims of atheism as proofs of its position. Rather, we gave the constructive arguments in proof of its opposite—the existence of a personal God. Many of our readers, writing to us on this matter, said that they were blessed by that article. Our constructive chapter on God's existence and attributes should better prepare us for our present study on infidelistic false views of God. In this chapter we desire to take up the arguments that atheists use as a proof of their position; and trust to show how each one of them singly, and all of them collectively, fail completely to give such proof. Their position is that there is no God. This is implied in the name of their theory. *Atheism* is derived from the Greek word *atheismos*, which in turn is derived from the Greek privitive *a* (*no*) and the Greek noun *theos* (*God*), the ending *ismos* standing for *theory*, *i. e.*, *no-God theory*.

Atheists first come to our view in Greek history, and that in very isolated cases, *e.g.*, Diagoras, Bion, Lucian, etc. The Greek considered atheism to be both an immoral and an irreligious thing, and therefore made infamous and banished atheists from their territory. There were also a few individual atheists among the Romans; but scarcely any since the Pagan Roman Empire merged into the Christian Roman Empire, until about the end of the seventeenth century, since which time atheism has been increasing. No nation, race, tribe or clan of atheists has ever existed; and we believe those are right who hold that atheism can only there exist where there is a lack in, or a perversion or degeneration of the human heart and mind. In the last 150 years atheism can be said to be increasing among a few philosophers, more scientists and a small number of the plain people. In America recently an atheistic society was incorporated, after at least one judge, on the ground that atheism was against public policy, refused it incorporation. This society is by lectures, correspondence, conversation, the press and organizations, seeking to spread its theory. It even asked President Hoover to dispense with the customary annual Thanksgiving proclamation, with which request he wisely declined to comply, knowing only too well that such a course, as well as the reason assigned for the omission, would be against public policy.

Among the few philosophers who have been atheists, we will cite two, with brief quotations of their views Feuerbach expresses himself on the subject as follows "There is no God; it is as clear as the sun and as evident as the day that there is no God, and still more, that there *can* be none; for if there were a God, then there *must* be one; He would be necessary. But now if *there is* no God, then there *can* be no God; therefore there is no God. There is no God, because there *cannot* be any." The rattle-brained pretense at reasoning in the above quotation has in it nothing akin to logic

and is self-refutative as logic. In another philosopher's view, set forth in his book, *Christianity and Humanism*, the following occurs: "Because there is no God, there can be no [real] object of [religious] belief. Man has placed *himself* in the shape of the ideal after which he strives, as a religious object outside and above his own consciousness, and worships the God whom he has thus set up." Thus he seeks on the ground of self-delusion unto self-deification to account for man's belief in a God. A critic of this gentleman well remarked on his thought as follows: "Accordingly, the world is a great madhouse; by some unexplainable bewitchment man sees above himself his own shadow, and takes it to be his real creator."

We do not agree with those who hold that there can be no real atheists; for under the terrible effects of the fall on heart and mind even thorough-going atheists are possible and actual. But we do believe that there are very few real thinkers who are atheists, because atheism runs athwart normal human nature and the normal processes of thought and feeling, even under the limitation of the fall. Atheism as a matter of course denies a Divine revelation, thus the possibility of a real object to the religious feelings, and hence communion between man and God. With these goes the denial of a hereafter, while for all atheists virtue loses its strongest support and vice its greatest deterrent; and for many of them these lose their moral significance, since atheism is usually necessitarianism, and thus denies freedom of choice and moral responsibility. There can, of course, be no place for atonement in such a system. In a word, the fundamentals of religion—which is the best and highest activity of man—go by the board in atheism. In some atheism is a settled belief; in others a fixed doubt. Some atheists glory in their atheism; others are greatly saddened by their belief, and wish they could believe in a Supreme 'Being. We can in the present dispensation

hope to do little to help a fixed atheist; for his belief is a prejudice in which his heart has first subdued his intellect and his intellect in turn has further hardened and blinded his heart; since neither such nor any other person can prove the non-existence of spirits. For such unfortunates in most cases we must wait until in the next Age faith gives way to sight. But the atheist who merely doubts God's existence and who is distressed by his doubts can be helped by the refutation of the considerations that cause his doubts. If this treatise falls into the hands of such an atheist, we may hope for his rescue; at any rate its exposure of atheism's fallacies will strengthen believers in God's reality. We will, therefore, examine the reasons that the more intelligent atheists give for their unbelief, remarking incidentally that in most cases it is indulgence in sin that primarily produces atheism, and in all of them it is illogical and shallow thinking.

The first reason that atheists usually give for their theory is that they cannot find God. Carneri puts it like this: "I do not find Him [God] either in the creation or in the government of the world." August Baur puts it as follows: "Neither in the use of the microscope, nor the telescope, the retort, nor the dissecting knife, has any investigator ever discovered a supersensuous [spirit] being." This is probably the strongest way of putting the first and main argument of atheism, and is calculated to deceive the unwary, as it has deceived some of them. To this we in the first place reply: All that an investigator can fairly say on this point is that *he* has not been able to find God by investigation. He cannot so speak for others; for many others claim that they have by their investigations found the supersensuous—God. Not only so, but these include the greatest philosophers and scientists who have lived, since in the seventeenth century atheism was reborn. The following list of names given by Dutoit-Haller and others, will prove this, Leibnitz,

Wolf, Kant, Descartes, Amphere, Faraday, Fresnel, Brewster, De La Rive, Euler, Gauss, Wuertz, Chevreul, Biot, Justus von Liebig, Fehling, Morse, Kepler, Copernicus, Newton, Herschel, Alexander von Humbolt, Maedler, Gruner, Elie de Beaumont, Fraas, Pfoff, Favre, Linnaeus, Albrecht von Haller, Griesbach, Oswald Herr, Ehrenberg, Owen, Quatrefages, Isidore Geoffray St. Hilaire, Mivart, Agassiz, Le Creaux, Pasteur, Hyrtl, von Beneden, Claude Bernard, Romanes (for awhile an atheist, then after deeper study, a theist), Edison, Marconi, Bell, Millikan, and hosts of others. We are not of those who believe that great names prove truth, but we cite these philosophical and scientific investigators who by investigation have found God, to offset the claim of atheists who assert that they cannot find God by their investigations. Maedler, one of the greatest of scientists, says: "A true investigator of nature cannot be a denier of God. Whoever looks deeply into the workshop of God as do we, and has so much occasion to admire His omniscience and eternal order, must bow his knees in humility before the rulership of the holy God." Pasteur wrote similarly.

In the second place, we answer this argument by the statement that no amount of human investigation, which by necessity of human limitations must be limited, could prove that there is no God; for only one who is omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent could be powerful, knowing and ubiquitous enough authoritatively to say in truth from knowledge of the realities of the case that God is nowhere and hence is non-existent. Hence, to be in a position to demonstrate God's non-existence, if it could be done, one must have superhuman powers, *i.e.*, must himself be God (which after all would prove there is a God); hence no human can prove God's non-existence. Even if the microscope and the telescope, the retort and the knife, the X-ray and the still more powerful Millikan ray, do not make

Him visible and tangible, their failure therein does not prove Him non-existent.

In the third place, the very thing that the atheist-investigator seeks to make visible is dealt with contrary to the nature of that thing; for the supersensuous, which a spirit of necessity is, is not grasped by sense. As well require of water that it be dry, of heat that it be cold, of ice that it be hot, of darkness that it be light, of light that it be darkness, of material that it be immaterial, as to expect to find the supersensuous, which among other things is invisible, to become visible to our material eyes (1 Tim. 6: 16).

Fourth, such an investigator is conducting his investigations by inadequate instruments. His instruments are material and are usable on material substances and will give splendid information thereon, but are entirely inadequate and inapplicable to make tangible the supersensuous. The scientist who would seek to work with tools inapplicable and inadequate to the materials in question would of course fail to produce results. If atheists cannot conceive anything except in terms of the material, that is their unfortunate lack; but such a lack does not imply that realities must become unrealities, just because they lack the ability to conceive of anything supersensuous. But if there are supersensuous beings, it follows that other than material instruments must be used in their discovery.

Our fifth argument is that the supersensuous can be sought only by the mind and heart, as the instruments that can come into touch with it. Reflection and the faith, hope, love and obedience that are built upon such reflection, are the instruments that manifest God, not material instruments like the microscope and the telescope, the retort and the knife, the X-ray and the Millikan ray. Nor are spirits the only things intangible to material instruments like the above. Ether cannot be reached by our senses through these. Yet what investigator denies its existence, so necessary to

explain many things in nature, yet itself invisible and intangible? Even so the existence of God, though invisible and intangible to sense, is, and is much more, required to explain all nature and its details. It is the real scientist's and philosopher's reflection on the universe as a whole and in detail, with its wonderful laws and order and marks of intelligence and wisdom, and on man and his history, that convinces them of God's existence. So we say to the atheist, You are using the wrong instruments in your search for God. Use the right ones, if haply you might find Him.

Our sixth argument is that God is not only to be sought in the unusual, like miracles, fulfilled prophecies, etc., which the atheist insists he has not seen and hence denies their reality, but in the usual and ordinary workings of nature. In dealing with atheists, Christians have too frequently made mistakes on this point in pressing the extraordinary—like miracles, fulfillment of prophecy, etc.—as against atheism, thus arousing their opposition to greater heights, because of their rejection of such evidence, instead of meeting them where they cannot answer. We will do better to stress the ordinary and the usual in nature, in proof of God's existence, in dealing with such characters. The laws of nature imply a law-giver. The order of nature implies an orderer. Its infinite proofs of intelligence imply an intelligent maker. Its being the product of a succession of causes implies a first, and hence a causeless, eternal cause. Its wonderful and multitudinous designs imply a Designer. It is reflection on these things which convinces that there is a God and which disproves atheism. The atheist's position that the laws, order, etc., of nature make God unnecessary and disproves His existence, thus destroys his own position.

Our seventh argument against the atheist's argument that he cannot find God, is that he has sought God in the less findable place—the most unfindable place for the atheist. He has sought Him in miracles and other

unusual things, and not finding any miracles and unusual things, except on the testimony of witnesses long since dead, he denies miracles and hence does not find God there. Let us, therefore, direct his attention away from these regions, as not conducive to *his* finding God there. Hence, in seeking Him and not finding Him in such realms, because to him these realms are non-existent, he has been making the mistake of not hunting for God in the place where, to the atheist, He is findable, *i.e.*, in the right place for the atheist. Let him seek for "the footprints of the Creator" in nature and in human history and experience, not by material instruments, but by his mind and heart, *i.e.*, by reflection, and by giving faith to the reasonable product of such reflection, which faith, in turn, will arouse his hope, love and obedience to go out to the God that these immaterial instruments will reveal to him. It is in this way that the scientists and philosophers above mentioned were convinced of God's existence and of His wisdom, power, justice and love (Rom. 1: 20). And the intelligent atheist in not imitating them has sought God in the wrong place as well as by wrong methods and wrong instruments.

The above seven reasons certainly prove the fallacy of the first argument of atheism—they cannot find God. The series of mistakes that these seven points reveal, as made by atheists in the use of their first argument, proves them to be shallow thinkers.

The second argument that atheists use to prove God's non-existence is that there are so many useless and unmeaning things in the world, which, they argue, would not exist, if there were an allwise Creator who made the universe; for such a Creator could not, they reason, make unmeaning and useless things. They have enumerated as some of such things the following: ice at the poles, intense heat at the equator, the vast deserts and seas uninhabitable by man, earthquakes, volcanoes, hurricanes, the existence of the moon, the

great vacant spaces in the universe and diffusion of light therein, the excessive heat of Mercury and cold of Neptune, the fifteen years of alternating day and night at Saturn's poles, the spleen, the glands, the appendix, the wings of the ostrich, the antlers of the deer, the appearance of wings on many insects that do not fly, and the functionless mammae on the breasts of most mammalian males. This list suffices.

To this we give a number of replies: First, why find in these few allegedly useless or unmeaning things an argument that there can be no wise Creator who would make them, when there are in the universe literally billions of meaningful and useful things arguing that there is a wise and beneficent Creator? Would it not be more sensible to hold to the latter thought by reasoning on the acceptableness of the decidedly more probable view than to that of the decidedly less probable view? Secondly, this argument assumes that the reasoner really knows that what he calls useless and unmeaning things are really such. How does he know that they do not have and will not yet be proven to have a meaning and use?

Thirdly, since the list was first made, beside the general uses that we find for all of them, the direct uses of some of them have been found. *E.g.*, ice stored at the poles has been found to aid in the cooling of the arctic streams that relieve the intense heat of the equatorial regions, as in turn the intense heat of the equatorial regions warms various oceanic streams to the help of the temperate and sub-frigid zones. If the vast deserts and seas are not conducive to habitation, they help prevent the too wide distribution of the race, which is advantageous to man in social, commercial, economic, political and other ways. Earthquakes and volcanoes are now seen to be related to preparing the earth for the Millennium, as well as preparing for more land to appear from the ocean's depths, which will be needed for the dead who soon

will return. Again, the polar ices are breaking up and thus helping to right the earth on its axis, a thing necessary to effect an Edenic climate for the earth shortly. In the meantime they also had their uses in accelerating the curse in certain respects so as to relieve man of worse features. "Cursed is the earth for thy sake," is a statement that proves that these unfavorable conditions will work an ultimate blessing for man, which shows that they are not so useless as our atheistic friends assume. But more on this phase of the thought when we consider atheism's fourth argument. Hurricanes at least clear the atmosphere and the oceans for man's and fishes' advantage. The moon benefits man by giving light at night and marks seasons and (lunar) months for him. The vacant spaces in the universe are needed for the safe play of laws like gravitation, to keep planets from bumping into one another and causing all sorts of catastrophes. The wings of the ostrich help its flight. The antlers of the deer are its defense. Even if there are some things whose direct use and meaning we do not yet know, modesty should teach us to remember that, after all, we know but little. Furthermore, as the number of things whose use and meaning are unknown is constantly decreasing, patience should move us to conclude that we will yet learn those not now known.

Fourthly, there are many general uses and meanings of things, whose particular use and meaning we may not yet know. To call such things unmeaning is allowable, if we would thereby indicate that *we do not* know why they exist. To call them useless because we assume for them a use to which they do not fit is revelatory, not of their alleged uselessness, but of the wrong end applied to them as to their use, and of the ignorance and folly of him that attempts such inadequate experiments. We should at most not call them useless or unmeaning; rather we should say

that *to us* they are unmeaning and useless, if they be so to us. This would be both wise and modest, and will save us humiliations that might otherwise be ours when their particular meaning and use become known, as has been the case with others. Surely our interests are advanced frequently by a thing whose direct use and meaning are hidden from us; for these things are a part of that variety in nature that is the spice of life. Frequently they form parts in the scheme of the sublime and beautiful in nature, so elevating to man's contemplation and enhancing to his happiness. Sometimes they serve as deterrents to the too bold, and as warnings to the too daring. Hence it is folly to say that there is anything in nature that is useless and unmeaning. At the rate that such things are losing their seeming uselessness and meaninglessness, it will not be many years before perhaps the only seemingly functionless thing in nature will be the mammae on the breast of most mammalian males. Will our atheistical friends then still hold to this as a proof of their theory, with billions of designful things in nature proving the opposite? If so would not their course remind us of a sightseer at the Tower of London who, looking at the case wherein are held the crowns, jewels and other golden implements in use at royalty's opening and closing of parliament, overlooks these in the contemplation of a fly speck on the glass of the case?

Fifthly, such things have frequently a morally and religiously elevating effect. Who that sees the marvelous abandon of the hurricane-tossed ocean's wave, that hears the thunder's roar, that sees the lightning's flash, that contemplates the desert's waste, that views the canyon's depth or height, where nothing can grow, that notes the moon's orderly phases and that beholds space's wastes, but is filled with awe, reverence and humility? Who that considers organs of his and other beings, whose uses he does not yet recognize, and that beholds other things in nature whose meaning

and uses he does not understand, but can derive a needed and wholesome lesson in humility and meekness? And who is he that would underrate the value of such lessons? Would he not be manifesting a sad lack of real practicability? And is not he to be commended as wise and practical who will derive the above-indicated benefits from things whose direct uses and meanings he may not know? And is not such a mind and heart better prepared to learn the direct uses and meanings of such things than those otherwise disposed? Surely our five reasons undermine the second argument of atheism.

Atheism's third argument is that there cannot be a Creator, because there is so much imperfection in the world, while an all-wise Creator, it claims, would have made everything perfect. Certainly, our earth and its inhabitants, not to speak of other spheres of being, are imperfect. Who would call perfect the earth's extremes of heat and cold, the barrenness of its frigid zones and numerous deserts, its swamps and wildernesses, its earthquakes and volcanoes, its tidal waves and floods, its hurricanes and tornadoes, its droughts and cloudbursts, its blizzards and hail storms, its famines and pestilences, its miasmatic airs and dismal fogs, its unequal soils and drainage, its resources and distributions, and its noxious germs, beasts and reptiles? These conditions all too plainly prove the claim of earth's imperfection. And what shall we say of man, whose physical, mental, moral and religious imperfections, large in number and most diverse in kind, confront us at every turn? Surely it must be conceded that the earth and its inhabitants are imperfect; but just so surely is it folly to conclude from these imperfections that there is no God—no all-wise Creator.

In the first place, creation is not a completed work; therefore it is unwise to base atheism's third argument on what is an incomplete work. Most atheists are evolutionists who seek, yet vainly, by evolution to get

rid of the idea of a God, but whose theory, of necessity, implies that the earth and its inhabitants are not yet a completed creation, and therefore cannot be a perfect creation. Hence they should be among the last ones to claim that the imperfections in an incompleting creation prove God's non-existence. The Bible also teaches that the creative work on man and the earth is as yet incomplete. Hence it is unfair and illogical to charge an incompleting work with imperfection, much less its author with non-existence because of such imperfections, since such is inevitably the condition of all incompleting works, and that without any fault thereby necessarily attaching to their authors. Thus the imperfections of God's incompleting work do not disprove His existence any more than the imperfections in an incompleting wrought piece of hide disprove the existence of the tanner. It proves the contrary.

In the second place, an objection to the Creator's existence based on imperfection in His work, proves no more than that the Creator might be imperfect, and not that He is non-existent, providing His creative work on earth and man were completed and were thereafter found to be imperfect; for the fact that He creates at all implies that He exists; for an imperfection in His completed work might imply inability to perfect it, or a shortsightedness in planning a work that He would fail or be unwilling to bring to completeness, or a lack of perseverance or ability to bring it to completion. In any case, only the imperfection and not the non-existence of the Creator might be inferred from a completed work that lacks perfection. But such a charge cannot be brought fairly and logically against the author of an incompleting work on which he is still active. Hence atheism's pertinent conclusion is false, illogical and unwise.

Atheism's fourth argument is that there are many harmful things in nature bringing suffering on man and beast; therefore there can be no Creator; otherwise

He would put them aside. It must again be conceded to the atheist that there are harmful things in creation bringing suffering on man and beast. Many of the imperfections in nature noted under the preceding point bring suffering on man and beast. Frequently beasts, reptiles, fish and fowls war on one another and on man, while in turn man frequently wars on his fellows and on beasts, fish, fowl and reptiles, causing suffering right and left. Sickness, sorrow, pain and death are on all hands. Calamities, pestilences, famines and hostilities play havoc among men. Losses, disappointments, lacks, faults, failings, poverty and a more or less infertile earth make for much suffering. Insanity, error, wickedness and selfishness add to this bitter draught that man drains, and often to the dregs. It must be allowed that there is an abundance of harmful things in the earth. And poor atheists, burdened with more or less of these, think that they disprove God's existence! But, again, we claim for good and sufficient reasons that such harmful things do not prove that there is no God. These reasons we now proceed to give.

In the first place, none of these things imply God's non-existence. They might impinge against the thought of His goodness and mercy, provided they cannot be shown to be instrumental in effecting ultimately more of good than they inflict of evil; but by no means do they imply that He does not exist, any more than the presence of the sick in a hospital implies that curative agencies do not exist, or any more than the presence of criminals in a country implies that civil officers do not there exist, or any more than the pains of a bad child undergoing chastisement from his father prove that he has no father.

In the second place, the good results effected by harmful things on some characters prove that they are wisely designed, at least for such characters; and hence, instead of implying God's non-existence, they

are in line with both His existence and goodness. Often we see character good—the very highest form of goodness—as well as material good produced by the adverse environment in which some people find themselves. Mercy and sympathy are developed in some by the presence of suffering in the world. Unselfish service is woven into some characters by their beholding others in affliction. Generosity frequently rises to its highest flights amid calamities. The qualities of forbearance, longsuffering and forgiveness, have their sphere of operation in the experience of enduring wrong or they cannot be exercised and developed. Courage and tact naturally come into play amid the dangers incidental to harmful conditions. Friendships formed in the furnace of affliction are usually the most unselfish and abiding. Thus the sufferings of the present refine and ennoble some characters as nothing else can. Not only so, but some of man's highest physical and mental improvements are due to the conditions of suffering that surround him. Necessity is indeed the mother of invention. Our comfortable homes, with their many improvements and accessories, and a multitude of other useful things, have been developed in the need arising from the harmful conditions about man. Much of learning, of civilization, of progress in the arts, sciences and inventions, is due to the presence of these harmful things about us. They are, therefore, not unmixed evils to those who use them for their moral, mental and physical improvement. Hence from them atheism cannot even infer that God is malevolent, much less non-existent.

Still, from another standpoint the presence of suffering even unto death in the world is not an unmixed evil, and therefore does not justify atheism's conclusion now under examination. Consider what would be the result, if suffering and death would not be the portion of the wicked and selfish. Could it be otherwise

than worse than conditions now are? If in such a short span of life now allotted to man, many of our kind develop such cunning as to be able to overreach their fellows, to the great detriment of the latter, what would conditions be, if these lived millenniums or forever? If in a few years some can become multimillionaires and even billionaires, sometimes to the great detriment of the masses, what would they do in the way of acquiring during millenniums or forever? Consider the exploiting and enslaving effect of this on the less acquiring members of the human family. If conquerors like Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, etc., could go on for ages in their course, what intolerable conditions would this mean to most of the rest of mankind! If the tyrannous, the murderous, the thievish, the adulterous, the covetous, the slanderous, the rebellious, the unduly ambitious, the fraudulent, etc., could go on indefinitely in their wrongdoing, to what intolerable existence would the rest of mankind come! At what a desperate disadvantage would the young, the inexperienced and especially the upright be, under such conditions! They would be a thousandfold worse off than the young, the inexperienced and the upright now are. Accordingly, it is a blessing for the rest of mankind that the wicked and selfish do suffer and die in a comparatively brief time. The two above reasons—(1) that the good and enterprising are bettered by their experience with evil, and (2) that the wicked and selfish are the more quickly cut down by evil—show that sufferings and death have a ministry of good in them; and thus they neither militate against God's goodness nor His existence, despite atheism's claims.

We present a fourth reason refutative of atheism's fourth argument—that harmful things in the world disprove God's existence: It is the ultimate Divine design in the permission of evil, so far as the wicked and selfish are concerned. Above we showed the ennobling effects of the experience with evil on the good. Now

we would show it as to the wicked and selfish. While atheism scoffs at the Biblical teaching of man's fall from perfection into sin and suffering conditions resulting in death, it must concede the fact that man is now in a condition in which he does experience evils of all kinds culminating in death, regardless of how he entered this condition. All benevolent hearts lament, even as all clear heads perceive the fact. Atheism acknowledges the fact of the present evil conditions; but has no real solution as to how it came about, as to why it is continued, as to what will cure it, and how the cure will come about. Such being his perplexed condition, would it not be wise for him to give an attentive hearing to the solution that clarifies to the satisfaction of head and heart this whole problem of evil? We now proceed to explain the Biblical solution of the problem: Evil is permitted to the wicked and selfish to teach them by experience what they would learn in no other way—that sin is bad in its nature and terrible in its effects, and therefore should be hated and forsaken. To this brief statement we would add a few particulars. The experience with evil is one (the first) part of God's creative process in bringing the race to perfection and happiness. A subsequent experience with righteousness will be the other part of His creative process to bring the race to perfection and happiness. He set out to create a race of free moral agents, who, intelligently appreciating sin from an experience of its nature and effects, and who, intelligently appreciating righteousness from an experience of its nature and effects, would as a result of these two experiences as their teachers, hate and have nothing to do with sin and love and practice righteousness. Foreseeing that inexperienced Adam, though perfect in faculty, but untried in evil, would under temptation fall into sin, God determined to permit it, but did not force it, seeing that by Adam's forfeiture of life and perfection he would be unable to transmit these to

his descendants, but on the contrary would transmit to them what he had—death and imperfection. Thus the race was without its fault—simply by the law of heredity—brought under an experience with evil, in which it would learn *by experience as a teacher* the hatefulness of sin and the desirableness of avoiding it under all circumstances.

By becoming Adam's substitute in death and righteousness, Jesus became the possessor of a needed asset—life and righteousness—for the race, equal to the things that were forfeited by Adam and that involved the race into the experience of evil. This asset He will use as the indispensable thing to bring the race—dead and living—out of the experience of evil and into an experience with righteousness. As through the physical, mental, moral and religious degradation wrought by the experience of evil, prevailing through Adam's sin and death, the race will learn the exceeding hatefulness of sin; so through the contrasted physical, mental, moral and religious elevation that will be wrought by the experience with righteousness, brought about by Christ's death and righteousness, when all the evils and sufferings of the present time will cease to be and their opposites will be made to prevail, man will learn the loveableness of righteousness. Then the race, so educated in head and heart by the best of teachers—experience—as to sin and righteousness, will be given crucial tests to demonstrate whether it will permit moral law freely to control it, so that God may get what, in undertaking the creation of the race, He designed to bring into existence—a race of free moral agents who, intelligently appreciating sin and righteousness, will hate and avoid the former and love and practice the latter. These crucial tests will manifest the heart's attitude of each toward sin and righteousness, and will be followed by the eternal annihilation of those who will break down under them, as thus proven to be unwilling to let moral law control them,

and by the everlasting preservation in blessedness and goodness of those who faithfully stand the trial, as willing to be controlled by moral law. We may hope that these two experiences will determine the bulk of the race against sin and for righteousness, with the result that when the creative process is finished God will obtain what He started out to create—a race of free moral agents who intelligently appreciating sin and righteousness, will hate and avoid the former and love and practice the latter. So viewed, present evils are a part of the creative process for the human family. This is the Bible solution of the problem of the permission of evil; and, so viewed, it destroys utterly the force of atheism's fourth argument: that the evils prevalent in the earth disprove God's existence. On the contrary, viewed as above, they imply God's existence and His benevolent and practical design in permitting them to prevail temporarily and thereafter in destroying them eternally.

It is atheism's fourth argument—weak as it is—that appeals to shallow thinkers more than its other three arguments. We believe that our four answers to it take all of its force away and that our reasons against atheism's other three arguments make them powerless. And by this the theory's arguments are overthrown. But there are many other things that might be said against it. Some of these we will briefly point out. The impossibility of its proof by a finite being tells against it. Its leaving uncultivated some of the highest and noblest faculties of the human brain—spirituality, hope and veneration—tells against it. Its removing the main support—reverence for God and respect for man as God's highest earthly creature—from others of man's highest faculties: conscientiousness, benevolence, firmness and continuity, also counts heavily against it. Its being against public policy and individual good, its encouraging in some pride and arrogance, in others gloom and despair, also counts

against it. It robs life of its greatest joys, blessings, experiences and attainments, and shuts the door of hope to a blessed hereafter. It cuts off from fellowship with God and the godlike. It blinds the mind against the noblest and most elevating truths; binds the hands against engaging in the most elevating service—drawing others to God; and shackles the feet from running the ways of life. Its hollowness is unrelieved; its shallowness is unhidden; its fruitlessness is undeniable; its unwisdom is undesirable; its falsity is unrivaled; its inducements are unpersuasive; and its victims are of all men the most unenviable.

As an illustration of an atheist's difficulties with the Bible we will here review those of Mr. Clarence Darrow, a professed atheist. One of the most extraordinary scenes in religious controversy was enacted on the Court House lawn at Dayton, Tenn., July 20, 1925, when Mr. Clarence Darrow, one of the leading trial lawyers of America, questioned the late Mr. William Jennings Bryan in an attempt to prove the Bible erroneous. Some of Mr. Bryan's answers seem not to have been convincing, though we greatly admire the strength of his confidence in the Bible. Mr. Darrow brought forward the usual skeptical objections to various Biblical matters—objections that seem strong to those only who are not well informed on such points. Frequently Mr. Darrow's difficulties were not clearly put, because the answers given him took his attention away from his points. Mr. Darrow, or any other inquiring man, should receive polite and correct information in connection with his difficulties on the Bible. We regret that Mr. Bryan, though a brilliant orator and a devout Christian whom we greatly admire, failed to answer convincingly on some of them. We sympathize deeply with Mr. Darrow and others like him, who have difficulties with the Scriptures, but who do not usually receive from Christian apologists the kindly, patient and intelligent answers

that they should receive, and that can be given. Not a few of our readers who have studied our answers to the objections urged by the Modernist, Dr. Potter, against the infallibility of the Bible, in his debate with Dr. Stratton, the Fundamentalist, Dec. 20, 1923, have spoken and written to us asking that we consider Mr. Darrow's difficulties with the Bible. We are pleased to accede to these requests, the more so, because we believe that most skeptics are made so through the creedal errors which are falsely claimed to be the Bible's teachings, the fumbling efforts of their defenders and the unhappy translations of our Biblical versions on some of these points. This is true of a number of the points involved in Mr. Darrow's difficulties. Accordingly, we will take up these in the spirit of helpfulness and not in a partisan or controversial spirit. And we trust that a blessing will come to the heads and hearts of all who will read these lines.

Mr. Darrow's first difficulty concerns the story of Jonah and the great fish that swallowed him. He did not get a chance to state what we believe are his main objections to this story—those usually given by skeptics: (1) that a whale's throat is too small to swallow a man and (2) that a man could not have lived three days in the belly of a great fish. On the first point several remarks may fittingly be made. In Jonah 1: 17 the Hebrew reads, *a great fish*, not a whale. The Septuagint's translation of this expression into Greek is, a great *ketos*, which last word is the one used in Matt. 12: 40 in the Greek and is translated into English by the word *whale*. Greek lexicographers, *e.g.*, Lidell and Scott, Thayer, etc., define the word as: *any sea monster, huge fish, like whales, sharks, dolphins, tunnies, etc.* Accordingly, this word in Matt. 12: 40 should have been translated *great* or *huge fish*, as in Jonah 1: 17. Even if it were rendered whale, in the absence of a specific statement to that effect,

it should not be inferred that it was a whale of the kind whose throat is too small to swallow a man; because the spermaceti whale, for instance, which has been found in the Mediterranean, has a throat large enough to receive a man. But this great fish might have been a huge shark, some of which have been known to swallow a man. One of such sharks—sixty feet in length—was washed ashore near Sidon in 1877, whose carcass Dr. Thompson, the celebrated author of the three-volume work, *The Land And The Book*, the most popular work on Palestine, sought to get for his college at Beirut, Syria. Some of the Mediterranean sharks, *e.g.*, the white sharks, have only cutting teeth, and therefore have no choice except to swallow their prey whole or to cut off a portion, since they cannot hold their prey or swallow it piecemeal. Mr. Mueller, a most trustworthy naturalist, tells of an experience in the Mediterranean in 1758 on the part of a sailor who was seized by a shark, which had him already in its throat when the immediate shot of a whale gun struck it and forced it to disgorge the man alive. The sailor later traveled over Europe exhibiting this huge fish. A great fish captured near Miami, Fla., a few years ago, had within its stomach another fish weighing 1500 pounds. This great sea monster is still on exhibition. It has been shown in various cities, and seen by thousands of people. Its picture showing its large mouth was shown in newspapers throughout the country. This shows that this objection to Jonah and the great fish does not hold.

The second objection—that a man cannot live three days in the belly of a fish—is based upon the denial of the reality of miracles. We sympathize with those who cannot bring themselves to believe in the miraculous. They miss much necessary for peace of heart and mind. Certainly the creation and the maintenance of the universe in its orderly arrangement, its movements, the relations of its parts, etc., are by far greater

miracles than any others mentioned in the Bible; yet all must admit their reality. Why then might not lesser miracles be wrought? Perhaps when the object of Jonah's being swallowed and of his being preserved alive three days in the belly of the sea monster and of his deliverance therefrom is understood, the reasonableness of this purpose will make the miracle seem unobjectionable. Jesus clearly teaches (Matt. 12: 40) that in this transaction a prophetic type of His death and resurrection was furnished by Jonah. It was in part this type that enabled our Lord to know that he would be put to death, and then be raised on the third day, as it in part enabled St. Paul to state that Christ arose the *third day according to the Scriptures* (1 Cor. 15: 4). The death and resurrection of Christ are the central facts of the Bible; and we should therefore expect them to be referred to in all seven lines of Scriptural thought, *i.e.*, in its doctrines, precepts, promises, exhortations, prophecies, histories and types. And the story of Jonah and the great fish is one of the types to teach Jesus' death and resurrection. While, apart from this purpose, this story may seem ridiculous to the skeptic; to the Christian it is, as a *typical prophecy* of Christ's death and resurrection, a strong proof of the Bible as being a Divine revelation, since such a prophecy is evidently Divinely inspired. At any rate, a candid consideration of this fact should make the story lose its objectionableness to a skeptic.

Mr. Darrow's second difficulty with the Bible is based on Joshua's prayer and its answer as these have been translated by the Authorized Version (Josh. 10: 12, 13). He is not at all to be censured for having difficulty with the thought conveyed by this translation, for *as it reads* it plainly teaches an untruth. But this raises the question of the correctness of the translation of these verses, and as a student of the Hebrew we unhesitatingly charge the A. V. with mistranslating

several words in these verses and, as a result, with giving a wholly erroneous impression of what was prayed for, and what was given in answer to the prayer. The words translated "sun," "moon," "stand still," and "whole," should have been translated, "sunlight," "moonlight," "be inactive," and "perfect," respectively. The following is offered as a correct translation of these verses: "Sunlight be inactive on Gibeon and moonlight [be inactive] in the valley of Ajalon. And the sunlight was inactive and the moonlight stood [inactive] until the nation took vengeance on its enemies. Is not this written in the book of the Righteous? And the sunlight stayed in the midheavens [remained in the atmosphere above the clouds from which the great hail was falling] and did not hasten to come [from the midheavens upon the surface of the mountain] as on a perfect day." So far the corrected translation with a few bracketed comments.

Our answer to Mr. Darrow's difficulty on this point is, therefore, the following: It was the *sunlight* that Joshua desired not to shine on Gibeon; for he knew that the sun itself never had been nor could be on that mountain, but that its light had been and could be there. It was the *moonlight* that Joshua desired not to shine in the valley of Ajalon; for he knew that the moon itself never had been nor could be in that valley, but that its light had been and could be there. The facts of the case make plain Joshua's meaning: The hail falling upon, confounding and killing the Amorites was so dense as to darken during the day the entire mountain and at night the entire valley where the Amorites successively were; and Joshua desired that condition to be continued, because thereby the foe was being overthrown. And for that he prayed. In effect his prayer was this: "O Lord, continue to cause the hail to fall in such dense masses upon Thy and our enemies as to darken the mountain by day and the valley by night, and thus overthrow Thy and our

enemies." In other words, if the hail would fall so densely upon the Amorites as to shut off the sunlight by day and the moonlight by night during the day and night of that battle, the Amorites would surely be completely overthrown; and for that Joshua prayed and his prayer was granted. In the poetic form with which the prayer was uttered, he tersely stated the accompanying phenomena and not the desired cause and effect—the great hail and the overthrow of the Amorites. The several unhappy translations above corrected have occasioned the widespread misunderstanding of this passage. Again we call attention to the last part of verse 13. It should read: So the sunlight stayed in the midheavens and hastened not to come [upon Mt. Gibeon] as on a perfect day. See Young's and Rotherham's translations. Additional to this and the correction above made on *sunlight* and *moonlight*, we would add the remark that the Hebrew word *dum* translated in the A. V. "stand still," primarily means *to be silent* and secondarily *to be inactive*. Joshua wanted the sunlight (not the sun) and the moonlight (not the moon) to be inactive that day so far as lighting up Mt. Gibeon and the valley of Ajalon was concerned, because that was the accompaniment of the dense masses of hail falling on the Amorites, which dense falling of hail he wished continued, until the enemy was overthrown. He did not desire the sun and the moon themselves to cease in their course that day, as so many, like Mr. Darrow, deceived thereto by the above mentioned mistranslations, have assumed. There is, therefore, no conflict between the Bible and Science on Joshua's dark day. But, on the other hand, Mr. Darrow and like thinkers are, on account of the mistranslations above pointed out, absolved from all censure; and by the above corrections of the translation the Bible and Science are shown to be in full harmony on this point. What a pity that the translators blundered so greatly! The Bible sometimes has to be saved

from its friends—in this case, its translators; for Truth is often wounded in the house of its friends.

The third difficulty that Mr. Darrow has with the Bible is its teaching on the length of time the human family has been on earth. According to the Biblical chronology, Adam was created Oct., 4129 B. C., or about 6067 years ago. Mr. Darrow thinks the human family is much more ancient than this; and in proof of his opinion he cites the civilizations of China, Babylon and Egypt, which according to not a few archeologists and historians reach back to nearly 6000 B. C. On this point we believe we can offer some suggestions that will bring the chronology of these nations into substantial harmony with that of the Bible, so far as man's antiquity is concerned. Let us take up the Egyptian record. Egyptologists have unearthed many genealogical and historical tablets giving lists of what are considered to be those of Egypt's rulers. These lists, to the perplexity of the ablest Egyptologists, vary greatly in the number of rulers that they give. Most of the lists contain the names of gods and demigods among these rulers. But one of these tablets, and that the most reliable of all of them—the Abydos tablet—omits the mention of the gods and demigods, and gives those whom the Egyptians supposed to be the human Pharaohs only. The Abydos tablet most remarkably confirms the Bible genealogies as given in Genesis 4 and 5. Comparing this list with the lists in the other tablets, we find that they substantially agree with the first ten Pharaohs given in the Abydos tablet. Thereafter the larger lists give a number of names of gods and demigods omitted in the Abydos tablet. Directly following these they next give the names that immediately follow the first ten in the Abydos tablet.

The first twenty Pharaohs in these tablets (omitting those of the gods and demigods in the non-Abydosian tablets) are most interesting; for they, in so far as they agree with the Abydos tablet, correspond exactly with

the twenty men introduced in the Genesis record up to and including Noah. It will be recalled that Adam and his firstborn descendants by and including Cain up to Jabal, who must have perished in the flood, since he is the last one of Cain's descendants named, number exactly ten; while Abel and Seth and the latter's firstborn descendants up to and including Noah number ten. The Abydos tablet gives these twenty persons their Egyptian names: first in the order of Adam and Cain and the latter's firstborn descendants, and then in the order of Abel and Seth and the latter's firstborn descendants up to and including Noah. Thus Adam under the name of Mena is called Pharaoh I. Noah under the name of Norfu is called Pharaoh XX. The gods and demigods are introduced in the other tablets after Jabal, Cain's last firstborn descendant, who in the tablets is called Kakan. This is just the Biblical time and place for them to appear; for these gods were the angels—"sons of God"—who just before the flood married women and by them generated the giants—the demigods (Gen. 6: 2-4; Jude 6, 7). We have treated in detail of these angels and their giant sons in H. E. '21, 5, 6, to which we refer our readers for these details. Pharaoh XXI is Ham, Hebrew Cham, called in the tablets Chamu and Chufu. Remembering that Ham's, not Shem's or Japheth's, descendants settled in Egypt, Ham is just the one that we should expect to appear in this list of so-called Pharaohs after Norfu—Noah.

There are some other interesting items in the Abydos tablet: Mena's (Adam's) wife is Shesh (Hebrew, Isha) meaning *woman*. Pharaoh II is called Teta—Khent, meaning *guilty one* in allusion to Cain's guilt of Abel's blood. The tablet portion for Abel represents him as the non-resistant one. The Abydos tablet was made by Seti I, who is supposed to have been the Pharaoh that had Joseph as his prime minister. Seti I had a shaft sunk 60 feet deep through solid rock. At that depth his masons cut out the stair case on which

the Abydos tablet was then inscribed. An exact copy of it is in the British Museum. This tablet is highly confirmatory of the Biblical chronology, if we keep in mind that, like the Bible, it gives two *contemporaneous* lines of genealogy, first one and then the other, to a completion. This would require us to count 1656, and not over 3300 years, from Mena (Adam) to Norfu (Noah) and the flood. Reducing the longest Egyptian chronology for this period into half its length, as required by this consideration, and then omitting the chronology of the gods and demigods—for these were also contemporaneous with the two genealogies involved, we find that the Egyptian chronology as given in the Abydos tablet, and as compared with the other tablets, and the Biblical chronology are substantially alike for the time before the flood. We may further add that the Babylonian, Chinese and Indian records, from which certain archeologists claim notices of persons living from 6000 years before Christ onward, have the same fault of counting as successive genealogical lists or dynasties those that were in fact contemporaneous, even as certain Egyptologists have done with the Abydos and other tablets. The fact that the Bible introduces the two genealogies involved separately, but does not require that their chronology be given as successive, but as contemporaneous, proves that it is reasonable to do this with the names in the Abydos tablet. The above considerations prove that reasonably we may harmonize the Egyptian, Babylonian, Chinese and Indian chronologies with that of the Bible, which assigns the period of about 6067 years to the human family's stay on earth thus far. Thus the most reliable tablet of Heathen antiquity corroborates substantially the Bible chronology.

Before leaving this point it will not be amiss to call our readers' attention to the fact that there are really no chronological notices given in the Egyptian chronologies previous to the eighteenth dynasty, which flourished

from the end of Joseph's time until about Moses' time. Egyptologists have had to *guess* on the chronology previous to that dynasty. The following table will show how the greatest of them differ in their guesses of the date for Mena, the first so-called Pharaoh, who was really not a Pharaoh—rather he was Adam, but the Egyptians claimed him as a Pharaoh. These guesses were made before 1912, when the above identification of the first 20 names of the Abydos tablet was made with the 20 names of the two genealogical trees of Gen. 4 and 5.

Mariette and Lenormant	5004 B. C.
Brugsch and Budge	4400 "
Lepsius	3892 "
Bunsen (earlier view)	3623 "
Bunsen (later view)	3059 "
Breasted	3400 "
Stewart Poole	2717 "
G. Wilkinson	2691 "
G. Rawlinson	2350 "

We need only add that the greatest archeologists and historians are as divergent in their views on the antiquity of the Babylonians, Chinese and Indians. Surely the clear chronology of the Bible should not be set aside by such divergent guesses as prevail among the ablest archeologists and historians. Let its deniers first bring forth agreed certainties, if they would have us accept their theories. In the meantime we do well to disregard them, since they are admittedly guessing.

Mr. Darrow finds another difficulty in the Bible claim that there was a flood that covered the earth. Yet he mentions a thing that implies the fact that there was such a flood—the Glacial Age. The glaciers were caused by the freezing of the flood waters north of the temperate zone. The best scientific opinion is favorable to the flood's actuality, and that along the lines laid down in the Bible. We refer to the Vailian theory of a canopy of water that surrounded our

earth, as Saturn's rings surround Saturn, and as Jupiter's watery canopies surround it. This is in harmony with the Bible, which speaks of God separating the waters on the earth from those above the earth by the expanse (whose place is taken by our present atmosphere), improperly translated in the A. V. by the word *firmament* (Gen. 1: 7). In fact there were many of these canopies—seven in all—around our earth, held off by the heat and motion of the primeval earth at varying distances, dependent on their density. Each of these fell to the earth at the end of its age-day, and these successively formed the strata of the earth on top of the original igneous mass now represented in the granite formed from the molten mass, when all its carbon was burned out. These seven strata are very plainly seen in immense layers in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado river. The last of these canopies was of pure water (the heavier minerals, etc., being in the various lower canopies according to their varying weights) and fell to the earth in the deluge of Noah's day. All ancient nations have preserved accounts of this flood, which accounts, however differing in details, agree substantially with the Biblical flood.

There are certain facts that necessitate the acceptance of a sudden flood covering the earth. The following will show this: With a canopy of water surrounding this earth, the earth itself would be a huge hot-house with evenness of temperature everywhere, making the climate at the poles the same as that at the equator. Thus the same vegetation would be found at the poles as would be found at the equator. How do we know this? Because huge mammoths, antelopes, etc., have been found in frozen Siberia embedded in the fields of ice—glaciers—with *undigested grass* in their stomachs. These while grazing in the far North were suddenly overwhelmed by the flood's descending waters, which quickly froze. The resultant ice or glaciers held them for millenniums in their secure

embrace until lately they were discovered and gave us the factual proof of the flood's reality. Geology tells the same tale, according to the testimony of such eminent Geologists as Dawson, Dana, Wright, etc. Thus the Bible, the history of all ancient nations, the Glacial Age, Zoological finds in frozen Siberia and Geology, all prove the reality of the flood; and the Valian theory gives it a scientific explanation.

The fact of a universal flood will enable us to assist Mr. Darrow out of his difficulty with the confusion of languages at the time of the Tower of Babel. According to the real Bible chronology, Noah's flood occurred 2473-2472 B. C. This is just about where the Abydos tablet, compared with the Bible, would place it. All accounts of the flood preserved by the ancient nations speak of but one family as rescued from the flood by a specially constructed ship. Accordingly, there was but one language brought over to this side of the flood, even if more than one had been previously used, which is doubtful. But the historical features of all ancient nations, as separate and distinct from one another, become chronological and reliable as such only at a period later than 2472 B. C. This fact would imply that nations as such came into existence only after the flood, even as the Bible teaches. We must, therefore, look for the rise of various languages as synchronous with the rise of various nations. Hence this must be looked for about the time of the building of the Tower of Babel, in Nimrod's days (Gen. 10: 8-12; 11: 1-9), about 2400 B. C. Thus the facts of the case put the origin of the nations from one family and thus the rise of national languages where the Bible teaches both came into being.

The confusion of languages was a fact; but additionally it was a Divinely arranged occurrence for prophetic purposes, which when seen makes the confusion of languages a reasonable thing to accept. In this picture we understand Nimrod to type Satan; the

city of Babel, the present evil world; the tower, a false religion—Papal Churchianity; the pride of the people in building the tower, the pride of papal sectarianism in developing their system; the expectation of the people of safety from another flood in building this tower, the expectation of papists that they had a refuge against the curse in their system; the one language of the tower builders, the papal creed; the confusion of tongues, the creedal confusion of the sectarian systems that papal errors and wrongs have occasioned to rise—the conflicting theories of Protestant creeds. The inability of the Babelites to understand one another types the inability of the holders of each creed to appreciate the contrary teachings of other creeds. Thus viewed, the confusion of languages at Babel was wrought by God as a miracle to prophesy the confusion of crededists as a result of papal perversions. This prophetic character of the event is the Divine attestation of its truthfulness.

Mr. Darrow finds difficulty with the Bible teaching of the age of this earth. Mr. Darrow is right in objecting to the teaching that the earth and its creatures were made in six days of 24 hours each, as many of the creeds unfortunately and erroneously teach. Since the sun and moon did not shine through the earth's canopies until the fourth creative day, evidently the days and nights implied in the previously mentioned three mornings and evenings could not have been days and nights of our kind. On the contrary, we understand that the six creative days were each of 7000 years' duration. Our reason for this is that the seventh day, following the six creative days, is a period of 7000 years, and therefore by parity of reasoning the preceding six days must each have been of 7000 years also. Before proving this proposition from the Bible, we will note how the Hebrew word *yom* (day) and the Greek word *hemera* (day) are in the Bible used to designate varying periods of time: such as a

period of twelve hours (John 11: 9), of 24 hours (Num. 13: 25), of 40 years (Ps. 95: 8, 9), of 1845 years, *i.e.*, the Jewish Age, from Jacob's death to Jesus' death (Rom. 10: 20), of the Gospel Age, which has lasted over 1900 years (2 Cor. 6: 2; Heb. 3: 14), of the Millennial Age—1000 years (Is. 11: 10; 25: 9) and of the entire creative period (Gen. 2: 4). We frequently use the word day in ordinary English to designate periods of many years, as the day of Caesar, of Napoleon, of Washington, of Lincoln, etc. Thus we see that the Bible uses the word day to designate periods and ages as well as a time of twelve or twenty-four hours.

In the following way we prove that each of the six creative days was a period of 7000 years: The seventh day, the day on which God rests, is a period of 7000 years. St. Paul in Heb. 4: 4 says that on the seventh day God rested from His creative works as respects man. In verse 5 he shows that God's rest was unbrokenly continuing unto and in his day. In verse 7 he shows that this rest covers the entire Gospel Age; and therefore it extends to our own day, over 6000 years from its beginning. During the Millennium, into which we have already entered, God will continue to rest; for Christ will then work for Him toward humanity, while He rests. It will be only at the end of the Millennium, after having subdued all things unto Himself, that the Son will deliver up the Kingdom to God. Then God working again toward man, His rest will be ended. Hence the rest day—the seventh day—of God is a period of 7000 years. But this seventh day of rest is spoken of as a day in the same connection as the six creative days are (Gen. 1: 3-2: 3). Thus they must be days in the same sense as the seventh—each of 7000 years' duration. Such periods permit of sufficient time for all the changes, deposits of strata, formation of fossils, etc., that Geology, etc., have brought to our attention. Geology, by

its seven geological ages, corroborates the seven periods since the original creation of the heavens, and earth, which of course were in existence before the first creative day began, but how long before we cannot tell. It is one of the secret things on which we will do well to refrain from speculation, since speculation, is guessing.

Mr. Darrow has another difficulty: Eve's creation from a rib of Adam. Almighty power in making of one blood all human beings (Acts 17: 26) could, of course, easily create Eve from a rib of Adam, as well as out of any other part of his body, since to be flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, she had to be made out of some part of his flesh and bones (Gen. 2: 23). This unusual thing will become reasonable when we understand that by this act God gave a typical prophecy of how from Christ's humanity and spirit the Church would be formed. We are familiar with the fact that the Bible uses Adam and Eve as types of Christ and the Church (1 Cor. 15: 45; 2 Cor. 11: 2, 3; Eph. 5: 31, 32; Gen. 2: 23, 24). The following will show this in type and antitype: Adam types Jesus; Eve types the Church. Adam had no real helpmate before Eve's creation; neither does Jesus before the Church's creation. Adam was put into a deep sleep preparatory to Eve's creation. Jesus was put into the sleep of death preparatory to the Church's creation. As from the sleeping Adam were taken a rib and some flesh for the creation of Eve; so from the dead human Jesus were the life-rights and the right to life taken to justify the Church to life; and the transformation of the rib and flesh into Eve corresponds to the transformation of certain justified human beings into the Divine Bride of Christ, the sinless Second Eve who, united to the sinless Second Adam, will with Him in the Millennium regenerate (Matt. 19: 28) the race in righteousness and life, in contrast with the sinful Adam and Eve generating the race in sin and death. So viewed, instead

of Eve's being formed from a rib and some flesh of Adam being ridiculous, it is a beautiful prophecy of one of the most glorious of all Biblical truths.

Where Cain got his wife likewise troubles Mr. Darrow. This question is very easy to answer: He got her from his father's family; for he married one of his sisters. We are told in Gen. 5: 4 that Adam begat sons and *daughters*. When the latter were begotten we do not know since the Bible, as usual in the case of daughters, does not say; but we do know that Cain married one of these; because the Bible teaches that all men came from one blood—Adam's (Acts 17: 26; Rom. 5: 12, 15-19; 1 Cor. 15: 22). Mr. Darrow's difficulty on this point arises from a misunderstanding of the language of Gen. 4: 16, 17: "And Cain went out from the presence [favor] of Jehovah and dwelt in the land of Nod [Hebrew for *wandering*] on the east of Eden. And Cain *knew* his wife, and she conceived and bare Enoch." This language is understood by Mr. Darrow to mean that Cain went into a far distant country, and there became acquainted with a woman whom he never before saw and married her and by her became a father. This is not the sense of the passage. The passage does not say that he became acquainted in the land of Nod with a woman and there married her. He took his wife with him from his and her father's home to the land of Nod. While there he knew her in the sense of cohabiting with her, and from this act she conceived and bore a son. The word "*know*" among the Hebrews very frequently was used to mean cohabit, and the connection clearly proves that such is its sense here. The following are some passages that use the word in this sense: Gen. 4: 1, 25; 24: 16; 38: 26; 1 Sam. 1: 19; Judges 19: 25; 1 Kings 1: 4; Luke 1: 34; etc. One may object that it is unhealthy to marry a sister. To this we agree in so far as concerns the present fallen condition of humanity; but such was not the case before human blood and

health were so much corrupted as they have become. Early in human history the blood and health were very much better than now, evidenced by the longevity of the antediluvians. In view of the above cited facts, it is evident that there is no difficulty in answering the question as to where Cain got his wife.

Further, Mr. Darrow experiences difficulty with Eve's temptation by the serpent. In explanation we would say that it was not really the literal serpent that tempted Eve. It was Satan who spoke through the serpent, even as he now speaks through mediums, for Satan was the speaker and deceived Eve, even as Jesus, Paul and John teach—Gen. 3: 4, 5; John 8: 44; 2 Cor. 11: 3; Rev. 20: 2, 3, 7.

Next, Mr. Darrow is troubled about the curse placed on the serpent, as though it had previously walked on its tail, and after the curse crawled on its belly and consumed more or less dust (Gen. 3: 1-14). His difficulty is due to his misunderstanding what is meant by the serpent. It is Satan. Through introducing sin into the world he can no more stand erect in the true nobility of a righteous character like other sons of God—the good angels; but he grovels—crawls—in things low, degraded and degrading, and appropriates them to himself, to his continually increasing degradation. Thus does he figuratively crawl and eat dust. The literal serpent was used by Satan, "that old serpent" (so called because of deceitfully using the literal serpent as a medium through which he spoke and acted), and is not at all meant in Gen. 3: 15. We will quote the passage and briefly explain it in brackets: "I will put enmity between thee [*Satan*] and the woman, and between thy seed [*Satan's* human servants] and her seed [*Christ and the Church—Rom. 16: 20*]; it shall bruise thy head [*destroy thee*], and thou shalt bruise his heel [*by opposition and persecution make the Faithful figuratively limp, inflict a not vital injury, but not destroy them*]."

Then, too, Mr. Darrow finds difficulty with the part of the curse placed on woman: sorrow, multiplication of conception, sufferings in child birth, and the husband's headship over her, often expressing itself in tyranny. At least it must be admitted that these evils are a fact in the average woman's experience. The curse upon the earth has more or less embroiled men, and from the severities of nature and man's hardness of heart have these evils mainly come upon womankind. Had she not in Eve sinned, sin would not have come, and she would have enjoyed paradise continually, even as the man also would have done. But sin caused the loss of the state of innocence and paradise and caused justice to drive them into the untoward—cursed—earth, where the severities of nature effected in man and woman such changes as have made her suffer the above-cited evils, even as man has had to suffer his peculiar part of the curse—heavy labor. The facts—dire as they are—prove God's statement to be true.

Finally, Mr. Darrow seems to have difficulty in the rainbow first appearing after the flood. This difficulty is readily explained. Before the last earth canopy, which consisted of water, was precipitated on the earth, *rain had never fallen*; because no clouds could form under this canopy. The Bible tells us that the earth was made moist by a mist arising from the earth, which had many underground streams, lakes and seas, whose beds, drained, made many of our caves (Gen. 2: 6). In some cases these huge reservoirs reached the surface and formed streams (Gen. 2: 10). When, however, the canopy of water engirdling the earth broke and precipitated itself on the earth in Noah's flood, the sun could produce clouds by its direct heat acting on the water, and as a result rain was made possible. And when for the first time the sun's rays struck the descending rain at the proper angle with man's sight, man for the first time saw a rainbow. It is also easy from

these facts to see how the first rainbow was a pledge that the earth would never again suffer a universal deluge: Its presence was a proof that there was no more a canopy of water engirdling the earth, and therefore it could not precipitate itself upon the earth in a universal flood. This fact, combined with that of the earth's traveling around its orbit, also accounts for the variation of the seasons, etc., as long as the earth lasts.—Gen. 8: 21, 22; 9: 8-17.

We have finished our brief review of the difficulties that Mr. Darrow and many others have with the Bible. Our review is now too long to take up at this time his views on evolution, which we will later do. We have found his difficulties in nearly every case to be based upon a misunderstanding, which we trust we have been enabled by the Lord's grace to clear up. We trust this study will prove a blessing to many who have difficulties with the Bible. We desire to assure these dear troubled souls that there is help for them out of these difficulties; for the Bible rightly understood is the best science, the noblest instruction and the clearest truth.

We have studied atheism as the first false view of God; and now we proceed to a study of materialism as the second false view of God. Atheism and materialism are really twins; for in almost all cases materialists, like atheists, deny the existence of a God. All strict materialists are avowed atheists. The exceptions to this rule are the few materialists who deify the universe as such, and give the worship of admiration to the laws, order, beauty, sublimity and power that are manifest in nature as a whole. But there is a marked distinction between atheism and materialism when they are contrasted; for atheism is an exceedingly crude and superficial denial of God's existence, while materialism is from the intellectual standpoint a keen-witted attempt philosophically and scientifically to account for the universe and its contents on the sole basis of matter and its inherent forces. Hence few

thinkers espouse atheism as distinct from materialism, while many of the educated and scientific for the last 80 years have espoused materialism, though during the last twenty-five years a distinct reaction has set in against this theory. Philosophical and scientific materialism usually in our day takes on the form of evolution, though Darwin was not a strict materialist, believing that a Creator started the first and lowest forms of life; but most of his disciples have disbelieved this; but as a theory, without the thought of evolution, it existed from the days of the ancient Greek philosophers, *e.g.*, the Epicureans and Skeptics. And in all times, those who have lived the life of the flesh only, the life of the senses only, the life for this earth only, have been practical, even if not theoretical, materialists.

But, one may ask, what is meant by materialism? In answer, we might say that it is the theory that reduces all existing things to matter and its inherent forces. It denies the existence of any substances other than matter. To it matter alone is substance, and substance is that which is tangible to one or more of our five senses. It therefore denies the existence of things intangible to sense. Hence to the materialist spiritual substances do not exist. The thorough-going materialist claims that by matter and its inherent forces he can explain the origin, development and present state of all nature, including animal existence and powers; but, as we will see, this claim breaks down at every turn and leaves unsolved the very problems that materialism sets out to explain. Modern materialism is a reaction against the excessive idealism that prevailed in philosophy, especially in Germany, during the first five decades of the nineteenth century. As a testimony to the correctness of the above definition and brief explanation of materialism, we quote the word of Wilhelm Strecker, one of the foremost of modern materialists. He says: "That which distinguishes materialism from every other view of the world is that it traces

all being and all events in the world [universe] to matter and the forces inherent in matter, and denies the existence and operation of any power outside of nature. All events are, according to materialism, the necessary effects of definite causes; and this necessity exists, not only in our thinking, but is founded in the things themselves. Even life and the phenomena of consciousness materialism regards as but phenomena of matter which appear under given conditions—which, however, are not certainly known—and which will cease with the conditions that attended them." "According to this view all events in the world come to pass in accordance to eternally valid and inflexible laws which cannot be abolished or changed by any arbitrary will [not even by the will of a God] but to whose might all will is subject." So far Strecker, whose explanation of his theory is clear.

Materialism, in its strict form, is therefore in striking contrast with Christianity. It deprecates the idea of God and denies His existence, ridicules faith as superstition, denies a Divine revelation, free will and moral responsibility, claiming that all act as they must, forced thereto by physical causes, and estimating virtue and vice as of equal worth or worthlessness. Of course, this theory disallows a personal hereafter, affirming that the only eternal life that man can have is by propagation or by the elements of his body entering food substances and becoming through assimilation parts of others' bodies. Spirit substances and beings, of course, cannot, according to this theory, exist. Some materialists, recoiling from some of these teachings, have introduced elements contradictory of materialism into their theory of materialism; but, of course, in so doing they have contradicted the theory itself.

We now proceed to a refutation of this theory, which is today in the scientific world the most prevailing one. Our first argument against it is that it fails of its professed purpose, *i.e.*, to explain all being and

events by matter and its inherent forces. It fails utterly to explain the nature of matter and the nature of force, which it confesses it cannot understand. It completely fails to explain how motion in matter first started; for it must assume that matter's inherent forces were at first quiescent, *i.e.*, potential, not active, *i.e.*, kinetic. It fails utterly to explain how consciousness—thought, feeling and will—arose out of matter and its inherent forces. It fails to explain the origin of life and of the various species of animal life. It breaks down in its attempted explanation of the origin of the difference between man's powers and those of the brute creation. Thus the very problems that it starts out to explain and that it boasts it can explain by matter and its inherent forces, it completely fails to explain. Hence it is a failure as a theory in the purpose of its existence—the explanation of all being and events by the sole agency of matter and its inherent forces. Hence its profession that it explains all being and events is false. Even Strecker, after asserting that it explains all being and events, is forced to admit that it does not do so in many cases, but that it is forced to concede that there are many gaps in knowledge for which it resorts to assumptions, since it lacks proofs for them. This is bad on this theory.

This brings up another consideration against it: It assumes and takes for granted as matters of faith some very important things that should be proved in order to establish itself as a theory, *i.e.*, it is in important particulars based on faith. For example, it assumes that matter is eternal, that its inherent forces *as potentialities* are also eternal. According to the materialist's principle that the proof of a thing depends upon its being sensibly observed, neither he nor anyone else could by the senses have observed their eternity. How then, we ask, does he in view of his principles know that these are eternal? It also assumes the reality of time and space and their being without

beginning and without ending. Have materialists been everywhere and always, that they know this by sense? How, then, according to their principles, do they know this? Again, materialism believes in atoms. How does it know that they exist, since they are not cognizable by sense, its indispensable test of existence? It also believes in the invariable operation of cause and effect. How can it prove this? It cannot prove it, because no one has observed all causes and all effects. Yet materialism assumes it. It also believes the doctrine of the conservation of energy—a thing not only impossible of proof, but also a thing that is now much doubted by the greatest scientists, *e.g.*, Millikan. It assumes spontaneous generation as the origin of life; but all scientific demonstrations and experience disprove such a thing. There are other gaps in the proof for this theory, some of which were pointed out in the preceding argument. All of these views it accepts *on faith*. Thus its main fundamentals are matters of assumption, *i.e.*, faith, and not of proof. This proves that materialists' flings at faith in believers in the Bible are entirely inconsistent with their own course. Scoffers at others' faith *as faith*, when they themselves base their main principles on faith, should remember the proverb on glass-house dwellers not throwing stones. But such *little* considerations as this seem negligible for those who perceive no difference between virtue and vice except in the atoms of the pertinent bodies, as strict materialism teaches there is none.

Again, materialism's denial of the reality of spirit substances is contrary to fact; for facts demonstrate that there are spirit substances. The following spirit substances and others exist and certainly are not matter: life-principle, light and ether. Hence the theory that denies the existence of everything except matter and its inherent forces must be false. Life-principle pervades the air and every living thing. Ether and light pervade space. The existence of these substances,

which are intangible to sense, is undeniable. Therefore, their existence disproves materialism, which denies the existence of spirit substances as well as spirit beings.

So, too, facts demonstrate the existence of spirit beings, whose existence materialism denies. By spirit beings we mean superhuman persons whose bodies consist of spirit, as distinct from material, substances. The phenomena of spiritism demonstrate the existence of spirit beings. While we admit that there is much fraud designedly worked as such for selfish considerations by some mediums, there is such a multiplicity of demonstrable facts on the activity of spirits in spiritistic phenomena, with no evidence of human fraud against them, proven by human fraud-excluding conditions used to test the phenomena, that the existence of spirits is properly accepted as a scientifically demonstrated fact. While we so speak, we are not to be understood as endorsing the characters of the genuine spirits that operate in spiritistic phenomena. On the contrary, while we believe these agents to be genuine spirits, we believe them to be demons, the fallen angels, who with almost unbelievable deceitfulness palm themselves off as dead humans existing as spirits. Thus the numerous facts of spirit activities in spiritistic phenomena prove materialism to be false; for it denies the existence of spirit substances and beings, which spiritistic phenomena prove to exist.

The fact that there is no known example of thought, feeling and will, without the union of life-principle and substance organized into bodies, disproves materialism. Inorganic matter does not feel, think or will. As a primary condition of thinking, feeling and willing—in a word, of consciousness—substance must be arranged into an organism, a body. But a mere organism cannot exercise thought, feeling and volition, else dead bodies and some automatons that have been constructed with proper chemically constituted and arranged organs, blood, etc., like those of a human body, would exercise

these. There must be a union of such an organism with life-principle by means of the blood. Such life-principle is Biblically called *spirit*—not *a* spirit; for there is no spirit being within man, according to Scripture, reason and fact; but there is in man a spirit substance called life-principle, and the union of this with man's organism, the blood acting as the point of contact for the union, produces personality—does not *give* man a soul but makes him a soul. Materialism is at an utter loss to explain the existence of human and brute souls without the union of the spirit substance, life-principle, with a human or brute organism. On this subject the Bible, reason and facts are in most exact harmony, as can be seen in the story of Adam's creation: (1) a body—an organism—was formed; (2) life-principle—derived from the air, which is accordingly called, "the breath of life"—was blown into it and (3) their union by means of the blood produced a third thing—a living soul, an energetic person (Gen. 2: 7). It is because materialism denies spirit substances that it cannot explain how matter was first put into motion and how life and consciousness originated. Without this spirit substance there can be no life, no thought, no feeling and no volition—no consciousness. This fact is annihilative of materialism. To these considerations no materialist has been able to make a satisfactory answer. To them this is one of their insoluble riddles, of which DuBois Reymond, one of the ablest scientists, acknowledges seven.

Materialism cannot bridge the gulf between matter and mind. Not only does it fail to understand the nature of matter and its inherent forces; but it cannot from these two things deduct mental processes; for mental processes cannot be deducted from material conditions. Materialists have wrestled with this problem unto exhaustion and have left it in despair of solution. Here the greatest of them after the hardest endeavor have had to admit that they could not explain

mental processes with only material substances and their inherent forces to work with. To the theist their failure is self-evident; for their denial of spirit substances, and hence the spirit substantiality of life-principle, leaves out of consideration the one indispensable thing for mental processes and hence for the solution of the problem here discussed. While the function of the brain is that of an instrument which the person—the soul—uses for thinking, feeling and willing, it is the union of the life-principle and the brain, the latter endowed with personal capacities, that produces the soul—the person—which, so produced, by the brain does the thinking, willing and feeling.

Another matter counts strongly against materialism: it denies the freedom of the will. Materialists think, as Strecker puts it, that man's will is controlled by physical law. Hence he of necessity acts as he does, though they concede that he fondly imagines that he is free because he chooses as he likes. But, they say, he likes as he likes under the unalterable law of his being, which forces him to choose according to the composition of his atoms. This certainly is untrue, and that for many reasons, *e.g.*, he frequently chooses from principle to do what he does not like, and frequently likes to do what he does not choose to do, as he also frequently changes into disliking what he formerly liked and into liking what he formerly disliked, and, again, without dislike becomes indifferent to what he once disliked and liked. We are conscious of freely choosing, sometimes solely by principle, sometimes solely by prejudice and sometimes by a mixture of these; and in all cases we know that we could have chosen otherwise, had we so desired. Again, our regretting on further consideration a former choice and reversing it, proves our free will. In all cases we are conscious of our freedom of choice, even if unable at times to execute the choice. But materialism, denying this, reduces man to a machine, or, as some

of them have called him, a conscious automaton, forced to choose and do by blind physical law. So to degrade human nature, and that contrary to the facts of experience and consciousness, is a strong count against it.

As a logical consequence of its denying man's freedom of choice, materialism denies moral responsibility. The more consistent materialists do not hesitate to deny man's moral responsibility, though some materialists shrink from this position and, inconsistently with materialism, seek to hold man responsible for his acts, at least to the extent that his conduct must be subject to the demands of society's needs. But consistent materialists deny that the virtuous man is any better morally than the vicious man. Blind nature, they say, works in one the same as in the other, forcing each of them to act as they act because of the material constitution and bent of their atoms! Therefore materialists insist that difference of conduct is due to a different distribution and quality of one's atoms, not to the varying degrees of people's sense of responsibility and character status. Therefore they have justified all the crimes of the calendar. Hume, *e.g.*, justified suicide. Darwin, who was only partially a materialist, speaks disapprovingly of man's allowing the weaker members of the race to propagate. Almost all of them have justified the indulgence of man's baser propensities. To them sin is due to a diseased brain, though facts deny such a thought. Such a theory certainly is dangerous to the individual, to the family, to society, not to say anything of character and religion; for low ideals are always degrading and injurious to the individual, to the family, to society, to character and to religion. And the wickedness and degrading influence of practical, as distinct from theoretical, materialism, is manifest in our day in the increase of sin, vice and crime, by those who regard the material things of life as the highest good.

Again, materialism fails to account for religion as the highest practice and attainment of man. It is a peculiar phrenological fact that the higher the office of the brain faculties, the higher are they located in the brain; and the lower the office of the brain faculties, the lower are they located in the head. Thus the social—worldly—and selfish faculties of the human brain are situated in the lower parts of the brain; next come the intellectual faculties; still higher come the artistic faculties; the next higher are the moral faculties and, finally; the highest are the religious faculties. Using the picture of a four-storied house to illustrate the brain we might say that those who live only in their selfish and social—worldly—propensities dwell in the cellar of their brains; that those who live only in their intellectual faculties—"all head"—dwell on the first floor of their brains; that those who live in the artistic sentiments dwell in the second story of their brains; that those who live in their moral sentiments dwell in the third floor of their brains; and that those who live in their religious faculties dwell in the highest floor of their brains—farthest away from the dust and clatter of the street and nearest the pure air and light of heaven. In strict materialism there can be no religion, since it denies God's existence. In less strict materialism there is a deifying and worshiping of nature. Hence there can be no exercise of the religious faculties in strict materialism; and in less strict materialism there is a degradation of them by perverting them to wrong objects. This means that materialism leaves uncultivated the highest and noblest faculties of the human heart, as well as degrades them. It therefore is a degrading and injurious thing. But it must also be an untrue thing, as an explanation of all being and events, for as all our other faculties have objects to which they are adapted, whose existence, therefore, they necessarily imply; so our religious faculties must have objects to which they are adapted and whose

existence, therefore, they necessarily imply. But materialism, in denying God's existence, is untrue as a theory and degrading as a practice. And its irreligion and false religion make it an exceedingly evil thing.

A contrast between materialism and theism is in every way unfavorable to the former and favorable to the latter; and, therefore, it proves the superiority of the latter to the former as to the creation, preservation and rulership of the universe. Theism is the doctrine that God exists as a Spirit Being independently of, but works creatively, preservingly and executively throughout, the universe. The eternity of God is a much more reasonable assumption than is that of the eternity of matter and its inherent forces, which at first could only be potential, but not active; for the first cause must be causeless and therefore eternal. But a motionless first cause (which matter at first must have been, if it assumed to be the first cause) cannot be the first cause; for something else had to cause it to begin to move. But this objection does not hold against a conscious first cause; for it could start motion in itself and outside itself. The billions of evidences of order—the reign of law—in the universe imply that the first cause was intelligent, which God is, while the facts of the case, if materialism be regarded as true, require us to ascribe to matter and its inherent forces the very highest and greatest imaginable attributes of mind—which they certainly do not have. The billions of evidences of design and adaptability in the creation, preservation and government of the universe, imply a conscious, wise and practical inventor, preserver and ruler, such as God is; whereas we can by no means account for these evidences of design and adaptability on the assumption that matter and its inherent forces, of necessity working blindly, are the only creative, preserving and ruling agencies; for this would be ascribing the very highest and greatest imaginable attributes of volition to matter and its

inherent forces—things that these do not have. To account for the existence, preservation and government of the universe in any other way than as the work of an intelligent, wise and powerful conscious personality, is utterly impossible, and inorganic matter and blind force are utterly wanting in every particular in capacities commensurate to the gigantic job of creating, preserving and ordering all nature animate and inanimate. Thus from the standpoint of the origin, preservation and rulership of the universe, theism is a most reasonable theory, while materialism is a wholly inadequate explanation of these wondrous phenomena.

Leaving inorganic nature as unexplainable by materialism and as reasonably explained by theism, let us compare these two views as to their adaptability to the explanation of organic nature. At the threshold of this question we are confronted by that of the origin of life. Here materialism breaks down completely; for it is unable with its materials—matter and its inherent forces—to bridge the chasm between the lifeless and life. It has resorted to spontaneous generation as an attempt to bridge this chasm; but by its own principle, that what is in the effect—here life—must be in its cause, it is estopped from logically using this hypothesis. Moreover, if the theory were true, we would find examples of spontaneous generation about us—which neither we nor anybody else ever found. Moreover, the efforts of scientific experiments have failed to prove it, every one of them breaking down in the effort to produce spontaneous generation. Scientists are now a practical unit in asserting its unprovableness. Thus materialism restricted to the use of its tools for the explanation of the problem cannot explain the origin of life in an alleged previously lifeless universe. Theism beautifully explains it in plant, animal and spirit life—in plant life by the union of a vegetable body and life-principle, with sap as the means of contact, in animal life by the union of an

animal body and life-principle, with blood as the means of contact, and in spirit life by the union of a spirit body (a body consisting of a spirit substance or of spirit substances) and life-principle, with no agency (so far as we know) as the means of contact apart from these two things themselves. Thus materialism breaks down as an explanation of the origin of life; while theism succeeds in explaining it. Hence from this standpoint theism is superior to materialism.

Again, materialism breaks down in its attempt to explain the origin of the various species in plant and animal life. It has sought to explain this problem by the theory of evolution; but apart from proving that within each species of plant and animal life there is a change either to higher or to lower forms (Haeckel, who has out-Darwined Darwin himself, claims that a deterioration from a higher to a lower form is the course of nature—devolution, if we may be permitted to coin the term—not a development from a lower form to a higher form), the theory of evolution, or devolution, has failed materialism in the solution of this problem; for no fossil nor historical record of the past nor living example of the present has been found to show that a change from one into another species has ever occurred, one of which must be proven, if evolution is to be proven true. Efforts to breed between members of two species have always produced sterile offspring, *e.g.*, crossing the horse and the ass produces the mule, which lacks power of propagation. This completely disproves the transmutation of species by propagation; thus materialism breaks down in the attempt to explain the origin of species. We might add that increasingly is evolution being discarded by the abler scientists. Theism completely solves this problem in the creation of "every seed after its kind," "every beast after its kind" and "man after his kind."

Again, materialism breaks down in its attempt to cross the bridge between brute and human beings. It

has attempted this, too, by the theory of evolution, or devolution. It has spoken much of the "missing link"; and time and again it has announced its discovery, only later to discard each one of its foundlings as illegitimately born and as unworthy of rearing. The reason is plain: the difference between the lowest human and the highest brute is so great that the chasm between them is unbridgeable. Virchow, who was undoubtedly the greatest scientist of the second half of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century, said of evolution in its form of teaching man's descent from brutes that "it is nothing but a windy hypothesis in proof of which not one fact of nature has been produced and against which all the discovered fossil remains, the records of history and the observed facts of nature testify." He further added that "'the missing link' has not been found, nor," said he, in his opinion, "would it ever be found, for the good reason that it does not exist." In vain does materialism point out the evidences of intelligence; feelings and volition in brute life as a proof that man was evolved from the brute. We concede that brutes have such; but these are limited to the needs of brute life and go no further. But the powers of the human are immeasurably higher. His intellect searches out the solution of multitudinous problems involving God, other spirits, the universe and animate and inanimate nature on earth—spheres utterly foreign to brute intelligence. His affections reach out to objects immeasurably above those that are the objects of the brute's feelings. His will works on problems and destinies here and hereafter; and he is capable of development along physical, mental, moral and religious lines, with which it would be errant nonsense either in thought or in practice even remotely to connect beasts. And some humans—the faith class—have possibilities, under Divine favor, of change from human to various spirit natures, in some cases even to the Divine nature. All these facts—summarized

briefly into classes—prove that there is an impossible chasm between the human and the brute creation; and materialism has utterly broken down in attempting to bridge this chasm, and must break down, for it is indeed a fixed gulf that is impossible to span by materialism. Theism bridges this gulf by a separate creative act by which, as distinct from brutes, man was made by God in His image and likeness, which accounts for every factor in the involved problem.

In a word, materialism breaks down at every new turn in creation, in failing completely to explain the riddle of the universe and of existence. Theism, on the contrary, is equal to the solution of every riddle of creation, and not only so, but also of the preservation and rulership of creation, in which materialism also breaks down as a solution. Hence theism, as a view of the universe and living beings, is a reasonable solution of every involved problem, while materialism, whose exponents continually ridicule believers in theism, as credulous and superstitious, is demonstrated as requiring a larger and at that an unreasonable faith at every new step in creation. Thus materialists, as glass-house dwellers clumsily throwing stones at their theistic neighbors' strongly built house, have missed their aim and devastated their own fragile dwelling. They are the credulous and superstitious theorists, believing nonsensical and unprovable things, while theistic believers hold a theory at once reasonable and efficient in explanation of all the involved questions.

Agnosticism is a word invented by Prof. Huxley to express his mental attitude toward all theories of being, especially that of God. Hence he held this attitude toward atheism, theism, pantheism, deism, materialism, Christianity and idealism. Etymologically, agnosticism would mean the theory that the existence of God and the problem of being are unknowable. Many use the word to mean the theory that the existence of God and the problem of being are not

known, but do not assert that these are unknowable. But this latter thought should, according to the usage of the Greek language, be expressed by the word *agnosticism*. The use that the two leading agnostics, Messrs. Huxley and Spencer, make of the word *agnosticism* as respects God's being, proves that they view agnosticism as the theory that claims that God is unknowable. It, therefore, claims not only to be ignorant of God's existence, but also that knowing of His existence is impossible to us. It, therefore, differs from atheism, which claims to know that God does not exist, and which theory we have above proven to be a self-refutive proposition: since to be able truly to say that there is no God one must be an eternal, infinite, omniscient, omnipotent and omnipresent spirit, *i.e.*, one must himself be God, which would prove that there is a God. But while there is a difference between atheism and agnosticism, atheists do not have much to say against agnosticism, which in turn has greatly helped and strengthened atheism. The genuine agnostic would object, if we should say that we *know* there is a God and a spiritual world, but would not object, if we should say that we *believe* there is a God and a spiritual world.

We might profitably take from Mr. Huxley's own words his explanation of agnosticism: "Agnosticism, in fact, is not a creed, but a method, the essence of which lies in the rigorous application of a single principle." He then explains this principle: "Positively the principle may be expressed: In matters of intellect follow your reason as far as it will take you, without regard to any other consideration. And negatively: In matters of intellect do not pretend that conclusions are certain which are not demonstrated or demonstrable." According to this, reason is the source and rule of intellectual matters and is to be followed regardless of where it leads us, even if it should lead us, as he said it did him, nowhere else

than "into the dark depths of a wild and tangled forest." Yea, he says we are even "to go straight on until we either come out on the other side of the wood or find there is no other side to it, at least, none attainable." This explanation proves that agnosticism rejects the Christian principle that the Bible is the source and rule of faith and that it sets up in its stead reason as the source and rule of faith. This prompts us to say that if Mr. Huxley's statement that agnosticism is not a creed, but is a method of investigation into matters of the intellect, it will have to be conceded that this method has as its basis a creed, *i.e.*, that reason is the source and rule of knowledge.

We presume that Mr. Huxley uses the word *reason* in the sense of: (1) our intuitions whereby we recognize the truth of certain principles as self-evident without the process of reflection; and (2) the knowledge that we gather by the exclusive and proper use of these intuitions. These intuitions arise out of the nature of the congenital endowments of our mental, moral and religious faculties as these occupy themselves with the objects to which they are adapted—self, the world and God—and the conditions in which they are. Thus by self-consciousness we know intuitively that we exist and by world-consciousness we know intuitively that other persons and created things exist; and our God-consciousness makes us know intuitively that God exists; for our mental, moral and religious faculties by their very nature intuitively know these as existing; hence the congenital nature of these faculties make these intuitively known to us (1 Cor. 2: 11). We are aware of the fact that the creeds decry reason in the two senses used above and will have none or almost none of it in the domain of religion. But the Bible does not share in this decrying and ignoring of reason. It appeals to it to judge; and it sanctions its use; else how could God ask us to reason together with Him? (Acts 17: 2, 11; 24: 25;

Is. 1: 18). Nowhere and on no subject does the Bible teach anything contrary to these intuitions of the human heart and mind nor the knowledge gathered by their exclusive and proper use, however much the creeds teach things contrary to them. God desires that we test His thoughts with the severest exactions of reason in these senses of the word, well knowing that His thoughts will appeal to it, if the heart is rightly disposed toward truth and justice.

Nevertheless, this the Bible does teach: that our individual and collective reason is not a sufficient source and rule of intellectual matters, that it needs teachers to give it knowledge that it cannot of itself gain. Comparatively this is seen by our reason needing human teachers in earthly matters to supplement the lacks of our individual reason. Furthermore, the Bible teaches that through depravity our individual reason is unable of itself alone and unaided to comprehend even all earthly things (John 3: 12). Experience also proves this to be true. Finally, the Bible teaches the inability of our individual and collective reason unaided and alone to *discover* the Truth of the Divine Plan (1 Cor. 1: 21; 2: 14; Eph. 4: 18). Experience proves this proposition to be true, in that men left to their unaided individual and collective reason reach contradictory religious views, manifest in the many religions of the world. That the bulk of the members of each religion more or less agree does not impinge against this fact, because for the most part without using their reason they accept on authority, and usually against reason, the tenets of their creeds. Consequently we need something more than general and individual reason to get the necessary Truth as to God and ourselves in relation to Him and to others. Hence reason helps us only part of the way. Revelation, which is in complete harmony with reason in the two senses above used, helps us all the way and commends itself to the individual reason in the

properly disposed person. Therefore agnosticism, relying solely on an insufficient guide, cannot lead us to satisfactory views as to the being of God or the problem of existence. Hence it, as a method creedally based on reason as the source and rule of intellectual matters, is insufficient for the task of solving the problem of God and the universe. Therefore it is foredoomed to failure as to determining the Truth respecting God. And as a misfit for the solution of the problem at hand it is a discredited theory.

In the preceding paragraph we used the expression, general and individual reason. By the former we mean reason as a power inherent in all and by the latter we mean this power as it is in each individual. As an inherent power it is a remarkable thing and is the instrument for all advances in intellectual matters. But as a matter of fact this power, while existing in all, appears in experience only as an individual matter; and because more or less imperfection mars this power in all of us, individual reason differs in every individual, dependent on heredity, environment and training. We, therefore, know of no example of imperfect men whose individual reason is infallible, and, therefore, can be depended upon as the source and rule of intellectual matters. On the contrary, we are on all sides met with abundant examples of fallible reason, for every individual's reason is fallible. Consequently we would be foolish to take reason, general or individual, as the source and rule of intellectual matters; for by it we are from the outstart doomed to error. But this aside, agnosticism plays a trick on its upholders. It professes to follow general reason—the rational intuitions and its knowledge acquisitions as these appeal to all; while, as a matter of fact, it follows individual reason—only that which appeals to an individual, with the result that each individual's reason, differing from that of all others, becomes the source and rule of intellectual matters for him. He

is thus enthroned as his own source and rule of faith, which we must all acknowledge is a most unsatisfactory thing. How much we therefore need an infallible Revelation to correct man's universal fallibility! Otherwise we cannot attain religious Truth on God's being, the world, self and their interrelations. This consideration exposes a fatal lack in agnosticism.

Furthermore, Mr. Huxley's proposition that one must as an agnostic follow reason, regardless of consequences, is unscientific, and is also foolish in the ordinary affairs of life. If a scientist finds that what seems to him to be a reasonable hypothesis leads him into inextricable confusion, furthermore, if he finds that it leads him to no practical results, and, finally, if he finds that it results in damage, regardless of how reasonable it seems to him, instead of his following it regardless of any other consideration, he discards it as inapplicable to the task at hand. Hence hypotheses which have seemed very reasonable, but have led to such results, are thrown out of the scientific laboratories upon the numerous and large scientific rubbish heaps. No progress would have been made in science, if hypotheses, in theory seeming reasonable, but in practice found to be unfruitful, unsatisfactory and dangerous, had been clung to with the dogmatic determination with which Mr. Huxley held to agnosticism. In the daily concerns of life practical and wise people do not hold to attractive theories which prove under experiment to be unfruitful or harmful. How long do we keep up using dieting systems which, however promising they may seem as theories, make us weak or sick? How long will a wise person continue with some exercising fad, however reasonable it might seem, if it exhausts instead of invigorating, or injures instead of strengthening him? How long does a wise parent continue to use child training methods that are theoretically most charming, but that in practice ruin his children? If they would on these matters "follow

reason as far as it would take them, without regard to any other consideration," they would ruin their stomachs, bodies and children. If by following reason alone we are led nowhere else than "into the dark depths of a wild and tangled forest" and cannot by following reason alone get "to the other side," we should draw the conclusion that we have been following an insufficient guide and should look for another. This, then, is the conclusion that practical people will draw from the basis of agnosticism's creed—reason as the sole source and rule in matters of intellect.

We should also consider somewhat Mr. Huxley's negative principle of agnosticism: "Do not pretend that conclusions are certain which are not demonstrated or demonstrable." This rule also proves to be a bad one for everyday life; for we certainly do not follow it in the most important concerns of life. People marry without being able to demonstrate whether they will prove properly mated. Nor is this a demonstrated or a demonstrable thing, except by years of experience in married life. Nor do they refuse to assume the responsibilities of parenthood until it is demonstrated or is demonstrable that they will make good parents and raise good children—a thing not demonstrated or demonstrable apart from years of experience in parenthood. In entering business people believe they will succeed; and only because of such belief do they enter business, though it is not then demonstrable or demonstrated that they will succeed. The greatest discoveries in science and invention have been made on matters that were neither demonstrated nor demonstrable that they would bring success, yea, they often dealt with things at the time not clearly understood. As a matter of fact, practically all human advancement is attained by entering experimentally the domain of undemonstrated and hitherto un-demonstrable things and by feeling, with much doubt, one's way to success. It is a safe rule in physical, mental,

moral and religious matters when one lacks the power of demonstration or to see what is demonstrable, that he work with the probable and credible until he is led on to the demonstrable and the demonstrated. The sinner with excellent results does this as he starts out to feel after God; and if his heart proves true, he will by and by reach a state in which what before was unclear becomes demonstrated and demonstrable by experience, which gives him certainty that he is dealing with realities in his contacts with God. Nor can the millions who have passed over this road of experience and found the way out of "the dark depths of a wild and tangled forest" to the "other side," to which Mr. Huxley never found himself able to come, allow themselves to accept Mr. Huxley's proposition, which they see cannot bring them to "the other side."

Not only in the practical concerns of life which must be met without being demonstrated and demonstrable, does Mr. Huxley's negative principle find itself impractical and unadaptable, but it has this defect in it, that it gives us and can give us no criterion as to what is demonstrated or demonstrable, for with the individual reason as the source and rule of knowledge, what is demonstrated or demonstrable to one is not such to another. General reason is abstract. It is the composite idea of the intuitions that are common to normal individuals. Therefore it has no concrete existence except as an idea. What actually exists is individual reason. But because of the varying degrees of hereditary imperfections the abilities of individual reason greatly vary, and that in imperfection. Moreover, these differences are further modified by environment and training. Consequently in individuals individual reason varies greatly in insufficiency as the source and rule of knowledge. Hence individual reason necessarily varies in almost all individuals. This raises the question, If reason alone is to be the source and rule of knowledge, whose reason is it to be? The reply,

of course, must prove that no man's can it be. But apart from an idea reason in the abstract does not exist. In the concrete it is always individual. Hence we see that Mr. Huxley holds up to us a guide that is an impossible one. Surely this consideration should lead us to discredit Mr. Huxley's views on agnosticism.

Mr. Huxley's individual reason is certainly not the one for us to take as reason, because it led him to reject as not demonstrated and not demonstrable some propositions that the reason of all normal persons—those who are not in head or heart degenerate or abnormal—tells them is demonstrated and demonstrable—*e.g.*, the existence of God. Furthermore, he himself admitted that his own reason never led him into a certain view on the being of God and on existence in general. The reason of others makes them certain that their congenital intuitions are right in implying that there is a God. Their reason, led by its intuition of cause and effect, makes them certain that there must be a first Cause, which is therefore causeless and hence eternal. Their reason makes them certain that the almost infinite expressions of intelligence, adaptation and design in the universe imply that that first Cause is intelligent and purposeful and hence is endowed with personality. Their reason, led by the intuitions of conscience and veneration, congenitally universal, makes them certain that there is a God. And the reason of multitudes, led by their intuitions of contact with God in their most intimate relations and experiences, makes them certain that there is a God. Their reason, led by their intuitions of consciousness of God, makes them certain that there is a God. And certainly some of them by using their reason on the Biblical solution of God, man and the universe, have obtained a solution of these in themselves and their mutual relations that no sophistries of individual reason alone can refute or find a flaw in.

We ask, whose reason, as to what is demonstrated or demonstrable, should we follow, since individual reason, left entirely to itself, is almost as diverse as there are individuals who use it? Should not the fact of this diversity move us to the reasonable conclusion that unaided reason cannot in man's present imperfect condition be accepted as a sufficient and satisfactory guide? And should this fact not move us to be open to help from other sources than unaided reason? Since heredity, environment and training make reason in many cases approach a subject with wrong and insufficient data and presuppositions, how could we be sure of what is demonstrated or demonstrable by fallen individual reason? Is it not therefore, if certainty is to be reached, reasonable to expect from an infallible and benevolent Power, if such exists, the aid so desperately needed by unaided individual reason? If not, then the quest for Truth is vain; and we will always have to remain with Mr. Huxley in the "dark depths of a wild and tangled forest" doomed "never to find the way out." If such outside aid does come to reason, we may be sure that it does not stultify our God-given reason, as the creeds do, but completely satisfies it by supplying just what it lacks and then lets it test such supplies with every intuition and other power that it has and comes out of the test fully satisfactory to reason. This the writer desires to give as his personal experience in the use of his reason on Biblical data, which, under as thorough and searching a test as he could apply, have always proven themselves both reasonable and complementary of what his reason has lacked. So we say in real friendliness and good will to our troubled agnostics: Come with us and see whether the Bible does not supply the reasonable solution of God's being and of the problem of existence, which the word *agnosticism* itself implies it cannot of itself attain. Many agnostics to their head's and heart's blessing have found it to give that solution. And, approached in the

right spirit, it will always so do; for He who alone had an infallible reason said of such: "Him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out" (John 6: 37).

Another evil that is associated with Mr. Huxley's negative principle of agnosticism—"in matters of intellect do not pretend that conclusions are certain which are not demonstrated or demonstrable"—is its practical outcome: it always leads into the miasmatic swamp of unbelief. Never has there been an agnostic who, given time enough, did not advance from the proposition: God's existence cannot be known, to the proposition, I do not believe in God's existence. Such retrogression lies, not accidentally, but essentially in a long abiding in agnosticism. Hence every thoroughgoing agnostic became an unbeliever in the God of the Bible. Messrs. Huxley, Spencer and Ingersoll are familiar examples of this fact. Accordingly, agnosticism is not a helper Bibleward, but is a turner away therefrom and is in practice essentially anti-religious. It, therefore, creates a condition that makes it unlikely that one will get the help that his reason needs to supplement its lacks; and it draws one away from the congenitally created quality—faith—indispensable for an approach to God and Truth on God's existence and the problem of being. And this (unbelief, irreligiousness) is the greatest evil that it inflicts on its votaries, whom, like the man that fell among thieves, it strips, wounds and leaves half dead, without encouraging, but seeking to prevent, the good Samaritan to come to their succor. This evil alone, apart from any other consideration, makes it a culprit at the bar of Divine and human justice. And with this remark we leave the Huxleyan form of agnosticism as an unsatisfactory theory.

We would now devote our attention to Mr. Spencer's form of agnosticism. Mr. Spencer's agnosticism may be summed up in the following statement of his: "The Power that the universe manifests to us is utterly

inscrutable." He thus admits that there is a Power back of the universe which the universe manifests to us. Thus he advances from the Huxleyan incomprehensible universe to a Power to which incomprehensibility is attributed. Moreover, Mr. Spencer holds that religiousness is an essential constituent of man's nature; and therefore he accepts the reality of its object—a higher Power, however inscrutable. So far we can walk hand in hand with Mr. Spencer. But Mr. Spencer then says that religion has erred in ascribing anything except existence and inscrutability to this Power. Therefore, he denies personality to this Power, claiming that thought can never reach the reality back of phenomena. This would mean that because God is the First Cause, the Infinite and the Absolute, He cannot be known. Mr. Spencer puts it like this: "Though the Absolute cannot in any manner or degree be known, in the strict sense of knowing, yet we find that its positive existence is a necessary datum of consciousness; that so long as consciousness continues we cannot for an instant rid it of this datum, and that thus the belief which the datum constitutes has a higher warrant than any other whatever." These words prove that his agnosticism is not irreligious, though unchristian. Indeed his position is that religion always has been, is and will be necessary to man's nature, though he claims that in all forms it is as near an approximation to Truth as man's imperfection will allow, none of its forms (hence, the Bible's form of religion) being the real and full Truth. Therefore, Mr. Spencer would tolerate all religions as attainments needed by the condition of their respective votaries. Mr. Spencer's and Mr. Huxley's agnosticism differ in this: whereas the latter insists on the limitation of our faculties, the former insists on the transcendent nature of the Object of religion. Yet they come to the same conclusion—it is impossible for man to know God.

We would not quarrel with Mr. Spencer if, when he speaks of God as inscrutable, he means that we cannot fully comprehend God; for we certainly do not comprehend His nature. We know not the shape of His body, the sound of His voice (John 5: 37), nor do we know the substance or substances of which His body consists. The Bible teaches that our knowledge of Him, instead of being complete, is decidedly piecemeal (1 Cor. 13: 12). The heights and depths, the lengths and breadths of His qualities are beyond our power of comprehension. With the Psalmist we must confess that these are too much and too wonderful for us. The following passages prove this thought abundantly: Job 5: 8, 9; 26: 14; 11: 7-9; 37: 23; 1 Cor. 2: 16; Ps. 139: 6; 145: 3; Eccl. 11: 5; Is. 40: 28; Eph. 3: 8. If our inability thoroughly to fathom God were the thing that Mr. Spencer affirms, we would say, Amen to his thought, as taught in the above-cited passages. But Mr. Spencer means more than this. He denies that we know or can know anything of this Great Power, except that It is the First Cause and is infinite and absolute. While many of the Lord's children have professed to know practically everything about God and have gone in this belief far beyond that which is written, and while Mr. Spencer's position conveys to them a needed rebuke, still to affirm that we know only of the existence of the Great Power and Its Infinity and Absoluteness is going too far in the other extreme. Mr. Spencer's error is basically the identification of two distinct propositions: (1) we do not and cannot know all about God; (2) we do not and cannot know anything about God. The first is true; the second is false, and is not to be allowed to be substituted for the first, as Mr. Spencer does.

Jesus taught us that God is a Spirit and frequently dwelt on many of His attributes of being and character, and on His relation to mankind and the world. Above we treated on God's attributes of being and

character, in which we cited multitudes of pertinent Scriptures. We can, therefore, see that Mr. Spencer's form of agnosticism denies very much of God as set forth in Scripture. It equally denies very much that we learn of Him from that other book that He has furnished us—nature, which is replete with thoughts of Him that are more than those of a great infinite and absolute Power. St. Paul tells us that His Eternal Deity, which includes personality, as well as power, are taught by nature (Rom. 1: 20). And the Psalmist tells us that the heavens declare the glory [the character, especially its wisdom, power, justice and love] of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork (Ps. 19: 1).

But what right has Mr. Spencer to limit our knowledge of God to His being an infinite and absolute Power? Surely neither our reason, nor nature, nor experience, nor the Bible, so limits our knowledge of Him. For our intuitions invest Him with personality, spirituality, omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence, as well as with benevolence and justice. In this nature also agrees; so does the Christian's experience and, assuredly, so also does the Bible. His only ground for so doing is his agnosticism—we cannot know any more of Him, or "It," as he would say. But why can we not? To this he has and can have no real answer, except that this is his belief. But others, with the intuitions of reason, the books of nature and Revelation and many experiences as their guarantees, affirm that they can and do know more of this Power than that. Certainly on such bases these have a better right to ascribe other attributes to that Power than he has to limit them as he does. He claims that there can be a higher mode of existence than that of personality and that our inability to grasp it is no proof against it, rather the reverse. This actually resolves itself into a mere evasion of the unanswerable arguments for God's personality given above. He thereby asks us to believe in a higher mode of existence than personality,

because we cannot conceive it. But the absurdity of such a position is evident; for it makes incomprehensibility a proof of truth. On this ground the incomprehensibility of transubstantiation would be a proof of its truth. The incomprehensibility of the creedal, as distinct from the Bible Trinity, would be a proof of its truth. The incomprehensibility of God's love and His providing for eternal torture would be a proof of the latter's truth. In other words, the inconceivability of any absurdity would be a proof of its truth, if Mr. Spencer's logic on this point were true.

It is a law of our thinking to ascribe personality to any cause that shows intelligence and design; and we do it because our minds are so constituted as to force us so to do. When we see intelligence and design in any human cause, our minds by their very nature cause us to ascribe personality to that human cause; and that same nature of our mind when we see a non-human cause that exhibits intelligence and design compels us to assign to that non-human cause personality. Hence only those thinkers who deny intelligence and design in the world can escape attributing personality to their source. But such a denial is first-class proof of the folly and unreasonableness of the deniers, and is corroborative proof of the truth of that which they deny. Hence, thinking according to the laws of our mind, which is the only way normal people can think, we are compelled to attribute personality to God. And this for normal thinking people refutes Mr. Spencer's view on God's personality.

We have examined the theories of the two main agnostics and have found their theories untenable; but additionally there is another form of agnosticism that denies that we can be sure of anything and that affirms that nothing can be known. But these theories are self-refutative; for if we can not be sure of anything, we can not be sure of the certainty of this theory, otherwise certainty would exist on that proposition.

Again, if we can know nothing, we can not know that we know nothing, since knowledge would exist on that proposition. Hence both of these agnostic theories are self-annihilative. We may therefore well leave the subject of agnosticism as a thing that hardly rises above quibbling with words, and whose fundamental thoughts when analyzed are found to be quite inconsistent, illogical, fruitless and negative.

So far in studying false views of God we have considered atheism, materialism and agnosticism. These more or less seek to set aside the existence of God. As to agnosticism, its influence has been decidedly favorable as an impetus to atheism. Mr. Huxley drew his principles largely from atheistic views, while Mr. Spencer drew his more from pantheistic theories. The word *pantheism*, like the words *atheism* and *agnosticism*, is a Greek derivative. It is compounded—from the words *pan* (all) and *theos* (God). Etymologically it means *all—god*. It is used to designate the theory that everything is God, *i.e.*, God is the sum total of all things. God and the universe, in the sense of all things, according to pantheism, mean the same thing. Each and every thing is a part of God. Accordingly, the planets and suns of all solar systems and whatever is in, or connected with them are God.

The inventor of pantheism in Christendom was Baruch Spinoza, a Jew, who was born in 1632 and died in 1677 and who while a young man for his unorthodox opinions was excommunicated from Jewry. While he claimed to accept both the Old and New Testaments, this was with reservations very much like those of our modern higher critics, whose father he might with propriety be called. Pantheism underlies Buddhism and Hindooism; and Averroes, the greatest philosopher of Mohammedanism, was a pantheist. It, therefore, is a plant foreign to Christian soil and is in violent opposition to the Biblical view of God. Casting away our glance from its heathen and Mohammedan

forms, we will view it as it appears in Christendom; though we may say to the credit of the Nominal Church that it never sanctioned it; nor has orthodox Jewry ever approved it. Its theory is, therefore, contrary to the views of God entertained by both fleshly and spiritual Israel. Spinoza as a philosopher sought to reduce all things to a single substance in order to attain, as he thought, to simplicity in philosophical thought. This one substance he called God, and claimed that He or it has two attributes: extension and thought. This one substance is the whole of being, and as such is God, whose irreducible attributes are extension and thought. Some pantheists look upon this one substance as spiritual and some consider it as material; but most of them evade a definition of it as one or the other—a fact which greatly militates against their doctrine that there is but one substance.

Their view compels them to deny the personality of God and even that of man, since they claim that the all—their God—is a numerical unity. Humans they teach have no individuality and therefore no personality. They also deny to their God the possession of intelligence. Their view denies, not only God's personality and intelligence, but in consequence of that denial, as well as of the nature of their view, it also denies His freedom of will and also man's freedom of will. Defining God as all, of course nothing outside of Him could affect the kind of freedom they ascribe to Him; for nothing, according to their view, is outside of Him—all things being parts of Him. They claim that He is free because He acts out the law of His being and therefore has no liberty of choice, but does what He does from the necessity of His essence, the essence of the universe. Hence blind necessitarianism, not free choice, is His freedom, which is no freedom of will, since the latter implies liberty to choose or reject this, that or the other thing. This same necessitarianism makes man do as he does; hence he has no free will.

As a result, they also deny moral responsibility in man and consequently affirm that the good and bad acts, motives, thoughts and words of men are alike God's, since men are parts, in fact the highest modes, of God. Consequently they make no difference between good and evil as qualities, except that they may have pleasant or unpleasant effects as between man and man. Such is a brief explanation of pantheism as a theory of God, which, as unbiblical, unreasonable and unfactual, we reject. We will now proceed to a refutation of this false view of God, as we have of other such views.

First of all, we hold against it that it is merely an unproved supposition. Contrary to the facts that we gave it our discussion of materialism, it denies that there are two substances, spirit and matter, and posits but one substance: some claiming it to be spirit, others matter and most of them evading a decision as to what it is. This condition is the factual refutation of their claim that substance is a numerical unity. Their desire that there be but one substance, so as to make it easier and pleasanter for them to think on the philosophy of being, of course cannot be accepted as proof of the truth of their foundation principle. Self-evident principles may in an argument be assumed without proof; but not so may we do with principles that are not self-evident, as in the case under discussion. For principles that are not self-evident we are warranted in demanding proof; and none has ever been offered for their foundation principle. It is therefore an unproved supposition set up against the proposition that there is a personal God, which has many cogent proofs in its favor, while this contradiction of it has none in its favor, it being nothing more than a mere proofless assumption—guess; which as thinkers we should reject.

Furthermore, not only is its foundation principle, that there is but one substance, an unproved guess; but the theory that all is God, built upon that supposition,

is also a supposition for which not one proof has been forthcoming. How do they know that the universe is God? To know such a thing one must be omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient, and from the exercise of these qualities be able to say with knowledge of all facts and all existence that nothing else except the universe and its belongings are God. Of course no pantheist has these attributes and therefore cannot have the knowledge that proves the universe and its belongings to be God. Their denial of will as the power of choice, *i.e.*, will in the true sense of the word, is equally unprovable. The same thing may be said of their denial of intelligence in God. The universe is replete with proofs of the contrary of these two denials. Thus, too, they can advance no proof that we are not individuals and that we do not have personal wills. What proof can they offer for their mischievous thought that there are no such differences as virtue and vice, good and bad? Yet there are views that logically flow from their groundless assumptions that there is but one substance and that all is God. Given these unproven assumptions and the rest of their errors logically follow. Should we not rather reason that assumptions that carry with them such erroneous consequences must themselves be thoroughly erroneous?

The opposites of their assumptions and implied conclusions are proven to be true. The underlying principle of pantheism, that there is but one substance, is contrary to facts. Experience and observation prove that there are two substances: spirit and matter. We instance the undoubted facts of spiritistic phenomena in innumerable cases proven beyond doubt by being subjected to the severest scientific tests on the part of such scientists as Sir Oliver Lodge and Professors Hyslop and Lombardo, as proofs of the reality of spirit beings. The existence of spirit substances like life-principle and ether are other proofs of the reality

of spirit substances, while the objects palpable to sense about us are proofs of the existence of material substances. These facts destroy the fundamental assumption of pantheism, that all substance is one. Moreover, the fact that no thought is possible in the animal creation without the union of the spiritual substance called life-principle and an organized material organism (since unconsciousness always is in, and follows on their separation), is another proof that there are two substance realms: spirit and matter. Thus facts prove that the foundation principle of pantheism is an unfactual supposition, instead of being a self-evident truth. This, of course, refutes the entire theory; for it leaves it without a foundation upon which it may rest its unsteady feet.

Their view that God, being identical with the universe, is inseparable from the universe, is also unfactual; for this implies that He made Himself, *i.e.*, the universe. If anything is scientifically true, it is the proposition that a cause precedes, produces and is different from the effect. But here we find a theory that identifies cause and effect, which implies that nothing produced everything, and that it acted before it existed and existed before it existed. The formula of pantheists, set forth in their Latin expression, *natura naturans et natura naturata, i.e., nature making nature and nature made nature*, as an attempt to explain the being of their God, is as remarkable a piece of nonsense as can be found in the whole realm of philosophy falsely so-called. This formula in ultimate analysis implies that nothing made everything, and that a thing existed before it existed. The proofs from facts that we gave above for God's eternal existence, His personality, His independence of, and activity in the universe—all contradict the view that the impersonal universe is God. Innumerable facts of nature prove His exercise of volition and therefore contradict the assumption of His having no power of

choice. The facts of our consciousness and experience prove the personality of humans; for our self-consciousness is the primary fact of our knowledge and of our relations to others and the universe.

And the same kind of facts proves our having the power to choose—ability to exercise volition. The same kind of facts plus our consciences prove the actuality of moral responsibility and the worldwide difference between the good and the bad, the virtuous and the vicious, which pantheism with its all-God must deny on pain of making its God sinful. Hence, since facts disprove the main superstructural principles, as well as the foundation principle of pantheism, it must be a wrong theory of God; for there is not one single fact that proves this theory, which, accordingly, is nothing more than a baseless assumption. Of course if we should concede their two main principles, that all substance is a numerical unit and that it is God, we would have to concede their other principles; but principles having such consequent principles as these two have cannot be true, and of course only a most careless opponent of pantheism would concede these two unproven and unprovable principles, so violently contradicted by all the pertinent facts.

Again, this theory makes God an errorist and sinner. If everything is God, then we, as pantheists hold, are parts or "modes" of God. Therefore, when we think, it is not we (who according to the theory have no personal and independent existence) who think, but it is God who thinks. Hence God thinks all the errors that have been among men from mankind's beginning until now; and He will continue to think all future errors! This implies His contradicting Himself as often as men contradict one another. This makes Him think out and palm off all the false religions and contradictory creeds of the past and present. This makes Him the inventor of all the contradictory theories of philosophy, science, art, literature and sociology,

from the beginning of these to the present, as well as future ones. This also makes Him the inventor of everything true in religious, philosophical, scientific, literary and sociological theories. Hence He is a mixed God, not perfectly inerrant, but a muddler, who hits and misses the truth and who hits and misses error, a vast giant wandering through the realm of thought, usually erring and sometimes gaining a glimpse of truth, but never attaining the full truth on any one subject. What a sham God of sham truth is the pantheists' God; for He is the greatest conceivable intellectual muddle and self-contradiction!

But the matter is worse yet when we come to the realms of moral and religious motives and acts. It is really God, according to pantheism, who worships and serves the gods of polytheism, pantheism, deism and theism, as well as abhors these gods in atheists, materialists and agnostics! It is really God who offered the human sacrifices that have defiled heathen altars, including the horrors of Moloch worship! It is really God who engages in the senseless and injurious rites of false religions! It is really God who prostrates Himself before the idols of heathenism and Christendom! It is really God who engages in the various rites of self-expiation to Himself in heathenism and Christendom! It is really God who takes His name in vain in the perjuries, blasphemies, sorceries and profanities of men! It is really God who exercises the unbeliefs in Himself rife among mankind! It is really God who disobeys and disrespects Himself in the disobedience and disrespect that children give their parents! It is really God who murders Himself in the human murders and devastates and kills Himself in the wars and executions among mankind! It is really God who commits adultery, and that with Himself, in the marital infidelities among mankind! It is really God who hates, scorns, despises, envies, cherishes resentment, revenge and implacability, and that toward

Himself, in the pertinent acts of His human "modes"! It is really God who steals, defrauds, cheats, counterfeits, forges, plunders, swindles, and that against Himself, in the pertinent acts of His human "modes"! It is really God who misrepresents, defames, slanders, falsifies and deceives in the pertinent acts of mankind! It is really God who exercises covetousness, avariciousness, miserliness in the self-seeking! It is really God who indulges in drunkenness, gluttony, narcotic drugs, laziness, pride, vanity, cowardice, hypocrisy and temper, in the pertinent acts of His human modes! In a word, it is the God of pantheism who has been indulging in the terrible list of sins mentioned by St. Paul in Rom. 1: 29-31; for if humans are merely modes of God, parts of God, God in them does all the wickedness that they do. What an abominable God the God of the pantheist is! He is even worse than the gods of Greek mythology; for with all their shortcomings, they were rather decent gods compared with the God of pantheism. Certainly, such an erroneous and sinful God as the God of pantheism is one repulsive to our Christian moral and religious sentiments and we would have none of Him as a God, because of His ungodlike thoughts, motives, words and acts.

Another argument against pantheism is its degradation of man. We have just seen that it degrades God. We now proceed to show that it degrades man. It degrades him by denying personality to him; for, according to it, men are not individuals who, as such, are separate and distinct from one another, and, as such, have self-consciousness, as well as consciousness of others. Man, according to pantheism, is only a mode or part of the non-self-conscious universe. This results in negating much of man's knowledge, *e.g.*, self-knowledge and knowledge of others as separate and distinct. Pantheism also degrades man's moral powers through its denial of his freedom of choice. According to it, the good man acts, feels and speaks

according to an irresistible principle which makes him act, feel and speak the good he does. This of course robs him of all real moral power, which expresses itself in its choosing the good from an appreciation of its intrinsic worth and rejecting the bad because of an abhorrence of its intrinsic worthlessness. Again, it makes guiltless the vilest of sinners, because it denies him freedom of choice and ascribes to him the natural enslavement of his motives, words and acts, and the compulsory character of these expressing itself as it does, makes the wicked characterless automatons who perforce do evil. Accordingly, it makes automatons of both the good and the wicked and thus degrades mankind to the condition of the brute creation. Of course: for does not this theory make them all alike so many modes of their God, parts of their God?

Furthermore, this degradation is religious, as well as mental and moral. Of course such a theory makes man a religious automaton and, according to it, there can be no virtuous difference between religionists and religionists. Religiously, the saintly person is of no more worth than the most depraved fetish worshiper—each is forced to religionize as he does, without being able to exercise choice in the matter at all. But in a fuller sense pantheism degrades one religiously; for it makes him incapable of exercising Godward some of the highest religious faculties of the human heart. Its identification of God and nature works ruinously on some of the religious qualities of man. The one idea of pantheists flowing from the consideration of nature is that of power. Nature is replete with evidence of power. Its lack of personality and the manifestations of the curse make it seem to the natural man to lack decidedly in wisdom, justice and love, though vestiges of these can be seen in nature about man; but under the limitation and conditions of the curse these are to the natural man poverty-stricken. Accordingly, the pantheist offers us power in God as the object of the

religious feelings. Certainly the God of pantheism, *nature*, does not call forth the exercise of devotion, sacrifice and disinterested love; for what is there in power to call these forth in our hearts? Power, therefore, of itself does not so act on such of our religious faculties. Nor does it arouse gratitude in us; for there is nothing to be grateful to and for. It is powerless to effect in us the desire of intimate fellowship and communion with such a God; for He offers us no basis of fellowship and communion; for these can go out only to a person, which the pantheists' God is not. Nor can it give us the sense of reverence; though it can, and often does, arouse in us the feeling of fear and dread. Again, such a God cannot arouse in us the sense of duty-love to God, which also requires personality in the one toward whom it expresses itself as a God. Accordingly, failing to call forth the highest religious qualities and to develop them, its effect on man religiously is not of an uplifting, but a degrading character. All of its religious tendency, therefore, at its best is on a very low level and at its worst is almost as bad as atheism and materialism.

If we look at the religious qualities that it can arouse by the sense of power that it impresses, we will readily see that it cannot raise man very high religiously. What are the feelings in us that go out toward power? One of the finest of these is admiration, which does go out to those of its expressions that do not harm the observer of power's phenomena. But this is as much an aesthetic as a religious feeling. Wonder is another of the feelings that the sense of power can arouse. Others are awe and sublimity. But all of these are mainly artistic emotions and may be felt apart from any religious sentiment. When power is exercised to our injury it naturally arouses fear and terror, which certainly are not religious feelings in the true sense of the word, according to the express statement of Holy Scripture (1 Tim. 1: 5), with which

statement certainly our Christian experiences are in harmony. Certainly mere power of an impersonal character will not lead to worship and adoration, which requires a person as their object. We can exercise a certain phase of hope and faith toward certain manifestations of power; but if their source is impersonal such a hope and faith fall far short of the hope and faith that true Christians experience. Even such a low degree of faith and hope the atheist can and does exercise. In fact, the atheist and pantheist hold the same notion of the power that is in the world; only the atheist does not stultify himself by calling it God, as the pantheist does. If the pantheist divests himself of every iota of theism, which in practice he holds, then there is no difference between him and the atheist, except in words. While contemplating the universe the atheist feels the same admiration, wonder, awe, sublimity, fear, terror, hope and faith, as does the pantheist in the contemplation of the universe—the pantheists' God. On the other hand, the true child of God, with the theistic belief, gives the aroma of religiousness to the above feelings, and additionally exercises worship, adoration, devotion, consecration, disinterested and duty love, fellowship and cheerful obedience to the Biblical God on account of His personality, and thereby reaches the highest degree of religious development, from which, of course, the pantheist's faith cuts him off.

Pantheism is false because it teaches that the All is a numerical unity. Modern pantheists, like Haeckel, Carus, Hoeffding, Forel, etc., are wont to call themselves *monists* and their theory *monism*; but they mean by it exactly what former pantheists meant by *pantheism*. Carus, speaking of it, says that it "means that the whole of reality, that is everything that is, constitutes one inseparable and indivisible entirety. Monism accordingly is a unitary conception of the world. ... The *All* being one interconnected whole,

everything in it, every feature of it, every relation among its parts, has sense and meaning and reality only if considered with reference to the rest of the world and to the whole itself. In this sense we say that monism [pantheism] is a view of the world as a unity." This language proves that pantheists hold that the All is a *numerical* unity; for they claim that only the whole is a reality and that its parts, considered separately, are only abstractions, mental ideas, but not realities. A numerical unity cannot have within itself differences of kind; for these would make it a duality or plurality of realities, which pantheism denies. But such a theory of the All as being a numerical unity that has in itself no differences in kind contradicts every known fact of existence. This contradicts the known facts of physics, which proves that matter varies in molecules, atoms and electrons. It contradicts chemistry, which classifies chemical elements into at least ninety-two kinds. It contradicts astronomy, which not only differentiates billions of suns and tens of billions of planets from one another, but also billions of solar systems from one another. It contradicts biology, which differentiates genera from genera and species from species throughout the animal, insect and bird world. It contradicts geology, which differentiates earth's strata, fossils, etc.; and mineralogy, which does the same with earth's minerals. It contradicts physiology, which differentiates the various elements of our bodies. It contradicts dendrology, which differentiates trees. It contradicts botany, which differentiates flowers and plants. It contradicts carpology, which differentiates the fruits and vegetables. It contradicts anthropology, which differentiates human individuals, as well as races and nations, from one another. It contradicts medicine, which differentiates remedies from one another. It contradicts psychology, which differentiates the minds of individuals, all having as the faculties of mind intellect, sensibilities and will.

It contradicts phrenology, which differentiates the various organs of the brain. It contradicts ethics, which differentiates between the good and evil. It contradicts theology as the doctrine of God in distinction from all His creatures. In a word, it contradicts the facts of every science, everyone of which proves, and that by observation and the mind's intuitions, the separateness and distinctness of being in the various spheres of existence. It contradicts the intuitions of the mind, which differentiate self, world and God from one another. Therefore pantheism, or to use its more modern name, monism, is a theory contradictory of every realm of knowledge based on reason, sense and intuition; for according to all realms of knowledge the world is an aggregation of individual things, more or less related, and not a numerical unit; since manifoldness is the voice of all creation and not a numerical unity. This proves that pantheism is a false view of God and the world and man.

The doctrine of pantheism intrinsically contains not a few absurdities, which of course make it unworthy of acceptance. According to it all is God and God created all. This analyzed proves that God made Himself; hence He must have existed before He came into existence; for a cause precedes its effect. This is further absurd, because it implies that the first cause was not causeless. But denying His personality denies that He could have created all; for existing before creation He must have been personal to bring it into existence; since it is replete with expressions of personality—wisdom, power, purpose, beneficence and justice. Hence these being in the effect must have been in the cause and they imply personality. Their doctrine of nature making nature (*natura naturans*) is absurd, because it implies the existence of the thing made before it was made, and while it was so non-existent it busied itself creatively on itself. Why nothing was the product of this non-existent

creator, we cannot figure out, nor, we opine, can pantheists. As an absurdity this one surely is worthy of the chief booby prize and deserves for its holder the high seat in the schoolroom's corner, with the dunce cap on his head and his back turned toward the school and teacher. To deny personality to man when man has the very things that constitute personality—self-consciousness and others-consciousness, which all sentient beings have, is certainly a transparent absurdity. To assert, as pantheism does, that man, considered as a part of the all, is a mere abstraction and not a reality, is another absurdity, since abstractions are only ideas, while it takes real existent and sentient beings to feel, know and will, as man does. To assert that there is no real difference or differing worth between good and evil, the saint and the sinner, is not only intellectually absurd, but is as morally absurd as it is morally mischievous. These considerations prove pantheism to be as absurd as it is untrue.

Another argument against pantheism is its insufficiency to explain the involved phenomena that it professes to explain. Its explanation of the nature of God is insufficient to account for His existence and work; in fact it explains neither. Its making Him His own Creator is insufficient to explain either Himself or His creation. Its denial of personality to Him leaves Him as an abstraction before our mind and an incompetent and insufficient originator of all things. Explaining Him to be the universe and the universe to be Him leaves both unexplained to us. Positing a numerical unity for the universe as against the unity of a systematic aggregation of diverse individual things, and reducing all the parts of this universe separately considered to mere abstractions, ideas, neither explains the universe nor its real parts; but does reduce the universe to mere abstractions, ideas, since, if all its parts are abstractions its whole of necessity is such. Doubtless it was for this very reason that

the leading pantheistic philosophers of the nineteenth century, like Fichte, Schelling, Jacobi, Hegel, etc., were idealists, *i.e.*, those who held that not real entities but only ideas exist, *e.g.*, what we see about us are not realities but figments of our minds. Finally, the denial of man's personality and his liberty to choose cannot explain man in his nature, structure, qualities and activities toward himself, his fellows, the universe and God. Accordingly, pantheism is a stupendous failure as an explanation of the problem of God, the universe and man. Hence it is a discreditable and discredited theory that soon will be cast away onto the rubbish pile of outgrown and outworn speculations.

Thus reason and facts are in most violent opposition to pantheism. To the true Christian, steeped in the Spirit of God and having intimate union and communion with God, not only in prayer and contemplation, but in the varied experiences and providences of his life, pantheism has not only the above considerations against it, but the facts of his personal and intimate life are to him a most striking contradiction of it. The marvelous enlightenment that he receives from God and that satisfies his head and heart refutes for him this theory. His experiences in justification deepen this refutation. His experiences in sanctification, especially his new-creaturely experiences in the developing of God's Spirit in Him and in its contacts with God heighten to him this refutation. And finally, his experiences in deliverance composed of his rescues by the Lord from Satanic traps and of his victories over sin, error, selfishness and worldliness in his battles under God's directions against the devil, the world and the flesh, widen this refutation, so that to him pantheism appears in the light of Scriptures, reason and fact to be a demonstrated false view of God, in proof of whose falsity everything within him, about him and connected with him, others and the world, prevails with unanswerable power and demonstration.

Our previous examination of false views of God has brought before our view: atheism, materialism, agnosticism and pantheism, all of which deny the existence of a personal God. In this particular deism differs from them in that it accepts the idea of a personal God. Deism stands for three views that are opposed to Christianity, each one of which we should examine in these discussions. Deism stands for a false view of God, of man and of the hereafter; that is to say, those who hold to the false view of God that is espoused by deists also entertain as a part of their view of God a false view of man and of the hereafter. It is because the errors on these two subjects are derived from the deist's false view of God that properly to understand the deist's view of God we must also understand his related view of man and the hereafter. Accordingly, these three phases of deism call for a review, if the deistic system is to be understood and properly appraised. We will discuss these three in the order named.

First, then, a study of deism's view of God and a refutation of it will engage our attention. The deist confidently asserts the personality of God and to his claim on this head we respond with a hearty amen. He by preference refers to this great Person as the Great First Cause; and on this point we can also grasp his hand in harmony. And by that appellation he properly asserts God's eternity and His separateness from creation; and on these points we also agree. He loves to expatiate on the numerous evidences of design, wisdom, power and beneficence as these are manifest on all hands in nature. And in this we are glad to own him as right. Accordingly, the deist believes in God as a great, mighty, wise and loving personal Creator, who, they say (here we must begin to dissent), made everything perfect and subjected everything to the sway of perfect laws and then left His creative work as a perfect thing to take care of itself without any further

interposition from Him. According to deism it would be wholly superfluous for God to occupy Himself any more with His creation; for, they allege, having made it perfect and subjected it to the reign of the perfect laws of nature, it no more needs, and therefore no more receives, any attention from Him. He has, according to deism, shut Himself off from His works, not only as something distinct from Himself, but also as something with which He is forever done, and therefore as something with which He neither needs, nor does concern Himself. He is like the watchmaker who, having made a good watch out of good materials and in workmanship manner, on selling it, winds it up and says to it, Good-bye forever. This is in brief the deist's view of God, who therefore is not only absolutely separate, but also absolutely separated from the world in the fullest sense of the word.

As we contemplate this view of God, we find it quite good up to the place where creation is claimed to be perfect and therefore is no more a concern of God. From there on we find it lacking. Our first objection to it, then, is this: It teaches that creation is perfect, while the Bible, reason and facts are to the contrary. This earth is a part of creation; but while the Bible teaches it will sometime be perfect—when the whole earth will be a paradise (Ezek. 36: 30, 34-36; Is. 35: 1, 2; 65: 21-35)—it distinctly teaches that both the earth and its animate beings are imperfect (Gen. 3: 17-19; Rom. 8: 19-22). A little consideration will show that facts are in harmony with these Scriptures. Certainly, the vast barren parts of the earth, like the deserts of Sahara, Gobi, Arabia, America, etc., are far from perfection. The vast ice fields of Arctica and Antarctica present a very imperfect part of the earth to our view. The vast swamps and marshes of the tropics and of some sections of the temperate zone do not strike the thinking mind as parts of perfection. The prevalence of disease-creating conditions in a

large part of the earth, directly due to the condition of the pertinent parts of the earth, their climate, and their atmosphere, do not agree with the thought of nature being perfect. Then, when we see the vast evidence of physical, mental, moral and religious imperfection among mankind, and the still greater evidence of imperfection in beast, fowl, insect, reptile and fish, we must concede to nature's being far from perfect in these respects. The earthquakes, volcanoes, droughts, famines, explosions, pests, blights, diseases, pestilences, tornadoes and tidal waves are another indictment of the doctrine of nature's perfection. Certainly, the monstrosities of some births, the selfish struggle for existence and the rule of might prevalent throughout nature, justify our questioning this doctrine. So far as we know, by reasoning from analogy, apart from God's and the angels' abode, the planets of our solar system and the planets of all other solar systems are, like ours, far from perfect.

To the objection that our understanding implies that the Creator's work is imperfect, we answer: Yes and no. That part of His creative work which is completed is doubtless without flaw (Deut. 32: 4). But, so far as our knowledge goes, there is as yet but one star in the universe wherein the Creator's work is completed—that star on which God and the angels dwell, and which God has promised, as heaven, to the Faithful. It would be as foolish to demand that we believe that God's incomplete work is perfect as it would be to require us to believe that a watchmaker's incompleting watch, an automobile-manufacturer's incompleting machine, or an electrician's incompleting dynamo, were perfect. No incomplete invention or creation can be perfect. The imperfections above pointed out in the earth and doubtless similar ones prevailing in other planets are present because the Creator's creative process is not yet complete in them. When such processes are complete this earth and they will be perfect,

as the Scriptures teach they will become. And there are hints in the Bible that Jesus and the saints will have as their eternal work the task of bringing one planet after another in the universe, with their inhabitants, to perfection (Rom. 8: 17; Is. 9: 7). This is quite a different prospect as to how the Faithful will spend eternity from that held out to us in hymn-book theology—"loafing about the Throne, killing time and playing on golden harps!"

But with matters viewed as above, we see at once on the one hand the unfactualness and unscripturalness of the deist's view of nature's perfection and on the other hand the factualness and Scripturalness of the Christian's view of nature and the appropriateness of Jesus' statement: Hitherto My Father worketh (John 5: 17), *i.e.*, the Father was working right along, even if He had temporarily ceased His creative work with the earth and man from the entrance of the curse up to the present, a cessation which will end with the Millennium. Consequently we say to the deist, Friend, "God's creative work with the universe and man is not yet complete; hence He cannot have withdrawn Himself from His work but partially done. His perfection argues that He must continue with His work until it is complete." If this be so, the entire viewpoint of the deist, both as to God's present relation to the universe and man and nature's perfection must be erroneous.

As the deist's view of God cuts Him off from all providential care of His creatures, we must also on this ground take issue with him. The very fact of an incomplete universe implies providential preservation exercised over its incompleting parts, that the past gains of the creative processes be not lost and that they may be maintained as a foundation for the remaining advancing stages of the creative processes. Furthermore, such preservation of past gains in the creative processes cannot be left solely in the hands of nature's laws, because nature's laws like all other laws are not

self-enforcing. There must be a ruler to order and enforce these; so that they are kept continually adjusted and re-adjusted in proper coordination and super-ordination and subordination to one another for the harmonious attainment of pre-designed results. Even man does to an extent manipulate laws of nature so as to bring about certain beneficial results, *e.g.*, electrical laws to produce light, heat, sound (in telephone and telegraph), etc., and radio laws to send us music and messages through the ether; and he can also manipulate these to produce disaster, *e.g.*, explosions, electrocutions, etc. And just as there is a continual adjustment on man's part of various natural laws required to insure such results, and a preservation of the operation of just such laws of nature as man desires to use; so the Creator must also act as the preserver and manipulator of nature's laws to keep them at work to produce His various designs throughout the universe. These facts further undermine the deist's view of God, according to which He is an absentee and unconcerned God. As little as it is possible for various laws of nature producing uniformly the beneficial or harmful results above indicated without man's manipulation of them, so little and much less is it possible for the laws of the universe to operate with their designed objects without the manipulation of a King, who must be infinitely more powerful and wise than the men who in very limited fields manipulate the laws of nature above referred to. Therefore, the Christian's view of God's providential preservation and control of nature's laws for the preservation and government of the universe, is seen to be reasonable, and this refutes deism from another standpoint of its creed.

The condition of the curse, in which both Scripture and facts prove man to be, creates the necessity of the intervention of a wise, just, loving and powerful Creator, lest man become utterly and eternally ruined. Hence the necessity of God's intervening, in order

both to show man a way out of his ruined condition and to help him avail himself of that way out. The former implies a Divine revelation, which the Christian believes he has in the Bible; and the latter implies a Divinely ordained and efficient Savior, whom the Christian believes God arranged for him to have in Jesus Christ, "the fairest of the children of men." But deism's absentee and unconcerned God in the nature of the case can give no Divine revelation nor send a Divinely appointed and efficient Savior, just because He can have nothing more to do with the works of His hand after bringing them into existence. Accordingly the deist denies the possibility of a Divine revelation on God's part, and as we shall see when we consider deism's view of man, he denies the necessity of such a revelation on man's part, claiming that man within himself has all the possibilities of saving himself. This consideration bares the inherent infidelistic character of deism. To his position we have several objections. A God like his who is so impotent as to be unable to communicate with His creatures surely must be too weak to have brought the universe into existence and to have put it under the reign of law. But if He was powerful enough to do the harder thing—create the universe and give it effective laws—certainly He must be powerful enough to be able to do an easier thing—to communicate with His intelligent beings. Again, if He was wise enough to plan and to produce the universe and work out laws for its preservation and government, He must be wise enough to plan and produce a communication of His Will to His creatures; for the latter is a less intricate thing than the former. Further, if He was beneficent enough to create man for man's happiness and well-being, as the deist claims, He must be beneficent enough to help man by a communication of ways and means to attain that happiness and well-being; for evidently the former was the more beneficent of the two. Accordingly,

from the nature of the Divine attributes that the deist claims that his God in creation had, we must conclude that the deist's idea of an absentee and unconcerned God is incompatible with his view of that God's attributes as these are displayed in His creative work. These considerations at once prove the reasonableness of a Divine revelation and the unreasonableness of the deist's denial of its possibility, viewed from the standpoint of his position on the attributes of God as displayed in creation.

A further consideration connected with the necessity of God's communicating His Will to man is found in man's evident inability to attain such needed knowledge as a Divine revelation could impart. We may as much as we please expatiate and that at great lengths on man's wonderful abilities, as the deist loves to do, and that even to excess; the stubborn fact yet remains that such knowledge is beyond man to attain by his own unaided powers. This is manifest from a number of considerations. The prevalence of so many mutually contradictory religions and of so many self-contradictory religions, each teaching a different theory of man's relation to God and of the securing of harmony with God, proves man's inability of his own powers to reason out a correct diagnosis of the condition of the race in relation to God and the way of salvation from his condition physically, mentally, morally and religiously. Not only so, but this is proven by the further fact that even with a Divine revelation—the Bible—in their hands, the vast majority of those who look upon that Bible as the Divine revelation misunderstand it, as is evident from the clashing creeds of Christendom, parts of which, like the creedal trinity, the God-man, etc., etc., etc., their adherents frankly admit they cannot understand. Man's inability to solve the problem of his relations to God and to amend them, makes necessary a Divine revelation, if such needed knowledge and accompanying help are to come

to man. But deism's God cannot give man this sorely needed knowledge, much less this sorely needed help. It cannot, therefore, be a view of God that can satisfy our head's exactions and our heart's needs as to a worth-while God.

Deism's absentee and unconcerned God makes the deist deny the possibility of the miraculous. His view of the laws of nature as being unchangeable because perfect, and his God's leaving everything to these laws of nature for management, make him deny the possibility of the miraculous. With this view the deist sweeps aside with one stroke the possibility of a Divine revelation and, therefore, also denies anything to be a Divine revelation that has the miraculous connected with it. This, of course, implies the deist's rejection of Christianity, which has much of the miraculous connected with it. We think this position of the deist is as untenable as his position on the perfection of the universe, on God as the Preserver and Governor of the universe that He has created and on the untenability of a possible Divine revelation. Having proven the possibility and necessity of a Divine revelation from the operations of the Divine power, wisdom and love and from the inability of men's heads and hearts, we have advanced a considerable distance on the journey in proof of the possibility of the miraculous. Against the claim of the deist we desire to state that miracles are not to be regarded as violations of the laws of nature. Their operation is along the lines of nature's laws controlled by knowledge. A hundred years ago it would have been said that it is contrary to the laws of nature for a man in New York to carry on a conversation with a man at Moscow and the defender of that proposition would refer to the curvature of the earth, the resistance of the atmosphere, etc., etc., as manifesting laws of nature contrary to the procedure. Now, we are able to do this both by telephone and by radio. We have learned to manipulate

certain laws of nature so as to supersede the operation of other laws of nature that were supposed to make impossible, as against the laws of nature, a man in New York conversing with a man in Moscow. The chemist and physicist are constantly using one law of nature to accomplish a thing that is under other conditions opposed by some other law of nature. And, thus, we have learned of a co-ordination, a super-ordination and a subordination among the laws of nature. And in this fact lies the possibility of the miraculous. God knows all about the working of the laws of nature in their co-ordination, super-ordination and subordination, and works the miraculous by acting along the lines of these three facts.

A few examples will suffice. Peter's mother-in-law had a fever. Fever in ultimate analysis is due to insufficiency of iron in the blood to resist some intruder. If that deficiency can be supplied to a sufficient degree the fever subsides. Jesus, whose miracles of healing were wrought by His taking out of His own body the thing that was deficient in the patient and putting that into the patient's body, thereby effecting the cure (Mark 5: 30; Luke 6: 19; 8: 46) in a way unknown to us, but known and enacted by Him, wrought the cure of the fever in Peter's mother-in-law, by giving her some of the iron in His body. The laws of nature turn the moisture and certain ingredients of the earth into sap. Other laws of nature produce therefrom grape blossoms, which in due course, by nature's laws, turn into luscious grapes. Their compressed juice is by other laws of nature turned into wine. But Jesus turned water into wine, not by violating these laws of nature, but by using certain of these in a way we do not understand to accomplish by one act what various laws of nature produce by a series of acts stretching over a considerable length of time. Again, it is a law of nature that each structure has its rate of vibration. It is another law of nature that if that same rate of

vibration acts sufficiently from the outside on that structure, the latter will break down. This accounts for many bridges in Switzerland breaking down when Napoleon's armies, while passing over them, kept step at a speed that produced the same rate of vibration as that of the bridges, which experiences resulted in a general order requiring the French soldiers to break step when crossing bridges. As a result no more bridges fell, though crossed by the same or larger numbers of men.

This fact enables us to understand several of the strangest miracles of the Bible—the fall of Jericho's walls by trumpet blasts and shouts, and the confounding of the host of Jehoshaphat's enemies by the songs of the temple singers. God, knowing the rate of vibration of Jericho's walls, had the priests blow the trumpets and the people shout at that same rate of vibration, which caused Jericho's walls to fall. Human brains under excitement of the war spirit have a certain rate of vibrations. God knew this rate as it existed in the host of Moabites, Ammonites and Edomites (2 Chro. 20: 14-25) and by having the temple singers produce sound of the same rate, the crazing of the opposing hosts set in; and in their insanity they destroyed one another. Scientists are just beginning to see the immense power shut up in an atom and are beginning to accomplish gigantic works of destruction by the concentrated application of the electrons of but one atom. God always knew this, and used this knowledge in the working of miracles. To those ignorant of the method, at times His miracles seemed to violate nature's laws. We feel confident that when science has sufficiently advanced in its knowledge of manipulating certain of nature's laws we will learn to explain every Biblical miracle along the lines of higher laws of nature displacing lower laws of nature and thus accomplishing the miracle. A miracle—the word means wonder—is such, not to God, but to man in his ignorance of the

process, which, though wrought by supernatural agents, worked along perfectly natural lines. We venture to say that there is scarcely a miracle set forth in the Bible that would have surprised its witnesses more than a man in New York conversing with a man in Moscow, or than a man by television seeing another man at a great distance with walls and other obstacles intervening. Why people living in the twentieth century, with all its scientific miracles, some of them as wonderful as many recorded in the Bible, should think Bible miracles impossible is one of the wonders, but not one of the miracles, of our times! Surely, we of all generations, seeing the wonders operated by manipulating certain laws of nature in the displacement of others, should not object to the miraculous.

On the contrary, as experience and observation prove, the co-ordination of some laws of nature to others, and the super-ordination and subordination of some laws of nature to others, with the result that usually the super-ordinated ones displace subordinated ones, so under manipulation subordinated ones at times overrule super-ordinated ones. We may be sure that man's manipulating such laws to secure the miracles of electricity, radio, steam and various rays, implies God's ability to perform more than such miracles. In the balloon and heavier-than-air planes we have splendid illustrations of how certain laws of nature under manipulation overcome the laws of gravity enough to allow man to attain immense heights. In diving suits and submarines, we see the manipulation of certain laws in ways to set aside the operation of other laws of nature. This principle is also manifest in the shooting of projectiles high into the air, yea, even in the lifting of a foot. If man in a variety of ways can thus manipulate the laws of nature so as to displace the operation of others for the purpose at hand, how much more could the Infinite Author of nature and nature's laws so manipulate them! Surely,

these considerations abundantly and satisfactorily dispose of the position of the deist on his absentee and unconcerned God being tied hand and foot by the laws of nature, when it comes to the miraculous. Let us, therefore, set aside the silly twaddle that superficially conjures up the supposed invariability of the laws of nature as a sure disproof of the miracles of the Bible.

This absentee and unconcerned deistical God certainly comes far short as a character developer and a piety producer in us. Such a God can arouse belief in His existence; but certainly not the kind of faith that trusts God as an unfailing Friend and Father, reliable Helper and Deliverer and steadfast Stay and Comforter. In the nature of such a God, tied hand and foot by nature's alleged unchangeable laws, we could not exercise hope in His interposing on our behalf in the changing and evil conditions that accompany more or less of our experiences; for He is a God who most leaves us in the lurch when we most need Him. The matter is still worse when we contemplate the inability of this God to draw out and develop our love. While He can elicit some of the minor features of duty-love from the standpoint of gratitude for His creative blessings, He is helpless to do this from the standpoint of providential, redemptive, instructional, justifying, sanctifying and delivering blessings, which develop duty-love to higher degrees than creative blessings can. But such a God can barely call forth even the lowest degrees of disinterested love and is helpless to do so in its higher degrees. Thus, He can fall forth very little of appreciation toward Himself, no sympathetic oneness and sacrifice. He is powerless to elicit from us whole-hearted consecration of ourselves to Him as a reasonable, wise, just and energetic service. As He is incapable to elicit such responses in us toward Himself, He cannot do it in us toward our Lord Jesus. Moreover, He is almost helpless to empower us out of devotion to Him to exercise duty-love, not to mention

disinterested love to the brethren, the world of mankind and our enemies. These are only the four main things in the truly godly life, wherein the deist's God breaks down as a real God. What shall we say as to His inequality to the task of developing in us other graces, like self-control, patience, humility, modesty, peace, joy, industry, longsuffering, forbearance, forgiveness, sincerity, liberality, self-denial, sacrifice, etc.? Here He suffers a darker eclipse than on the graces before considered. How could such a God draw out such a devotion toward Him as enlists all our time, strength, health, talents, means, position and influence, to enhance His Name? Surely, here is an utter breakdown in Him. And how could He strengthen us to suffer and die in His service? In all candor we would have to answer: Not at all! Hence, the deist's God is not the kind that we need, to live, serve and suffer aright; and hence He is not the kind of a God that fills the requirements of a satisfactory God for the Church or World.

Such a God is one who is not a prayer-heeding and prayer-answering God. This lies in the nature of an absentee and unconcerned God, as well as in the nature of a God who is tied hand and foot by alleged invariable laws of nature. Do our hearts crave and cry out for fellowship with Him as by their constitution they naturally do? The deist's God deigns not, nay, is incapable of entering into a relation with us, wherein He might heed and answer our prayers. Furthermore, His aloofness estranges us from Him so that we do not feel drawn toward Him in prayer; for a prayer-eliciting God must be powerful, approachable, sympathetic, kind, winsome—in a word He must be one who has the good will and the ability to help us. He must be gracious enough to invite us to approach Him for help, good enough to promise to give us a favorable hearing, kind enough to respond according to our needs, and wise enough to supply them aright and to

deny our whims, whose satisfaction would prove to the injury of others as well as ourselves. Such the deist's God cannot be. As a result deists do not pray; and why should they? Is their God not tied hand and foot by alleged perfect and invariable laws of nature? Assuredly they so teach and as a result do not come in prayer with petitions, believing Him too indifferent, far away and circumscribed to make favorable response. In other words, considered from every standpoint in which we look for God to be, the deist's God breaks down. He cannot be the God that corresponds to the deepest physical, mental, moral and religious needs of mankind; and therefore He cannot be mankind's God. As an all-around God He is a failure for human needs and aspirations, a misfit.

Contrast with such a God the God of the Bible, and the incomparable superiority of the true God as able to fulfill all man's needs is apparent. As a progressive, not a prestochango Creator, He stands forth, and that in harmony with all observed facts that the condition of the universe requires. He is the Preserver and Governor in His domain, though He temporarily permits, because of ultimate good coming therefrom, a rebellious and evil condition in a part of it. He made the laws of nature, but not so that they all work mechanically without the interrelations of co—ordination, super-ordination and subordination and not so that He is their ignorant slave, but that He is their intelligent Manipulator and Regulator. He has the power to communicate with man and does so through the Bible, His revelation. He is wise and powerful to use the laws of nature to accomplish His good will toward man. He is such a Being as elicits the good in mankind for character development, supplies the good mankind lacks and prompts Him to reformation. Moreover, He is so gracious as to invite man to approach Him in prayer, is able to supply his needs, promises to supply them and keeps His word of promise so to do. Hence

He is the kind of a God that we need and that all the universe needs. This proves His incomparable superiority to the deist's conceptions of a God.

Next in order let us consider the unsatisfactoriness of deism's view of Man and the Hereafter. This will dispose of the three tenets of deism which its advocates usually put as: God, Virtue and Immortality.

Foregoing we set forth deism's view of God and then refuted it from Scripture, reason and facts, and came to the conclusion from all three of these standpoints that the deist's God is a failure as a God for human needs. On every hand His deficiencies as a God stand out, and that to a degree that makes both head and heart turn from Him as unsatisfactory to both. His unsuitableness for the purposes of a God further becomes apparent when we consider deism's view of man as a creature of God; for man in his creation is perfect, according to deism; but this claim is as false as the deist's other claim that nature is perfect. This latter thought we sufficiently refuted above. As superficiality marks this latter thought, so does it also mark the thought that man is perfect. The deist has a too optimistic view of man. According to deism man is really good, both in head and heart. He intends well. There is really no root fault in man; at worst he lacks some in knowledge and is in some cases weak in good; but he is not really evil and corrupt, since his intentions are good and always would be realized had he in every case the necessary knowledge. Give him time enough, and he will develop into the highest heights of character. In the meantime, like a good-natured father, God looks upon his deficiencies as negligible, his ignorance as excusable and his faults, if he have any, as trivial, and therefore to be good-naturedly ignored. Therefore He does not hold him strictly to account, blaming not him, but his environment and training, for these blemishes, if they are such. But as to man's being radically evil—evil in

nature—the deist will have none of such a thought. The above brief sketch of deism's view of man is unscriptural, unreasonable and unfactual; accordingly it implies a gross defect in God, especially in justice, though also in power; and it is because of this defect that we discuss deism's view of man as a thing implying a defect in its view of God, and as therefore fathering a false view of God.

But before pointing out the erroneousness of this view of man, and thus of God, we would say something in extenuation of deism's view of man. This view of man was undoubtedly elaborated in antithesis to the view of total depravity, which especially Calvinism has championed. In these two views we meet two extremes, both of which are incorrect. Man by nature is neither so bad as Calvinism makes him out, nor so good as deism sets him forth. Neither the expression nor the thought of the total depravity of fallen man is Biblical, reasonable or factual. If fallen man were totally depraved, he would not have one vestige of God's image remaining in him. Hence he would have no conscience Godward nor manward, nor any proper feeling and quality Godward and manward; hence he would not only lack all faith, hope, justice, love, etc., but would have their opposites. He would have no conjugal, parental, nor neighborly love. Such a condition the Bible clearly denies. How completely does Jesus overthrow this thought when He says, "If ye, being evil [fallen], know how to give good gifts to your children" (Matt. 7: 11; Luke 11: 13). Hence to say that man is totally depraved in his faculties, feelings and qualities, is unbiblical, unfactual and unreasonable. The Bible, reason and facts teach that there is depravity in all of these, not that they are totally depraved. Such depravity varies in degree in various people. Only in actual death can total depravity exist. Even Satan is not totally depraved; for his faculties are yet perfect, though his moral and religious character

may be called totally depraved—irreformably fixed in sin. The character of the second death class may be called totally depraved Godward, but not necessarily manward. But such exceptions, in which total depravity exists within certain limits, but not throughout the entire being, do not touch the question of the race's alleged total depravity; for the vast bulk of the race is outside of the second death class—the irreformably wicked—and often do good things.

Above we pointed out the fact that deism's view of man is the natural revulsion to the extreme view of present human nature as being totally depraved, held especially by Calvinism. Man, as a rule, is a creature of extremes; few indeed are they who, opposing an extreme of error, keep the golden middle between it and the opposite extreme. Deists are no exception to this general rule. Avoiding the error of total depravity, they have jumped to the opposite extreme and, theoretically at least, predicate man's perfection as a creature of God, a perfection that they hold, despite ignorances and weaknesses that they concede to exist in man. Too superficial to see a contradiction between man's alleged perfection and his acknowledged ignorances and weaknesses, they let their optimism blind them to realities, losing themselves in the delusions of such optimism. Like the ostrich, they cover their eyes of understanding with the sands of oblivion. The falseness of this view is apparent in the light of Scripture, reason and fact. As Calvinism fixes its eyes on some exceptional human monsters and from them concludes that human nature as now existing under the fall is totally depraved; so deism fixes its eyes on a few exceptionally fine specimens of human nature and from them concludes that present human nature is good—perfect. It must be conceded that the deist is right in claiming that there are some very fine specimens of human nature and that in all generations there have been such. But it is fallacious to conclude

that these are perfect, and more fallacious to conclude that all others are more or less like them. All are imperfect: some more so, some less so.

In harmony with facts and reason the Bible recognizes this variety in mankind. Indeed the Bible, roughly speaking, divides the race into two classes—the faith class and the unbelief class. Some are born so depraved that under the untoward conditions of the curse they cannot exercise the faith now needed to come to God. Moreover, these have been under such environment and training as to increase their natural incapacity to come to God. On the other hand, some are born so as to make them capable of exercising the faith now needed to come to God; and their good heredity is reinforced by favorable environment and training. These two classes are brought to our attention by Jesus in Mark 4: 11, 12, and Matt. 13: 10-13, where also their different treatment from the Lord is set forth. And in each one of these two classes there are variations of faith or unbelief. So in other good qualities there are naturally great differences between people. But under the limitations of the curse there is depravity in all, but total depravity in none. It is by superficially fixing his eyes on the good qualities in people, and optimistically shutting his eyes to the bad qualities in people that the deist takes his seat on the opposite side of the question from that where the Calvinist has seated himself. The truth is midway between them: All humans under the curse are varyingly depraved in all their faculties, but none are therein totally depraved; all have some of the vestiges of God's image in all their faculties; some have very much of these in them; others have very little of these; and between these extremes in mankind as at present constituted are all sorts of variations in the degree of such vestiges.

Certainly the Bible teaches the depravity of all mankind in all its faculties under the curse. "The imagination

of man's heart is evil from his youth" (Gen. 8: 21). Surely "all flesh had corrupted his way" (Gen. 6: 12). The claim to be perfect is a proof of perversity, depravity (Job 9: 20). This depravity is transmitted by heredity (Job 14: 4). "There is none that doeth good [perfection]" (Ps. 14: 1). All have gone astray and become filthy, without exception (Ps. 14: 3; Is. 55: 6). Even the best have been conceived and born in sin (Ps. 51: 5), let alone the wicked, who are estranged from God before birth (Ps. 58: 3). Men's thoughts are vain (Ps. 94: 11). There are no exceptions to such depravity and its effects (Ps. 130: 3; Eccl. 7: 20). In God's sight no living person can justify himself as sinless (Ps. 143: 2). Even the delay in executing punishment incites the fallen race to sin (Eccl. 8: 11). Even the heart is filled with evil (Eccl. 9: 3). "The whole head is sick; and the whole heart is faint. From the soles of the feet even unto the head there is no soundness [perfection] in it; but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores" (Is. 1: 5, 6). All of us are unclean and all our righteousness more or less polluted (Is. 64: 6). All have transgressed against the Lord (Jer. 2: 29). The Ethiopian's inability to change his skin and the leopard's inability to change his spots illustrates man's inability to do perfectly, since he by nature and practice is sinful (Jer. 13: 23). "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked" (Jer. 17: 9). Fallen man as prone to all sorts of evils is graphically described by the Lord (Mic. 7: 2-4).

The above are some Old Testament teachings on this subject. Now for some witnesses thereon from the New Testament. "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies" (Matt. 15: 19). Sin made the world incapable of recognizing Jesus (John 1: 10). It is depravity that makes men love evil rather than good (John 3: 19). Certainly the Apostle Paul gives

fearful descriptions of human depravity (Rom. 1: 21-32; 3: 9-19). "All have sinned and come short of the glory [perfection] of God" (Rom. 3: 23). Such depravity makes us weak as to righteousness (Rom. 5: 6; 8: 3). Most graphically is our inability to do perfectly described in Rom. 7: 5, 11, 13-15, 18-25. Our depravity makes us disposed to further depravity and to enmity and disobedience toward God, and makes us unable perfectly to please Him (Rom. 8: 5-8). Such depravity makes people think that spiritual things are foolishness (1 Cor. 2: 14). Without God's help we are unable to think aright of Divine matters, much less to do them (2 Cor. 3: 5). Man's good works, because imperfect, cannot justify him before God, on account of man's depravity (Gal. 3: 11; 22). There is a continual conflict going on between the spirit and the flesh, because the latter is depraved, making one unable to do perfectly (Gal. 5: 17). The following are the effects of human depravity: "adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envying, murders, drunkenness, revellings" (Gal. 5: 19-21). This depravity leads to darkening of the understanding, alienation from the Divine life, ignorance of the Divine Truth, blindness of heart and corruption by lust (Eph. 4: 18, 22). It puts humans under the power of darkness and makes them enemies of good works and lovers of evil works (Col. 1: 13, 21). It brings one into the captivity and snare of Satan (2 Tim. 2: 26). It makes people foolish, disobedient, dupes, slaves of evil, malicious, envious, hateful and offensive (Tit. 3: 3; Jas. 3: 2). It fills us with things alien to God (1 John 2: 16). It makes the whole world lie in wickedness (1 John 5: 19). And it makes people spiritually wretched, miserable, poor, blind and naked (Rev. 3: 17). Surely these Biblical teachings prove that the human family is fallen—depraved.

And facts fully corroborate these Scriptural teachings. If human nature were perfect, why do we not see perfect humans—people who are physically, mentally, morally and religiously flawless? Only one such human being has appeared on this earth since sin entered into the world; and one of the strongest fundamental proofs of the fallen condition of human nature is the fact that He was not only not understood and appreciated by His fellows, but was most ignominiously rejected and most foully and wickedly put to death by some of those who considered themselves, deistically like, "not sinners like other men," and were by common consent considered among the best of mankind. The gross mistreatment that all, and the cruel tortures and deaths that some of God's servants have received from their fellow men, are further evidence of the fallen condition of the race. The rejection and persecution that God's Truth has always received from the bulk of the race and the espousal of error by the great majority of mankind attest the same fact. When the varying degrees of degradation in such rejections and espousals are considered, they add further proof of the fallen condition of man. How could the superstitious religions rampant in the world be accepted as true and right, unless their votaries were mentally and religiously degraded—fallen from God's image?

The fearful wrongs prevailing between and against many husbands and wives, between and against parents and children and brethren and brethren, show degradation—depravity—in the family life. The fearful wrongs of many governments against their citizens, and of many citizens against their governments, and the violations of international rights among the nations, show that such depravity marks national and international life. The gross iniquities that prevail in business, industry, finance and labor, show an appalling amount of depravity in the commercial world. The

professions are full to overflowing of examples of wrong and sin. In man's social relations the same depravity is illustrated. Our penitentiaries, jails, reformatories, asylums, hospitals and detentionaries give unanswerable evidence of human depravity. Each clear-thinking person who has made an honest and deep study of himself knows that there are depraved tendencies, motives, thoughts, habits, words and acts in his life. Each such thinker who has sought to stem the tide of depravity in himself knows that his best efforts are imperfect, knows that to will is present in him, but to perform perfectly he is unable. With the best of the fallen race he must in keenest anguish cry out, "Wretched man that I am; who shall deliver me from this dead body" of corruption!

We ask the deist: How can you think of most men as perfect and the rest of them as nearly so, suffering only from inconsequential ignorance and weakness? Do the sin-wrecked homes, so numerous in our times, imply this thought? Do the scoffers of our time exhibit the qualities of human perfection? Do the murders, social, religious, civil, international, commercial and professional, imply any such a thing? Do the hatreds, envyings, jealousies, feuds, cruelties, heart-lessnesses, rivalries and vengeancees, that thrust literal or figurative daggers into their victims, argue for man's perfection? Do the stock frauds, gambblings, waterings and manipulations, the legal technicalities, delays and miscarriages, the price fixings, the monopolistic and competitive cut-throat acts, the adulterations of materials and foods for profit, the class control of the press, the landlordistic exactions, the dishonesties of bank and trust officials, the juggleries in bookkeeping, the briberies, the tax dodgings, the freeings of rich criminals, the frauds with trust funds, the scandals of big finance and business, the corruptions of civil officials, the battles of financial giants, the election frauds, the manufacturing of panics and wars

for gain, the robberies and crookedness, the racketeerings of all kinds, the bootleggings, the gangsters, etc., etc., etc., demonstrate man's actual or near perfection? Do the adulteries, the fornications, the brothels, the white-slavers, the white-slaves, the debauchees, the seducers, the rapers, the libidinous, the sodomists and self-abusers, suggest the actual or near perfection of our race? Do the slanderers, the libelers, the gossips, the reputation assassins, the whisperers, the falsifiers, the perjurers and the traitors, conduce to the proof that human nature is perfect or nearly so?

Let the deist face these things as actual facts of human character and human actors, not as he is wont, like the ostrich, hiding them from his sight, but let him look them in the face as revelatory of actual conditions and facts, and he must give up his theory that mankind is perfect in its bulk and nearly so in its remaining numbers. Christianity apart, these facts and conditions give the pessimist a hundred times more arguments for his pessimism than the superficial inductions from a few exceptionally fine specimens of humanity give arguments to the deist for his optimism. The Christian, in contrast with the theoretical pessimist and optimist, is a realist as to present conditions, which unanswerably prove varying degrees of human depravity as the golden middle between Calvinistic total depravity and deistic optimism, while as to the future with its prospective Millennial restitution work, he is an optimist of the first water, and that because of his confidence in God's Oath-bound Covenant to bless with restitution opportunities all the families of the earth, and in Christ's ransom sacrifice as giving Him the power and authority to uplift to human perfection whosoever will of the depraved human family.

What conclusion do the above Scripture proofs and facts of experience on man's physical, mental, moral and religious condition warrant us in drawing? Undoubtedly

they warrant our drawing the conclusion that human nature as it is now is not only imperfect, but fallen, depraved, corrupt. They argue that man is a diseased being, that this disease does not only affect his body, but also, and especially, his intellect, sensibilities and will, both as faculties and as contents of such faculties. In intellect it makes him more or less blind or obtuse as to truth, especially as to religious truth, and easily susceptible to error, especially religious error, in which he habitually lives. In sensibilities it makes him prone to more or less of insensibility to the good, especially to the religious good, to detach his affections from the good, especially from the religious good, and to attach his affections to the evil, especially to the religious evil. In will it makes him more or less weak or powerless to determine to do the good, especially the religious good, and weak or powerless in determination against the evil, especially the religious evil, and strong in determination for the evil, especially the religious evil. Its effects in these respects vary in individuals; but even in the best of them it effects the condition that St. Paul accurately describes in the language of Rom. 7: 15, 19: "For that [imperfection] which I do I allow [approve] not; for what [perfection] I would that I do not; but what [imperfection] I hate that I do ... for the good [perfection] I would I do not; but the evil [imperfection] which I would not that I do"; while for the others in varying degrees they more or less hate and avoid the good and delight in, and practice the evil. Hence man sins as naturally as the sparks fly upward. Such being the case, the deist's view of human nature is not only not approved by the Bible and facts, but is thoroughly overthrown by these.

But one may ask: Why discuss deism's view of man while discussing deism as a false view of God? Is such a discussion not foreign to the announced subject? We reply, No; because the attitude that

deism claims that God maintains toward "human imperfection," which expression deism prefers to that of "human sin." The attitude that deism ascribes to God as to human sin may best be set forth in part under the similitude of an over-indulgent and thoughtless father who sees in his son's derelictions things, not so much to call for his disapproval and correctional chastisements, as to wink at, to smile at and even to chuckle over, as proving his son to be "a chip off the old block," and in part under the similitude of an easy-going and careless father who sees in his son's derelictions, not sins to be retributively corrected, but ignorances and weaknesses that his son will later on, through enlightenment, of his own accord put off. That God should become displeased with, resent and punish human sin is as far from the deist's creed of God as the East is from the West. "O," exclaims he, "God is too good, wise and loving for that; for such a course is foreign to God's character!" This proves that according to deism God is neither wise, just nor loving; for a wise, just and loving God could not treat human sin with such indifference. Deism's view of God's attitude toward human sin proves it to be unbiblical and unfactual. We will now, first, proceed to prove that deism's view of God's attitude toward human sin is an unbiblical teaching as to God's character and then, second, we will proceed to prove that deism's view of God's attitude toward human sin is an unfactual teaching as to God's acts toward human sin.

Wisdom tactfully applies efficient means to secure good ends; but deism's God neither uses such means nor does He secure such ends; for His treatment of human sin according to deism is pure indifference, neglect and laziness; hence He is not only not wise, but most unwise toward human sin; for His attitude is one that encourages sin. Nor is deism's God just; for justice is the quality that rewards righteousness and punishes sin, not indeed with eternal torment, as

many blasphemously assert, but with death, which is efficient to stopping the sinner's wicked course and depriving him of the existence that he refuses to use righteously. Nor is deism's God loving; for love is neither mushy nor sentimental, but the unselfish goodwill that delights in good, abhors evil, and labors to advance the former and to repress the latter, while the deist's God not only lacks this Divine quality, but pursues a course that discourages the good and advances the evil. Hence the deist's God in his attitude and acts toward sin is a God unworthy of our appreciation, reverence and obedience, and is a failure as to being a wise, just and loving God. How differently does the Bible describe God's attitude toward human sin. It proves that it is repugnant to, and is punished by Him. It so grieved Him as to bring the flood upon the antediluvian world (Gen. 6: 6, 7). It grieves Him to such a degree that it makes the sinner an abomination to Him (Deut. 25: 16). He does not refrain from such displeasure with the best men and nations, *e.g.*, David and Judah, when they commit sin (2 Sam. 11: 27; 1 Kings 14: 22). Abhorrence is a state of mind that it works in God (Ps. 5: 4-6; 10: 3; 78: 59). Such abhorrence is what the Bible means when it speaks of God hating the wicked (Ps. 11: 5; 106: 40). Seven of the main sins are enumerated in Prov. 6: 16-19 as being especially abominable to God. So much is God displeased with the wicked that their sacrifices, prayers and religious thoughts are abominations to Him (Prov. 15: 8, 9, 26; 21: 27). Sins are burdensome and wearisome to God (Is. 43: 24). They anger Him and provoke Him to punishment (Jer. 25: 7; 44: 4, 22). He can in no wise look upon sin with favor, since it merits His hatred (Hab. 1: 13; Zech. 8: 17). Nor are such thoughts peculiar to the Old Testament; for the New Testament expresses the same sentiments (Luke 16: 15; Rev. 2: 6, 15). These Scriptural delineations thoroughly show that God

does regard sin with repugnance and punishes it, and therefore prove that the God of deism in His attitude toward sin is unbiblical and unacceptable.

Furthermore, the Scriptures plainly teach that God punishes sin correctionally and, when correction is rejected, executes the extreme penalty of death upon the sinner. One of the forms of punishment that He inflicts is to cut off the sinner from His favor and fellowship. This is repeatedly set forth in the Bible (Deut. 31: 17, 18; 2 Chro. 24: 20; Job 13: 24; Is. 59: 2; Micah 3: 4). Sin is punished by the woes of the curse (Gen. 3: 16-19). It led to the destruction of the human race, except one family, in the flood (Gen. 6: 7). Sodom, Gomorrah and the other cities of the plain were given over to destruction because of it (Gen. 18: 20; 19: 13). It brought upon Israel many a chastisement (Ex. 32: 33, 34; 34: 7; Lev. 26: 14-21; Num. 15: 30, 31; 32: 23). It led to the exclusion from Canaan of the generation that left Egypt, except two individuals (Ps. 95: 10, 11). It also led to the driving out from Canaan of everyone of them for 70 years (Jer. 42: 2-6). It also led to their being cast off from God's favor and to their abandonment unto much sufferings throughout the Gospel Age (Rom. 11: 25; Dan. 9: 26, 27). These teachings and facts are in strictest contradiction of deism's view of God's carelessness as to human sin. Then, too, the Bible teaches that as a final penalty God imposes death upon the incorrigible sinner. The following passages directly prove this: Gen. 2: 17; Jer. 31: 30; Rom. 1: 32; 5: 12, 17; 6: 16, 21, 23; 7: 5; 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22, 56; Jas. 1: 15; 1 John 5: 16. The following passages imply death as sin's final penalty: Gen. 3: 19; Rom. 1: 18; 5: 16, 18, 19. Thus God's imposing death as the extreme penalty of sin shows that He is quite a different God from deism's God as to sin.

The facts of human experience also prove that God is not indifferent to human sin, but first undertakes

to correct it with instruction and chastisements; and when the correction will not be accepted, He puts the sinner to death. The extra-Biblical history of Gentile nations during Biblical and post-Biblical times is replete with illustrations of this fact. In Egypt, in Assyria, in Babylon, in India, in China, during Bible times, we have records of sin chastised and destruction wrought at its being clung to. This is apparent in the records of these nations brought recently to light through archeological research, wherein is described how in the domestic, commercial, imperial, religious and social order, sufferings came upon wrong-doers. In Persia, Greece, Rome and its successor nations the same principle manifested itself times innumerable. Within Christendom this principle can be observed as working as markedly at least as in Israel. What have many of Christendom's innumerable wars, revolutions, plagues, pestilences, earthquakes, volcanoes, droughts, famines, tidal waves, panics, etc., with much of their accompanying miseries and deaths, been other than chastisements for its sins? Our penal institutions, insane asylums and hospitals are more or less in existence because of sin's chastisements. Much of sickness is directly traceable to the effects of sin, and all of it is indirectly traceable thereto. Frequently sin is its own punisher in the physical, mental, moral and religious degradation and suffering which it directly entails. All about us we see the wrath of God against sin operating directly or [by heredity] indirectly. We witness it in our aches and pains and decays. We see it in every drug store, physician's office, hospital and undertaker's establishment. The quarantine notices, the crape on our doors, the funeral processions and cemeteries, one and all, reveal it. Every institution of the healing art, every nurse, every surgical instrument, every dentist's parlor, manifest it. Surely God's displeasure at the original sin and frequently for subsequent transgressions, is seen with an impressiveness

second perhaps to nothing else in the world. All these facts, therefore, inculcate the lesson of God's displeasure at, and punishment of sin. And, therefore, they disprove deism's view of God as to human sin.

As the final point against deism's creed on human sin as viewed by God, we would point out its demoralizing effect on human character. For the proper development of our characters a true view of God's character is necessary. If we think God to be in any way unwise, unjust and unloving, we lose for character development all the inspiration coming from an appreciation of the thought and example of His perfect wisdom, justice and love. If we conceive of God as being in any way unwise, unjust and unloving, we must fail to take Him as an ideal example for our imitation, and will take Him in these respects as an example for imitation far below a proper ideal, with the result that we will develop more or less in unwisdom, injustice and selfishness; for people never rise in character above their ideals. How could we really respect, let alone reverence such a God as that of deism, as manifested by His attitude toward man's sin? How could we appreciate Him from a delight in good principles? How could we really trust one with such a weak character, especially amid trials in which our circumstances seem not in harmony with His promises? How could His weak character draw out our obedience? Who would ever think of consecrating himself wholly to such a Being? And how could He influence one to carry out his consecration to Him? Such a weakling of a God is a failure as an inspiration to moral and religious development of a worth-while kind. Herein He fails us at a most vital point; therefore we must say such a God does not correspond to mankind's deepest needs, and cannot fit in with the aspirations of the saintly, which things disprove the actuality of such a God. His unsatisfactoriness as a God will become all the more

apparent when we come to consider the third principle of the deist's creed—human immortality.

Deism's view of the hereafter for man, implying such a false view of man's nature as to be opposed to a right view of God and as to advance a false view of Him, justifies our study of its hereafter for man. As to man's hereafter, some few deists deny it altogether, thinking that death ends all for man. Then there are deists who hold that the most degraded of mankind will have no hereafter, but they expect a hereafter for the others. But the large majority of deists believe in natural inherent human immortality, according to the teachings prevalent in all heathen lands, to the effect that man does not really die, but at what seems to be death he changes into a spirit being and lives on. According to this view, he seems, it is true, to die, but by the necessities of his constitution he actually lives on in a changed form. He now, according to this view, has become a spirit and as such lives on endlessly. The fact of there being wicked, as well as good humans, has moved the few deeper-thinking deists to reject this view, as necessarily involving the eternal torment of the wicked; while the shallow and optimistic deist, who accepts his longings and desires for mankind's eternal happiness as proofs of the fact of such a happiness, and who does not bother his brain as to the requirements of justice against the wicked, holds that all having suffered much in this life, and that largely without their fault, it coming to them mainly by heredity and environment, God is in justice obligated to give dead humans a compensation for these earthly sufferings by bestowing eternal felicity upon them. These deists have no faith in a resurrection, which is the last thing they want, since they believe the weaknesses of human character are due to the corrupt tendencies of the body, of which if one is freed, his character blemishes no more exist. Hence they claim that all the dead can and do enjoy eternal

felicity in virtue. Fundamental to this view of man's natural immortality in eternal felicity is the wrong view of God implied in His being obligated in justice to give man endless, death-proof and happy life in righteousness for man's suffering while in this life. Against this view of mankind's inherent immortality and certain eternal happiness as spirits, allegedly necessitated by the justice of God, there are many cogent reasons which in brief form we will here present, hoping later to give this subject more detailed examination.

Against such a view the silence of the Bible and opposing passages of the Bible may be argued. Certainly the writers of the Old Testament are entirely silent on the subject, their only hope for a hereafter being based on their belief in a resurrection and not on man's not actually dying. The same silence of the Bible applies to the teachings of Jesus, the Apostles and the non-apostolic writers of the New Testament, despite opposing teachings of sectarianism set forth by literal interpretations of parables and visions, none of which without travesty may be interpreted literally, since they are of necessity by their very nature expressed in symbolic language. Such a view of man is contrary to numerous Scriptures. Of these the following are some samples, which prove man to be dead and not alive, while in death: Josh. 20: 3, 9; Job. 36: 14; Ps. 56: 13; 78: 50; 116: 8; Ezek. 18: 4, 20; Matt. 26: 37; Jas. 5: 20; Rev. 8: 9; 16: 3. This doctrine of man's inherent immortality and of his consequent living when dead, is contrary to the passages that speak of dead souls. This is shown in proper translations as given in the A. V., as the following passages by their contrasts show: Ps. 22: 29; 30: 3; 37: 18, 19; 66: 9; Is. 56: 3; Ezek. 13: 18, 19; 20: 27. This is likewise shown in passages in which in the Hebrew the expression, *dead souls*, is translated in the A. V., *dead bodies*: Lev. 21: 1; Num. 6: 6; 9: 6, 7, 10; 19: 13;

Hag. 2: 13. The contrariety of this doctrine to the Scriptures is further proven by those passages which teach that wicked souls are destroyed (Lev. 23: 30; Josh. 10: 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 39; Ps. 35: 17; 40: 14; 63: 9; Prov. 6: 32; Ezek. 22: 27; Matt. 10: 28; Luke 6: 9, 56; Acts 3: 23; Jas. 4: 12). It also contradicts the Scriptures that teach that wicked souls are consumed (Is. 10: 18), devoured (Ezek. 22: 25), perish, which word in the Bible means to die (Job 31: 39; Matt. 10: 36; 16: 25, 26; Mark 8: 35, 36; Luke 9: 24), and are cut off (Ex. 12: 15, 19; Lev. 22: 3; Num. 15: 30, 31). These proofs sufficiently show that deism's doctrine on the hereafter as being, apart from a resurrection, a conscious one due to man's alleged immortality, is unscriptural.

Again, such a view is contrary to God's character and Christ's ransom. It blames God for making man sinful, which would make Him the cause of sin and, therefore, unjust; whereas God originally made man good and man made himself bad by the fall into sin (Eccl. 7: 29), which by heredity has been transmitted from generation to generation, to man's increased depravity. Man's original good creation likewise clears God's character from the charge of injustice, in that it proves, as against deism's claim that sin is due exclusively to the body, that it is due to a fall in man's disposition (Matt. 15: 19). It also charges God with injustice, in making man suffer in this life without his fault and giving recompense for this injustice in the next life; for recompensing for a former injustice implies the commission of such an injustice, of which God is incapable. Certainly the whole view involving injustice in God from various standpoints likewise involves unwisdom, lovelessness and weakness in God, which contradicts His character as being wise, loving and powerful. This teaching likewise impinges against the ransom (Matt. 20: 28; 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6). The Bible teaches that Jesus gave His soul as the

ransom, which the Greek of Matt. 20: 28 expressly says, and which 1 Tim. 2: 5 shows, for it says He gave Himself (the soul, not the body, is the real person) a ransom for all. The same thought is taught in Is. 43: 4 (see margin); 53: 10, 12. The same is also shown by the Greek of John 10: 11, 15, 17; 15: 13. Accordingly, Jesus' soul died as the ransom, which proves that men's souls died; otherwise to become their ransom Jesus' soul would not have died, which proves that the soul is not alive when dead.

This teaching is also contrary to the development and practice of godliness. If God were, as deism holds, responsible for imprisoning the real man in a "clod of earth," as they speak of man's body, making ignorance and imperfections inevitable, why should one desire to become godlike and imitate Him? If one will become rid of all such ignorance and imperfections immediately on or by leaving his body, why should one not wait for the deliverance from ignorance and imperfection then coming, rather than undergo the inconveniences, losses and sufferings due to fighting against error, ignorance and sin now? And if riddance of error and imperfection is accomplished by deliverance from the body, why not suicide and thus gain the coveted deliverance? Not only so, but why not begin a suicide propaganda world-wide in scope and show the easiest means of suicide so as to make the attainment of almost omniscience and perfection attractive? If deism's view of the hereafter were true, certainly the above would be the logical course to advocate and practice. But this very fact proves that it is inimical to the development and practice of godliness and therefore must be wrong. Certainly its belief in its cure for all evils and in its door to all good—death—must have the effect on the average person to make him postpone the difficult task of cultivating godliness until at death it can be attained without effort! It cannot but lead to disrespect for God and

for our parents as the ones responsible for our ignorance and imperfections. As a hope it leads to pride, as Eve under the influence of its deception through Satan exemplifies, in her grasping for its hope in self-exaltation. And without doubt it undermines the sense of moral responsibility. All these considerations prove it to be a teaching subversive of godliness and, therefore, it is an erroneous teaching.

Furthermore, deism's view of the hereafter is both incapable of proof and is a baseless assumption. None of the methods whereby facts are proven as such can be used to prove it. Facts are proven by the senses, rational intuition, experience and competent testimony. Our senses do not inform us that people become spirits, and that death-proof in addition, when they die. There is nothing in our rational intuitions that supports such a thought. A few persons have died and were shortly afterward, before the blood could begin to separate into clot and serum, resuscitated, and their testimony is that they were unconscious while dead. Accordingly, experience does not only not prove, but actually disproves, this view. Nor is there any one who has testified to such a thought from observation of the facts of the case. Spiritism purports to give such testimony; but its testimony is demonstrably unreliable, because most of its suggested proofs have been demonstrated to be slight-of-hand tricks in which the mediums have taken a guilty and fraudulent part, and because of the rest of its proofs being demoniac frauds in which demons—the fallen angels, the lying spirits described in the Bible—palm themselves off as the dead. And certainly the Bible, as the source and rule of proof to the Christian, does not prove it, but contradicts it from every Biblical standpoint, as we have in part seen and shall for the rest yet see. Hence deism's view of the hereafter is unprovable. As it is unprovable, so is it also a baseless assumption. There is nothing in nature to suggest it; there is nothing in

the death of any being on any plane of existence that suggests it; there is nothing in reason that implies it. There is no analogy that requires it. It has simply been assumed as true, because people shudder at the thought of death being extinction, and because they long to continue to exist. Fear and hope, not reason and truth, make some people believe it. And certainly, fear and hope are poor, baseless and delusive foundations for truth and faith.

For the Bible believer deism's view of the hereafter is untrue because it is contrary to many Bible doctrines. We will briefly set forth with terse proofs some of these doctrines that are contrary to deism's view of the hereafter. First, the Bible teaches that only beings who have the Divine nature are immortal. By immortality we understand a death-proof condition to be meant, a condition in which it is impossible to die. In the Bible it is defined as life in oneself, self-existing life, a life that depends on no external condition or thing for continuance (John 5: 26; 6: 53). Immortality, which is the equivalent of Divinity, was originally in God alone (1 Tim. 1: 17; John 5: 26). Then He offered it to Jesus on condition of His being faithful unto death (John 5: 26, 27; Heb. 1: 3; 12: 2). Hence before the resurrection of the saints Jesus is the only one given it (1 Tim. 6: 16). In their resurrection the saints, but no one else, will be favored with it (2 Pet. 1: 4; 1 Cor. 15: 53, 54; 2 Cor. 5: 4; 1 John 3: 2), because it is a thing not inherent in man, but must be sought as a reward by patient continuance in well doing; hence it is a thing given only to saints (Rom. 2: 7). Since, generally speaking, deism predicates immortality of all humans, it does this contrary to the Bible, which says that God alone originally had it and then gives it as a reward to Jesus and His faithful followers only. Since, then, only Divine beings have immortality, it is no inherent possession of humans; and this proves deism wrong. Again, the

Bible contradicts deism on this point, because it teaches that the truth on immortality was first revealed by our Lord through the Gospel (2 Tim. 1: 10), while the error of deism on a conscious immortal existence for all men in death was believed in for over two thousand years before Christ came until He came, and since, as is evident in the false religions of Egypt, Babylon, India, China, Persia, Greece, Rome, etc., which fact is another disproof of deism's hereafter. This doctrine of deism is contrary to the Bible teaching that death, extinction, is the penalty of sin, whereas deism, instead of teaching extinction to be the wages of sin, holds that sin and righteousness are alike rewarded with eternal, immortal and blissful life at death, apart altogether from a resurrection. That death is the wages of sin, the Scriptures quoted above abundantly prove. Hence on this point the Bible contradicts deism's view of the hereafter.

There are numerous other Biblical doctrines that contradict deism's hereafter. The Bible teaches that eternal life—everlasting, perfect, blissful existence—is a gift conditioned on faithfulness to God through Christ's merit and ministry. The following are a few from among many passages that give us this thought: Matt. 19: 29; Rom. 2: 6, 7; 5: 21; 6: 23; 8: 13; Rev. 2: 10. But deism, in contradiction to these and numerous other Scriptures, asserts that eternal, immortal, perfect and blissful existence is a natural endowment of man and is realized at death. Again, it contradicts God's judicial statement that the sinner will really die—not seem to die, but actually live on when he dies (Gen. 2: 17). It also contradicts the clear Scriptural statements that death is an unconscious state in which men know nothing, do nothing, remember nothing, think nothing, feel nothing and will nothing (Ps. 6: 5; 146: 2, 3; Eccl. 9: 5, 6, 10; Job 14: 21; Is. 63: 16; Dan. 12: 2; John 11: 11-14; Acts 7: 62; 1 Cor. 15: 6, 18, 20, 51). It likewise contradicts the true view of

what dies. The Scriptures teach that it is the soul, the person, who dies (Gen. 3: 19; Job 36: 14 [margin]; Ps. 56: 13; 116: 8; 78: 50; Is. 53: 10, 12; Ezek. 18: 4, 20; Matt. 26: 37; Jas. 5: 20), while deism claims that the soul does not die but, on the contrary, lives on in eternal immortal bliss. Hence it is unbiblical.

In contradiction of deism, which teaches that the reward comes at death, the Bible teaches that the reward is given at the resurrection (Is. 35: 4; 62: 11; Dan. 12: 1, 3; Matt. 16: 27; 19: 29; 25: 14-23; Luke 14: 14; John 14: 3; Rom. 8: 23; 1 Cor. 5: 5; Col. 3: 4; 2 Tim. 4: 8; 1 Pet. 1: 3-8, 13; 1 John 3: 2; Rev. 11: 18; 22: 12). Deism's view of the hereafter also contradicts the Bible view that a hereafter is entirely dependent on a resurrection; for the Bible teaches that if there is no resurrection there is no hereafter (1 Cor. 15: 18, 32). It also contradicts the idea of a resurrection, which implies the restoration of the soul to life in a body suited to its character (1 Cor. 15: 35-38), a thing completely at variance with deism's view of the hereafter as a conscious life of a spirit everlastingly from death onward, without a resurrection. It also contradicts the resurrection as the Biblical basis of the hope of a future existence (Acts 23: 6; 24: 15; 26: 6-8), whereas it teaches that man has inherent self-existence which goes on in death. The Bible teaching of a day of judgment (Rev. 20: 12) also strikingly contradicts deism's hereafter, in which there is no place nor need for a day of judgment. The Bible's teaching of the destruction of the wicked (Ps. 145: 20; Phil. 3: 19; 2 Thes. 1: 9), including that of Satan and his angels (Heb. 2: 14; Is. 27: 1; Matt. 25: 41), violently contradicts deism's hereafter, in which the wicked will live on, no more wicked, since they have shed "the clod of earth" that made them sin. But if it is "the clod of earth," the fleshly body, that is responsible for sin, how comes it that Satan and his fallen angels, who do not have "a clod of

earth," sin, and that worse than mankind? Why have they not been sinless these 6,000 years, seeing they are spirits? This shows another contradiction between the Bible and deism on the hereafter of mankind in death. On each one of the above points there is violent conflict between the Bible and deism on the hereafter. This means a rejection of deism's unbiblical hereafter.

Deism's view of an existence of dead humans as spirits apart from a resurrection is a heathen, a pagan, belief inculcated by every heathen and other false religion on earth. This, among other reasons, led the Apostle Paul to speak of the heathen religions as a worship of devils (1 Cor. 10: 20). Certainly we should wish to be free from devil worship and, accordingly, should eschew deism's view of the hereafter. Deism's view of the hereafter is based on, and is an expression of Satan's first lie (Gen. 3: 4, 5; John 8: 44) told in direct contradiction to God's law as to sin's penalty (Gen. 2: 17). It is well to note the three features of this lie: (1) "Ye shall not surely [really] die [you will only seem to die, without actually dying]"; (2) "ye shall be as the gods [angels, spirits, (Heb. 1: 7, compared with Ps. 97: 7), while seemingly dead]"; (3) "knowing [experiencing, while seemingly dead] good [bliss]." The deist does not quote the rest of the falsehood's third part—"and evil [torment]"—for he does not believe in the torment of the wicked dead. But he has accepted and endorsed Satan's threefold original lie, except the last half of the third. His hereafter, accordingly, is exactly that of the first lie, with the exception noted. This proves its falsity. It is also, apart from the above stated exception, much the same teaching as the counterfeit of the death state that Satan palmed off on the world through the papacy, which also proves its erroneousness. Deism's hereafter is much in harmony with the principles of evolutionism, which is another reason for its erroneousness. It is certainly

based on a false view of man, which, denying that man is a human soul, claims that man is a combination of a human and a spirit being, while the Bible teaches that man is a human soul.—Gen. 2: 7; 12: 5; 14: 21; 36: 6; 46: 18, 22, 25-27; Ex. 1: 5; 16: 16; 21: 23; Lev. 5: 1, 2, 4; 6: 1, 2; 17: 12; 22: 11; 23: 30; Num. 19: 18; 31: 35, 40, 46; Deut. 10: 32; Josh. 10: 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 39; Is. 53: 10, 12; Matt. 20: 28; Ezek. 18: 4, 20; Jer. 52: 29, 30; Acts 2: 41, 43; 3: 23; 7: 14; 27: 37; Rom. 13: 1; 1 Pet. 3: 20.

The above arguments sufficiently, from Scripture, reason and fact, refute deism's view of the hereafter. Accordingly, we have proven its three principles—the deistical God, the deistical virtue and the deistical hereafter—to be errors; and thus we have proven deism from these three standpoints to be a false view of God, directly from the first standpoint and indirectly from the second and third standpoints, because they are pivoted upon the first, which is false.

And while bright visions of Thy power
 The shining worlds before us bring,
 The earthly grandeur, fruit and flower,
 The praises of Thy bounty sing.

But not alone do worlds of light
 And earth display Thy grand designs;
 'Tis when our eyes behold Thy Word
 We read Thy name in fairest lines.

Wide as creation is Thy plan,
 Deep laid in wisdom's mighty rock;
 The course of Ages is its span;
 'Tis for Thy universal flock.

It compasses the wants of man,
 And lifts him from the mire of sin;
 It starts him on the way to life,
 And shows him how to enter in.

CHAPTER VIII.
PAGANISTIC FALSE VIEWS OF GOD.

POLYTHEISM. TRITHEISM OR TRINITARIANISM. THE FATHER ALONE THE SUPREME GOD. THE SON NOT COEQUAL, NOT COETERNAL, NOT CONSUBSTANTIAL WITH THE FATHER. THE HOLY SPIRIT.

HITHERTO in our study of false views of God we have examined five of them: atheism, materialism, agnosticism, pantheism and deism. The next false view of God that presents itself for our study is polytheism, a part of which is creedal, as distinct from Biblical trinitarianism. Etymologically the word *polytheism* is derived from two Greek words, *polys* and *theismos*. *Polys* means *much*, and in some connections *many*; and *theismos* means *the doctrine of God*. The compound word *polytheism*, therefore, means *the doctrine of many gods* and is used to express the doctrine of a plurality of gods. In polytheism there is always a plurality of gods. And in practically all forms of polytheism there are three supreme gods that supposedly constitute one supreme god. Thus these three gods in one in India are Brahma, Vishna and Shiva, who are called the *Trimurti* (Indian for *trinity*). In Babylonia and Assyria they were Anos, Illinos and Aos. In Phoenicia they were Ulomus, Ulosuros and Eliun. In Egypt they were Kneph, Phthas and Osiris. In Greece they were Zeus, Poseidon and Aidoneus. In Rome they were Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto. Among Celtic nations they were called, Kriosan, Biosena and Siva. Among Germanic nations they were called, Thor, Wodan and Fricco. Passing over other heathen trinities without express mention, we remark that the ancient Mexicans worshiped the sun under three images, which they called, Father, Son and Brother

Sun. They called one of their great idols *Tangalanga*—One in Three and Three in One. Their three gods that emanated from the original god they called *Trinamaaka*—*Trinity*. Thus the very terminology, as well as thought, of heathenism on their god-head was by the apostasy early in the Gospel Age introduced among Christians to designate the false trinity of the creeds. And to make the counterfeit taken from heathenism complete, Satan palmed off Mary in the place of the highest of the goddesses of the heathen, who stood next below their trinities, and the canonized saints in the places of the lower gods and goddesses of heathenism. Thus Catholicism introduced heathen conceptions of the gods and goddesses under Christian names. Therefore it may rightly be classed among the polytheistic religions. While most Protestant sects have taken over the creedal trinity, as distinct from the Bible trinity, from Catholicism, they fortunately did not take over its Mariolatry and hagiolatry—worship of Mary and saints—avoiding Rome's main polytheism.

The contrasts between the expressions, atheism—the doctrine of no God, and monotheism—the doctrine of but one God, on the one hand, and of *polytheism*, on the other hand, help us better to grasp the meaning of polytheism. There are but three purely monotheistic religions: Judaism, non-creedal Christianity and Mohammedanism. All other forms of religions are more or less polytheistic. Thus it is rather singular that monotheism is more or less limited to Abraham's fleshly and spiritual descendants. Polytheism is also synonymous with paganism, a name that is associated with the Latin word *paganus*, an inhabitant of a country or village district, and that arose from the fact that country and village people rejected Christianity in the interests of their gods, long after the town and city people of the Roman Empire accepted it, and were therefore wont to be called *pagini*, in allusion to

their heathenism. Thus Augustine early in the fifth century said, "The worshipers of gods false and many we call pagans (*paganos*)." Similarly did the word *heathen* come to its present meaning; for it is derived from the word *heath*, which formerly meant a dweller in lonely or remote uncultivated districts. It probably arose from the translation of the Latin word *pagani* into the Germanic languages. Additionally, the Latin word *gentes* and the Greek word *ethne*, as the equivalents of the Hebrew word *goyim*, which means *nations*, in contrast with Israel as God's people, have given us the expressions, *gentilism* and *ethnic* religions, as synonyms of *polytheism*. Furthermore, not etymologically, but factually, polytheism and idolatry are practically synonymous, for they are almost universally associated; for almost every polytheistic religion has, as a part and parcel of it, idols which its votaries reverence and worship.

There are marked differences between monotheism and polytheism, apart from their basic difference of one God as against many gods. In monotheism absoluteness and supremacy are united in the thought of but one God, while these conceptions are absent from polytheism. This is due to the very nature of the two views. Since it unites in one being supreme perfection of attributes, monotheism in its very nature implies absoluteness and supremacy in the Divine attributes, while polytheism in its very nature must deny these, since it distributes the Divine qualities among many gods. Furthermore polytheism lacks these two qualities in what it attributes to the sum total of its gods, *i.e.*, if we should unite in one God all the attributes that polytheism applies to all its gods, the result would not be a God who would be absolute and supreme; nor have their highest gods these two attributes, *e.g.*, while Jupiter was considered very intelligent, powerful, and more or less benevolent, he was nevertheless limited in his powers, sometimes by the other gods,

and always by what the Romans and Greeks called *fate*. Then, too, the gods of the polytheists are far from being holy persons. The mythologies of the Greeks and Romans literally reek with stories of the unchastities, incests, rapes, thefts, quarrels, envies, jealousies, plunderings, murders, falsehoods, covetings and slanders of the gods. This is also true of the gods of India, Egypt, Babylon, *etc.* The distinctly lower plane on which the polytheistic gods stand as to attributes of being and of character than that occupied by the one God of the Bible is, therefore, manifest on all hands and in every detail. This fact puts the conception of the God of the Bible into a position that is unique and sublime and puts Him into a class by Himself, to the confounding of the gods of polytheism. The Christian finds nothing in his God that needs apology, while polytheism stands in such need of apology for the attributes of being and character of its gods as makes its defenders hang their heads in shame when they are brought face to face with Christian apologists in debate.

Originally the human family was monotheistic, believed in and worshiped but one God. Throughout the antediluvian period there is no trace of polytheism. Mythologies originating after the flood purport to tell of the activities of polytheistic gods in creation and after creation; but these myths are partly the inventions of a later age and partly the perversions of the activities of the sons of God, the angels who had charge of the race during the first dispensation, and who became the fathers of giant sons—the demi-gods of polytheism—by human mothers (Gen. 6: 2-4). To the claim of infidels, evolutionists and higher critics, who assert that mankind was first polytheistic and gradually evolved into the monotheistic faith, we answer that the bulk of mankind is still polytheistic, that but one nation, partly by tradition and partly by revelation, years after the flood was monotheistic, that

from this race others, not by evolution, but by adoption, received monotheism, and that the Bible shows that polytheism was a departure after the flood from the primeval revelation and subsequent reflection (Rom. 1: 19-28). The Scripture just cited shows that subsequent to the flood polytheism had its start. Other Scriptural hints suggest it as first starting in Babylon, later developing in Egypt among Ham's descendants.

The originators of polytheism were Nimrod and his wife, Semiramis, who was his mother as well as his wife. A short account of Nimrod is given us in Gen. 10: 8-12. The word *Nimrod* means *subduer by the leopard*. As a hunter he made use of a leopard as his assistant, as archeological remains of Babylon and Egypt indicate, his wife joining him in the chase. Evidently the rapid increase of wild animal and reptile life made their reduction much desired by the people; and Nimrod's prowess as a hunter gave him such great prestige as to make him become the first king, and that ruling over Babylonia and Assyria, as the above Scripture shows. His being the first king of Ninevah (Gen. 10: 11) enables us by secular history to identify him with its first king Ninus, after whom Ninevah received its name, *Ninevah*, meaning *habitation of Ninus*. He was the son and afterward the husband of the Semiramis of secular history, the first queen of Ninevah, as his wife. His descent from the wicked Ham and Cush and his marrying his own mother imply for him a wicked character; and his wife was equally wicked. They attracted people away from a religion of trust in God to one of trust in Nimrod as their deliverer and king in worldliness, luxury, pleasure and debauchery. Thus Nimrod gave to Babylon's religion a bent away from God to himself and to his wife, more or less of Divine honors coming to them thereby. According to secular history and archeology they invented certain initiatory rites, called *mysteries*, by which they palmed off on certain select

Persons their false religion, in which myths of the gods (the angels who took human wives before the flood) and demi-gods (the giants born from these unions) were told, and by which they exalted themselves to Divine beings and honors.

While the Scriptures are silent on the subject, the ancient historians and archeological remains set forth the thought that Nimrod, under the name of Osiris, and Semiramis, under the name of Isis, went to Egypt and became the sovereigns of that country. But they became so wicked there that Egypt's 72 supreme judges, at the instigation of Melchizedek, the shepherd king then in control of Egypt, sentenced him to death; which was inflicted upon him. They caused his body to be cut into pieces and these to be sent to various cities of Egypt as a warning example of the fate of evil-doers. Grief stricken Isis and her son, Horus, gathered these parts of his body together for mummifying and then circulated the report that her husband and his father came to life again and ascended to heaven as a god. She worked out a ritual whose climax was the suffering and death of this god. About this ritual the Egyptian religion with its multiplicity of gods was developed. The death of Isis and of her and Osiris' son, Horus, became the occasion of their being deified. Other notables of Egypt who were initiated into these mysteries were on death also set forth as deified. Attaching itself to Gen. 3: 15, the myth grew that Isis was the mother of the promised seed, that her son and husband, Osiris, was that seed, and that by his defending humanity from the depredations of wild animals he proved himself to be their promised deliverer. The myth was further developed into setting forth that Osiris while killing a great and destructive serpent was himself killed. With variations of names, places and circumstances these general myths were spread everywhere throughout the heathen world and became the framework of almost

all polytheistic religions. In this way polytheism originated and developed and spread among mankind.

What lay back of this? St. Paul, David and Moses give us the clue that enables us to see the whole situation clearly. They say that the gods of polytheism are devils, demons (1 Cor. 10: 20; Ps. 106: 37; Lev. 17: 7; Deut. 32: 17). Jesus and St. Paul further tell us that Satan is the prince or god of this world (John 16: 11; Eph. 2: 2) and that in his rulership over the earth he has other fallen angels as his associates (Eph. 6: 11, 12). In a word, then, as ostensibly deified dead humans, Satan and two of his associates got themselves worshiped as the alleged supreme triune god. Another demon got himself worshiped under the name of a supreme goddess, and other demons got themselves worshiped under the names of other gods and goddesses. In other words, polytheism is demonism, the religion of devils as the gods and goddesses of the heathen. It was set up by Satan for a twofold purpose: to turn the minds and hearts of mankind away from the one true God and righteousness, and to turn and enslave their hearts and minds to him as their god and to unrighteousness; and he succeeded in these two purposes with the bulk of humans. From this viewpoint we can see why the Bible is so full of denunciations of heathen religions; and why they have had such a debasing physical, mental, moral and religious effect on mankind.

In these religions Satan has counterfeited as far as possible what he could gather from the few promises of the Messiah given up to the time of their development. In these counterfeits the true God was put in the place of the devil and the devil was put in God's place, and the actually wicked were palmed off as the good, while the righteous, who opposed the wicked were palmed off as the wicked. Up to the time of Nimrod's (Osiris') death only two promises had been made touching the Divinely-arranged deliverance: that

of the seed of the woman and of the serpent, their warfare, the former bruising the serpent's head and the serpent bruising his heel (Gen. 3: 15), and that of the chief blessing coming to those represented by Shem and the secondary blessing coming upon those represented by Japheth and the curse coming upon those represented by Ham (Gen. 9: 25-27). As God gave later promises as to the true Deliverer and His delivering work, Satan worked these up into his counterfeits. Now, reverting to Nimrod (Osiris) and Semiramis (Isis) with these thoughts in mind, we can see how the counterfeit was worked up around them. She was counterfeited as the mother of the seed of the woman mentioned in Gen. 3: 15, while he was palmed off as her seed. Melchizedek, as the chief of the shepherd kings opposing Osiris, was the alleged seed of the serpent. The opposition that he righteously offered to the wicked course of Osiris was represented as the inimical course of the seed of the serpent toward the seed of the woman. The bruising of the serpent's head was represented as the death wrought by the counterfeit seed of the woman upon an alleged serpent, really God, and the death of Osiris was allegedly the bruising of the heel of the woman's seed, while the deifying of Osiris after his death is the alleged glorification of the seed of the woman. The blessing on those represented by Shem was counterfeited by the alleged bliss of those elect few who were initiated into the heathen "mysteries." The blessing on those represented by Japheth was counterfeited by the alleged bliss of the supporters of such initiated elect. And the curse of those represented by Ham is counterfeited in the evils suffered by the alleged seed of the serpent. Additions, as said above, were by Satan made to the counterfeits as additions to the Divine revelations on the coming Deliverer were given by God through the patriarchs, the lawgiver, the prophets, Christ and the Apostles. These additions to

the counterfeits reached their climax in the papacy, which is Satan's masterpiece in counterfeiting every feature of the true seed, and His work and reign.

In the myths of polytheism the hunting capacity of its delivering god (Nimrod) is manifest in the leopard skin in which he and his priests were represented as clothed, in the weapons that he bore and in his alleged fight with the serpent. These appear in the "mysteries" of the Egyptian Osiris, the Roman Bacchus, the Grecian Adonis and the Syrian Tamuz (Ezek. 8: 14). Melchizedek is represented in the wild boar that killed this counterfeit deliverer, who is one and the same person under these various national names. The grief of Semiramis is set forth under that of Isis over Osiris, Venus over Bacchus, Astarte over Adonis and Asteroth over Tamuz. Her being a huntress is represented by her appearing with the quiver full of arrows and the bow, as the Egyptian Isis, the Grecian Artemis, the Syrian Ashera and the Roman Diana. No matter what the varying names were that the different nations gave these characters, they were the same two individuals. Despite varying local colors bestowed upon them, they were the selfsame deified humans. And under the names of these and other alleged deified humans Satan and his demon associates secured the worship and service of the heathen for themselves. Thus there was a oneness in the heathen religions, whatever non-essential variations were found in them. These non-essential variations were the local drapery with which Satan sought to commend his religion to the heathens' affections; but on all essential points he succeeded in giving them everywhere and in all nations one religion. It was for this reason that heathen religions almost never persecuted one another. It was for this reason that under different names they all recognized their gods as the same beings. And it was for this reason that, *e.g.*, the Romans always adopted

the religions of the nations that they conquered, except that of the Jews.

It is important that we remember that polytheism originated in Babylon and from there emigrated to other countries, notably to Egypt. If this fact is kept in mind, we will understand how in type (Jer. 51: 7) and antitype (Rev. 17: 5; 18: 2, 3) Babylon made the nations drunk with false doctrine. It is because false religion, polytheism, had its origin in, and largest influence in and through Babylon that God used Babylon as a type of Romanism, the mystic Babylon of prophecy. Not only so, but into mystic Babylon Satan brought over as much of the ritual of polytheism as possible, giving these rites Christian names, but retaining their heathen externals and internals as far as possible. We have already shown how it teaches creedal trinitarianism, which Romanism foisted on Churchianity from polytheism. The Christmas rites and date in Romanism are much akin to those associated with the birthday and date of polytheism's celebration of the birth of Nimrod. The madonna and son worship are counterparts of the worship of the heathen goddess mother and son. The Romish Lenten service partakes of much of the character of the polytheists' mourning period for the death of their deliverer god. The Romanist non-biblical emphasis on Mary mourning over Jesus' death is the counterpart of Semiramis' mourning over Nimrod's death. The fleshly resurrection of Jesus is Rome's counterpart to polytheism's deification of Osiris, *etc.* The heart-of-Jesus worship is the counterpart of polytheism's worship of the heart of Osiris, *etc.* The mass is the counterpart of polytheism's enactment of the death of its delivering god. So, too, are auricular confession, satisfaction, asceticism, monasticism, the priesthood and its celibacy, the hierarchy and the pope as its head, *etc.*, *etc.*, *etc.*, counterparts to polytheism's pertinent features. These facts prove that Satan introduced

into Romanism various features that he introduced into polytheism. But he did more than that; he in that system counterfeited everything with reference to the true Christ, in doctrine, organization and work. It is because of Rome's essential heathenism, which originated in, and spread out from Babylon, that God designates Romanism, mystic Babylon.

From the above we are able to see very clearly the essentially wicked character of polytheism. Instead of its being, as evolutionists claim, a stage of man's progress from bestiality toward a religious life, which is one of the differences between man and brute, it is a stage of his degradation from a belief in, and service of the one God to a belief in, and a service of the devil and his underling demons. Its author is Satan; and, accordingly, its theories are devilish deceptions and also counterfeits of glimmerings of the slowly advancing Divine revelation. Instead of its uplifting man it has degraded him and turned him away from the true God and a godly life. It has always stood for Satan's original lies (Gen. 3: 4, 5), the unreality of death, the consciousness of the dead, the change of humans into spirits at death and the bliss or torture of the dead. Then, too, it has always stood for the other great Satanic error: three gods constituting one god—the trinity of polytheism and creedism. When looked upon according to the above description of it, we have a right focus upon it; we can see its nature, purpose and results from the right standpoint and can properly measure its real size. Accordingly we are able to sympathize with the Scriptural delineation of it. The prophets' descriptions of it become sober estimates of it; and their zeal as servants of God and as patriots in seeking to prevent its entrance into Israel, and in seeking to expel it when it found lodgment there, become transparent as fully appropriate and justified. Of course Satan's determined and persistent efforts to foist it upon Israel were intended

not only to advance his religion, but also to extirpate monotheism; for Israel was then the only monotheistic people, whose mission, among other things, was to keep alive the knowledge of the one true God. Accordingly Israel was the battle ground of monotheism and polytheism; and we thank God that monotheism survived the centuries-long attacks that Satan through polytheism made upon it.

But the battle did not end with the Jewish Age. When Christianity, as another monotheistic religion, came on the stage of human affairs, Satan made the subtlest attack on monotheism ever launched. For through the apostasy, which had its start in St. Paul's day (2 Thes. 2: 7), Satan made the attack of attacks upon it and for centuries foisted a real polytheism upon Christians, which in Romanism is a rather complete counterpart of the polytheism of the ancient heathen. While the reformation purged away much of this baptized polytheism, it for the most part left the chief feature of it intact; and even to this day this feature—creedal trinitarianism—has not been completely set aside, as we trust it will ere long. As Christians learn to think more logically and Scripturally they will free themselves from this intrusion, this poisonous graft upon Christianity. "In that day the Lord will be one and His name one" (Zech. 14: 9).

While the gods of polytheism are really Satan and the fallen angels, as alleged deified humans mainly, the more strongly to enlist human attention, which frequently falters at the contemplation and worship of invisible spirits, Satan has associated such gods with visible objects of nature, like the sun, the moon and the stars (Deut. 4: 19; 2 Kings 17: 16; 21: 3, 5; Jer. 7: 18; 8: 2; Acts 7: 42), the earth and separate objects in and about it, like trees, mountains, streams, stones, skies, the atmosphere, *etc.* In such cases the gods have been considered the spirits of such objects, which they allegedly inhabit and leave at will. The energies acting

in these objects have been supposed to be the manifestations of the resident god's activities. Thus the sun has been worshiped as Baal, *etc.*, Satan, because he was supposed to dwell in it, as a spirit indwelling a body. The moon has been worshiped as Asteroth, *etc.*, the goddess of love, who supposedly has indwelt it, as a spirit is supposed to indwell a body. Other demons, mainly as alleged deified humans, have been worshiped as various planets and stars. The earth has been supposed to be the mother and the heaven the father of the gods. These have been polytheism's chief gods and goddesses. This personifying and then worshiping of objects of nature, especially those great objects of nature set forth as created by God in Gen. 1, *e.g.*, the heavens, earth, chaos, the land, the sea, the firmament (atmospheric expanse), the sun, the moon, the stars, were the original form of polytheism, as invented first by Nimrod and his wife. This can be seen from the Babylonian and Assyrian creation tablets discovered by George Smith, *etc.*, during the last century. A little later Nimrod and Semiramis added to this much of polytheism the worship of the sons of God and their offspring giant sons—as gods and demigods. Still later, after Nimrod's death, the form of polytheism described previously as invented by Semiramis arose. To the three above-mentioned forms of polytheism the worship of heroes and ancestors was added after Semiramis' death. By the first three of the foregoing forms of polytheism Satan and his fallen angels especially secured for themselves the worship of the heathen. Then, there have been still other secondary gods and goddesses invented as the personifications of inferior objects of nature, like the nymphs of woods, fountains, mountains, seas, *etc.*, through which other demons have been worshiped. Still others as attendants on the gods, as fauns, have likewise been worshiped. Even abstract qualities have been personified as certain demons and then have been worshiped

as gods, like law, justice, fear, memory, death, honor, virtue, peace, victory, *etc.* Even rulers as alleged descendants of the gods have been worshiped as divine in polytheism. Thus under a variety of objects of nature, persons and thought Satan and the fallen angels, mainly as alleged deified humans, secured the worship of humans. It is especially through the deifying of objects of nature that Satan has spread superstition and the spirit of fear.

Mythology has likewise been brought into the service of Satan to palm off the worship of himself and his underlings. After the flood myths were woven about the angels that sinned in marrying women (Gen. 6: 2-4) and their giant offspring produced by these unions. These sinning angels were made to appear blameless; and then great creative and providential acts were ascribed to them in these myths, resulting in their securing the worship of themselves by humans. They furthermore palmed off the unfallen angels in these myths as wicked and malicious spirits. The giant sons of the fallen angels that they represented in the myths, they suggested to the minds of men as great heroes and benefactors, and thus raised them up to the dignity of demigods. These myths gradually grew among men at demoniac suggestion and are practically alike in almost all polytheistic religions, despite the variations due to local coloring. Thus they are found in the archeological remains of Babylon, Egypt, Phoenicia, Assyria, Syria, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, *etc.*, as well as in the literary remains of China, Japan, India, Persia, Greece, Rome and the Germanic and Slavic nations. These were through the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, possible of amalgamation with the accounts of alleged deified humans by the very nature of polytheism, which is capable of accepting all sorts of gods, whatever their alleged origin.

Idolatry, though not exactly synonymous with polytheism (as the religion of ancient Persia, in which

there were no idols, shows), usually is a by-product of polytheism. It is based upon the incapacity of the average uncultured human to worship an invisible spirit without a visible representation of him, wherein he is supposed to dwell. These idols have been of the greatest variety, some of them being simple fetishes, amulets and charms, largely of almost no value and of almost endless variety. Some of them have been sticks and stocks and stones, especially in the earlier polytheistic religions and in later African religions. Some of them have been the ugly figures of hideous gods and goddesses supposedly adorning the temples of India, China, Japan, *etc.* Some of them have been images of men's bodies with heads, *etc.*, of various animals, birds, reptiles, *etc.*, as in Egypt. Some of them have been the marvelous creations of Greek and Roman painters and sculptors. Some of them have been the images and paintings in Roman and Greek churches. The thought of the idolaters has been generally that these images and pictures were not the gods themselves, but such representations of them as they indwelt. Hence they are, even in our times in Roman and Greek churches, represented sometimes as winking, smiling, shedding tears, bleeding, speaking, *etc.*, They are thus worshiped as related to, and connected with their indwelling gods. To such fetishes, amulets, charms and idols belong the relics of the saints, whose bones, *etc.*, are usually claimed to sweat blood, to work miracles of healing and to prevent and ameliorate calamities. Thus in such idols, *etc.*, Satan and the fallen angels succeeded in securing man's worship.

In practically all polytheistic religions there is a special order of officials, usually called priests, who are the representatives of Satan and his fallen angels to their devotees, and who are also the representatives of their devotees before such idol-indwelling gods. Their position is closely akin to that of mediators between the gods and their worshipers. It is through these

priests that these gods have palmed off various embellishments of the religion that Satan originally made known through Nimrod and Semiramis. They usually have given the responses of the gods to the questions put to the gods. They have kept the knowledge of their religious mythology, rites, beliefs, arts, sciences, literature and liturgy in custody, and have taught the people what they desired them to know, as well as have revealed the "mysteries" to the elect initiates. As a rule, they have offered the people's sacrifice, and have claimed to make peace and keep peace between the gods and them. They have degenerated into wizards, fortune tellers and necromancers, instilling the spirit of fear into the people. This has given them a vast amount of influence over the people and often has invested them with dictatorial powers in matters of state and family, as well as in religion. Their office, place, power, *etc.*, is well illustrated in that of the priests of Rome. These polytheistic priests, like those of Rome, have been of various grades, ascending from the common priests through a well regulated and organized hierarchy of various ranks to a chief priest. In this respect the Roman priesthood has been graded by Satan after the polytheistic pattern. At the side and as assistants of such polytheistic priests, orders of monks and nuns of a lower grade than the priests have stood in practically all polytheistic religions, more or less devoted to celibacy, but not to chastity. Hordes of these monks have yielded themselves up, as parts of their religious rites, to the most debasing vices, and the nuns have been required to act as prostitutes in connection with the temple rites of the goddess of love, *as a part of the religious worship*. Even to this day there are thousands of temples in India that have attached to them these nuns, as adjuncts of the obscene rites of those temple services; for a part of the worship of the goddess of love from times immemorial has been the unchaste use of these nuns by the male

worshippers at those temples. Not only so, but where female worshippers did not bring along male companions to consort with them as a part of the worship of that goddess, the monks attached to such temples served this debasing purpose. And when Satan made monks and nuns a part of the Greek and Roman Church organizations, he had similar, but by far more attenuated purposes in mind, above which, we are glad to know, not a few monks and nuns have lived.

In practically all polytheistic religions Satan has caused temples to be an adjunct of them. These were not so much to accommodate worshippers as either to house the gods as invisible spirits or to house their images and to be convenient sacrificing places. The most important feature of such temples was their altars, where sacrifices were offered to appease or to please the gods. Usually the roofs above the altars were open so that the smoke and incense might ascend toward the sky. The worship of polytheism was both private, in the homes, and public, in the temples. In the former case the head of the house usually officiated; and in the latter case the priests always officiated. Sacrifices were a usual part of the public worship, which was as a rule carried out according to an elaborate ritual. These sacrifices were either unbloody, *i.e.*, growths from the ground, or bloody; *i.e.*, animal. These sacrifices were sometimes propitiatory, to make atonement between the gods and the sacrificers; sometimes they were non-propitiatory, as matters of thanks, worship and praise. In most polytheistic religions human sacrifices were made, as burning the children on the red hot hands and arms of Moloch, hurling the children into the Ganges River, burning living widows with the husbands' bodies in the funeral rites of India, and sacrificing people to appease the gods.

The effects of polytheism on character and society have been bad. Almost always the civilization of polytheistic nations has been on a low scale, and always

they have been cursed by the most degraded manners and ideals prevalent. It has directly depraved religious as well as moral character and has implanted the spirit of fear, superstition and servility toward the gods, thus stifling true faith, hope, love and obedience. It has developed selfishness and crushed duty-love and disinterested love toward one's fellows. It has pandered to the lower tendencies of the naturally depraved heart, leaving each successive generation worse than the preceding one. Instead of inculcating the brotherhood of man, it has formed castes whose contrasted acme is reached in the Brahman and the Pariah (the lowest of the untouchables) of India. The right of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness it has crushed. Everywhere has it made its votaries sensual and degraded, particularly along sex lines. Its papal form has fostered much of the evils just set forth. The worst indictment of polytheism still remains the section of the Bible from the pen of St. Paul in Rom. 1: 21-32. Well may we bless God that we are free from it! Well may we worship, praise and adore the God and Father of our Lord Jesus, the one and only true God, all whose ways praise Him and elevate us in character.

The final false view of God that we desire to consider is the trinity, which is a view held in most denominations. Because of the many details involved in this subject, our discussion of it must be terse and pointed, otherwise it would become entirely out of proportion with the rest of our subject. The word *trinity* is a compound of two Latin words, *tres*=three, and *unitas*=unity, the idea being three in unity or three in one. In the compounding of these words they have been made to amalgamate and assimilate into one another. Hence the words *tres* and *unitas* have in Latin been amalgamated by assimilation into the word *trinitas*; and it has been taken over into English with the change of the last syllable, *tas*, into *ty*, as is usually

done with the Latin nouns ending in *tas*, if taken over into English, *e.g.*, *libertas* = liberty, *amitas* = amity, *qualitas* = quality, *etc.* The idea actually expressed by the word trinity is, three gods are one God, though, the proponents of the trinity doctrine would not so express it. Rather they put it as follows: three persons are one God. Yet as they say of each of their three persons that he is God, their doctrine actually implies that three Gods are one God. They further claim that these three persons are the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and these are by them meant by the term trinity. They admit that they can neither understand nor explain it, but claim that it must be believed on pain of eternal torment. The fact that it is ununderstandable and unexplainable, yea, self-contradictory, is, they claim, to be expected on the ground that it is a mystery, which is an expression that they use of the trinity and other teachings to mean an actually ununderstandable, unexplainable and self-contradicting idea, *e.g.*, three are one and one are three. Of course in our arithmetic we learned better, *i.e.*, that three are three times one, not one. But they claim that this is a Bible mystery; hence must be received with blank unquestioning minds. To this we reply that the word mystery as used in the Bible and profane Greek never means self-contradictory, unreasonable, ununderstandable and unexplainable things; but in the Bible it is used to mean a secret not understood by the uninitiated, but understood by the initiated.

The following are all the passages in which the Greek word *mysterion* occurs in the New Testament: Matt. 13: 11; Mark 4: 11; Luke 8: 10; Rom. 11: 25; 16: 25; 1 Cor. 2: 1, 7; 4: 1; 13: 2; 14: 2; 15: 51; Eph. 1: 9; 3: 3, 4, 9; 5: 32; 6: 19; Col. 1: 26, 27; 2: 2; 4: 3; 2 Thes. 2: 7; 1 Tim. 3: 9, 16; Rev. 1: 20; 10: 7; 17: 5, 7. Let the reader look up each of these references, and he will find in none of them the thought that Bible mysteries are unreasonable, ununderstandable, unexplainable or self-contradictory things. Every

where he will find our definition true, that Bible mysteries are secrets not understood by the uninitiated, but understood by the initiated. In proof we will comment on a few of the plainer of the cited passages. That Matt. 13: 11; Mark 4: 11; Luke 8: 10 use the word as we have defined it is evident from the contrast that Jesus makes between the disciples' being given to understand the mysteries and the multitude, who heard them, not being given to understand them. The secret that St. Paul tells in Rom. 11: 25—that Israel would be in blindness until the full number of the Elect would be completed and then would be recovered from that blindness—is certainly an understandable thing and by no means a self-contradictory or unreasonable thing. The secret that St. Paul explained in 1 Cor. 15: 51—that the last part of the Church, those alive at our Lord's Second Advent, would not sleep in death—is certainly not an ununderstandable thing; for we understand it. The secret that St. Paul told us—that Adam and Eve are a type of Jesus and the Church (Eph. 5: 32)—is certainly not an ununderstandable, unreasonable or self-contradicting thing; for we understand it. That God made *clear* the hidden mystery to the saints (Col. 1: 26, 27) proves that it is not an ununderstandable thing, since we understand it—that the Christ is not one person, but a company of persons. St. Paul directly tells us that he *understood* the mystery of God (Col. 2: 2); hence it is not an ununderstandable thing. We certainly understand the mystery of lawlessness (2 Thes. 2: 7); for it is the Papacy as the counterfeit of the mystery of God, Christ and the Church as the one new man consisting of many members (Eph. 2: 15; 1 Cor. 12: 12-14, 20, 27). So, too, do we understand the mystery of the seven stars (Rev. 1: 20) as representing the seven composite messengers that God has sent, one for each stage of the Church, even as we understand the mystery of seven candlesticks as representing the seven stages of the Church.

We likewise understand the mystery of the woman (Rev. 17: 5, 7) as representing the Roman Catholic Church. These clearer examples of the cited passages enable us to see that all of them use the Greek word *mysterion* as we have defined it. Hence the use of the word mystery as a Bible proof that the trinity doctrine is to be accepted with blank unquestioning minds as a Biblical doctrine is wrong. Such use of the word is a Satanic counterfeit employed to deceive the guileless, in which it also succeeded.

We offer a second line of argument against this doctrine. It is contrary to the seven axioms for Biblical interpretation. These axioms are as follows: An interpretation of a Scripture or a doctrine to be true must be (1) harmonious with itself; (2) with every Bible passage; (3) with every Bible doctrine; (4) with God's Character; (5) with the Ransom; (6) with facts; (7) with the designs of the Bible, *i.e.*, glorify God as Supreme, honor Christ as the Executive and Mouthpiece of God, and contribute to the outworking of God's plan for the Church and the world. If any interpretation or doctrine is in harmony with all these seven axioms, it gives us *prima facie* evidence of being true; but if it in any way impinges against any one of these axioms, it gives us *prima facie* evidence of being false. The trinitarian doctrine violently impinges against every one of these seven axioms, and is evidently, therefore, false. Let us now compare it with these seven axioms: (1) Being self-contradictory— $3 \times 1 = 1$, $1 = 3$ and $3 = 1$ —it is evidently false. Other self-contradictions we will bring out under axioms (3) and (5). (2) It contradicts many Scriptures, *e.g.*, (a) those that teach that the Father in contrast with all others is God alone; and that He in contrast with all others is the Supreme Being (John 17: 3; 1 Cor. 8: 4, 6; 1 Tim. 2: 5, compared with Gal. 3: 20; Jude 25, A. R. V.). These contrasting the Father and the Son, call the Father alone the One God, therefore

imply that He alone is the Supreme Being. Here belong the passages that teach the Father's sole supremacy (John 14: 28; 10: 29; 1 Cor. 3: 23; 11: 3; 15: 28; 1 Pet. 1: 3; Ps. 45: 6, 7; Is. 42: 8). All of these passages teaching the superiority of the Father to the Son, who is, next to God, the highest Being in the Universe, God, His Father, must exclusively hold the place of supremacy. (b) All the passages that treat of God's unity treat of Him as but one person or Being, none ever mentioning Him as being three persons in one being. These passages, therefore, prove that the Father alone is the Supreme Being (Deut. 6: 4, compare with Mark 12: 29; 1 Kings 8: 60; Zech. 14: 9, A. R. V.; 1 Cor. 8: 4; Gal. 3: 20; 1 Tim. 1: 17, A. R. V.; Jas. 2: 19). Please, on this point (b), see also the passages under (a). These passages most explicitly teach that there is but one God; and neither they nor any other Scripture intimates in the slightest degree that there are three persons that are and constitute the one God.

The only passage that seems to give some color to such a doctrine is 1 John 5: 7, 8; but this passage is now universally recognized by the students of the original, the Greek text, to be an interpolation. It first crept into the Greek text in the fourteenth century. Nor do any translations made before that century contain it; but some late Latin, Vulgate MSS., copied not more than five centuries before, contain it. This interpolation was first inserted into some Vulgate MSS. and was therefrom in the fourteenth century translated into the first Greek text having it. Had this text been in the Bible when the trinitarian controversies were going on, in the fourth to the eighth centuries, certainly the trinitarians who were hard pressed by their opponents to produce such a text, would have used it as a proof text; but none of them ever so used it, for the good reason that it was then not in the Bible. It doubtless crept into the Latin

text by a copyist taking it from the margin, where it was written by somebody as his comment on the text, and inserting it into the Latin text itself, whence, as just said, it was first translated into a Greek MS. in the fourteenth century. The next Greek MS. that contains it is from the fifteenth century. But even assuming that this text were genuine, it would not prove that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one God; for the Greek word for "one" here is "*hen*," and is neuter; and the masculine word *Theos* (Greek, God) cannot be supplied after it; for the Greek word for one in that case would have to be *heis* (masculine for one). Nor can the Greek word for being (*ousia*) be supplied after it, because *ousia* is feminine, which would require the feminine of one, *mia*. If the passage were genuine we would have to supply a neuter noun, e.g., like *pneuma* (disposition), after *hen* in this text even as we have to do in John 10: 30: "My Father and I are one" (*hen*) disposition. It could not be *theos* (God) nor *ousia* (Being); which would respectively require the masculine *heis* and the feminine *mia*. We agree that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one in disposition, one in heart, mind and will; but not one God. Nowhere, as the trinitarian doctrine requires, does the Bible distinguish between three persons in one Being, as God. Nor does it ever teach that there is a being who is more than one person; for one person is one personal being, and one personal being is one person always, and not more than one in the Bible. It was Satan who, in producing a counterfeit for everything in the Bible in the dark ages, counterfeited the true God as one Being composed of three persons. Let us avoid this unbiblical, unreasonable and unfactual distinction between the words *person* and *being* when referring to a personal being; for it surely is an error invented by Satan to deceive—a work of darkness, a self-contradiction,

which no one can understand or explain, while Bible doctrines are all explainable and understandable.

(c) This trinitarian doctrine contradicts the fact that in the Bible God's Name, Jehovah, applies to the Father alone, and is never used as the personal name of the Son, who repeatedly in contrasted passages is shown not to be Jehovah; for He is in them distinguished from the Father, who by contrast is alone called Jehovah. In Is. 42: 6-8, not only is the name Jehovah applied to the Supreme Being as His exclusive name; but as Jehovah he is shown not to be the Son, who is here represented as being called, held, kept, given by Jehovah, which is the Hebrew word used in the text always where we have the word Lord written entirely in capitals in the A. V., as is the case with the word LORD used in Is. 42: 6-8. Jer. 23: 6, when properly translated, markedly distinguishes between God as Jehovah exclusively, and Christ. Trinitarians have grossly mistranslated and miscapitalized this passage to read their trinitarianism into it, as they have done in other cases. The proper translation shows that Christ is not Jehovah: "This is the name which Jehovah shall call Him [Christ], Our Righteousness." Please compare this with 1 Cor. 1: 30. Thus He is Jehovah's appointed Savior for the world, not Jehovah Himself. See the literal translation of Dr. Young, who, though a trinitarian, translates it substantially as we do. While mistranslating Jer. 33: 16, they have not miscapitalized it, and that because they doubtless feared that the same kind of capitalization would suggest that the Church was also Jehovah, which their translation actually makes her, if their procedure in Jer. 23: 5, 6, be allowed to rule as a parallel case. Here the proper translation is: This is the name that Jehovah shall call her, Our Righteousness. The following are the violations of grammar committed in almost all trinitarian translations in rendering these two closely resembling passages: They have rendered

an active verb, shall call, as a passive verb—shall be called; they have made the subject of this active verb, Jehovah, an attributive object, hence one of its objects, and they have made the object of this verb, *him*, its subject, *he* shall be called; so greatly did their error on the trinity blind the translators to these elementary matters of Hebrew syntax. Rightly translated, the first passage proves that Jesus is not Jehovah, while the false translation of both passages makes Jesus and the Church, Jehovah, which on trinitarian principles would give us 144,003 in one! Rightly translated, how clearly Jer. 23: 6 distinguishes between Jehovah and Christ, and Jer. 33: 16 between Jehovah and the Church! This passage proves our point.

Ps. 110: 1 demonstrates that Jesus is not Jehovah: "The LORD [Jehovah, in the Hebrew] said unto my [David's] Lord (*adon*, not Jehovah, in the Hebrew), sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Here they are clearly distinguished from one another; and our Lord is shown not to be Jehovah. Is. 6: 1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 12, treats of our Lord Jesus and of Jehovah as separate and distinct Beings. In vs. 1, 8, 11 our Lord Jesus is referred to under the Hebrew word *adonai*, which is indicated to the English readers as such by the translation of the word *adonai* by the word Lord being written with only an initial capital letter, while in vs. 3, 5, 12 Jehovah is the Hebrew word, as indicated by its translation LORD being written entirely in capitals. Both of them are in v. 8 indicated by the word "us" in the sentence, "Who will go for us?" Jesus here asks: "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" The fact that these two words *Adonai* and *Jehovah* are used in this chapter, the former to designate Jesus and the latter to designate God, proves that Jesus is not Jehovah, which proves that He is Jehovah's Vicegerent, not Jehovah Himself, and which disproves the trinity doctrine, since it proves that the Father alone is the Supreme

Being, and Jesus is His subordinate, as His Vicegerent. Mal. 3: 1 is an illustration of the same facts, while Josh. 5: 14, with some variation in form, makes similar distinctions to the above.

In many other places Jesus is distinguished from Jehovah, and is thus proven not to be Jehovah, *e.g.*, as the Servant of Jehovah, not Jehovah Himself (Is. 42: 1, 6, 19; 52: 13; 53: 11). He is Jehovah's Arm, Agent, not Jehovah Himself (Is. 53: 1). He is Jehovah's Son, not Jehovah Himself (Ps. 89: 27; 2: 7, 12, compare with Acts 13: 33; Heb. 1: 5; 5: 5). He is Jehovah's Angel, not Jehovah Himself (Gen. 22: 11, 15; Ex. 3: 2; Num. 22: 22-27, 31, 34, 35; Ps. 34: 7). He is Jehovah's Companion, not Jehovah Himself (Zech. 13: 7; Prov. 8: 30). In another connection we will discuss the passages that are alleged to prove that Christ is called Jehovah, and will show that in them Christ acts as God's Representative, speaks, is spoken to and spoken of as Jehovah, because in that representative relation Jehovah speaks, is spoken to and is spoken of representatively in Christ. Thus the lines of thought given in these last two paragraphs prove that the name Jehovah belongs exclusively to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and prove Him to be the only Supreme Being. In this part of our subject we have proven that the trinitarian doctrine, contradicting the second axiom for Biblical interpretation, *i.e.*, a doctrine to be true must be in harmony with all Scriptural passages, must be false.

(3) The trinity doctrine contradicts numerous Bible doctrines, which is a violation of the third axiom of Biblical interpretation. We have already seen this as to the doctrines of God's unity and also the subordination of the Son of God, for the trinity doctrine teaches His equality with the Father. It also contradicts the doctrine of Christ's being the firstborn of all God's creatures (Col. 1: 15; Rev. 3: 14, claiming His coeternity with the Father. It also contradicts

the Bible doctrine that first in His resurrection Christ attained the Divine nature (Heb. 1: 3-5; Phil. 2: 7-11; Eph. 1: 19-21; 1 Cor. 15: 42, 49, compared with 2 Pet. 1: 4; John 5: 26 and 1 Tim. 6: 16, compared with John 6: 53 and 1 Cor. 15: 53, 54); whereas it teaches that from eternity He had the Divine nature. Consequently it contradicts the Bible teaching that His pre-human nature was lower than the Divine, proven among other ways by the fact that He emptied [divested] Himself of that pre-human nature (Phil. 2: 7), which could not have been done had it been Divine, since the Divine nature is unchangeable into another nature. It contradicts the Bible doctrine that Christ, emptying Himself of His pre-human nature, *became flesh, i.e.*, the doctrine of Christ's carnation (John 1: 14; Phil. 2: 6, 7; 2 Cor. 8: 9; Heb. 2: 9, 14, 16). It contradicts the functions of all of Christ's offices, since in them He has acted and still acts as God's Agent, not as His equal. It contradicts the nature and offices of the Holy Spirit, as we will show later on. It contradicts the creative work, inasmuch as it denies Christ's agency therein for the Father. It contradicts the Ransom; for if the trinity doctrine be true, some one outside the trinity would have to be the Ransomer, since under the theory the trinity's, justice would have to be satisfied before it would deal with man; hence somebody outside of the trinity would have to bring the Ransom merit to the trinity to satisfy its justice. It contradicts the Ransom from another standpoint, *i.e.*, a member of the trinity could not die; hence could not furnish the Ransom. Nor could such a being as the second person of the trinity furnish the exact equivalent of Adam's debt, since a Divine being does not correspond in value to a perfect human being. The trinity doctrine violates not only the doctrines of Creation and Ransom as executed by an *Agent* of Jehovah, not by Jehovah Himself, but for the same reason contradicts the Bible doctrines of

providence, revelation, instruction, justification, sanctification and deliverance, all of which are Biblically represented as being performed for God by an Agent (1 Cor. 1: 30; 8: 6). Indeed it is difficult to point out any Biblical doctrine that is not in some way or other impinged against by the doctrine of the trinity. Hence it cannot be a Biblical doctrine.

(4) The trinity doctrine is false, because it contradicts the character of God and thus violates the fourth axiom for Biblical interpretation—a doctrine or a Scriptural interpretation to be true must be in harmony with God's character, since the Bible teachings are an outflow of God's character (Ps. 45: 1). Any doctrine that contradicts that character must be false. God's character blends in perfect harmony His wisdom, justice, love and power. Job 37: 23; Jer. 4: 2; 9: 24, show that these are attributes of God's character, and that they also characterize all His acts. This thought is symbolized by the four living creatures of Ezek. 1 and Rev. 4. Ps. 45: 1 shows that every feature of the Bible Plan is an outflow of God's character. And since God's being and character are harmonious, any teaching that would introduce a contradiction between it and God's being and character must be false. But the trinity doctrine does this very thing; for it reduces God, who is supreme in every attribute of His being and character, and who therefore is, among other things, more wise, just, loving and powerful than any one else, to equality with Christ, a subordinate of God, or to put it another way, it exalts God's Son, who is God's inferior, to equality with God in all His attributes of being and character. Hence the trinity doctrine, which does this, must be false, and cannot be a Bible doctrine. That the Son is in every way inferior to the Father is evident from John 14: 10; 10: 29. That He is inferior to the Father in knowledge is manifest from Mark 13: 32; Acts 1: 7. That He is inferior to the Father in justice and love

appears from John 3: 16, 17. That He is inferior to the Father in power is shown by the fact that His power is that of God's Vicegerent, as is seen in John 5: 30; Matt. 28: 18. Hence the trinitarian doctrine is false, since it makes Him the Father's equal in these, as well as in other attributes. No creature can be the Creator's equal; and the Son is a Creature of the Father (Col. 1: 15; Rev. 3: 14). Hence He can in no way be God's equal, though He is as great as it is possible for a creature of God to become.

(5) The trinity doctrine is false, because it contradicts the Ransom, the central doctrine of the Bible: The Ransom doctrine is this: "The Man, Jesus, is the corresponding price for Adam, and Adam's race condemned in his loins (Matt. 20: 28; 1 Tim. 2: 6). This doctrine is the hub of the plan of God. It conditions every Bible teaching, and assigns to each its place and function in God's plan, as it is also the support of all of them. Any doctrine, therefore, that does not fit in with it, or any doctrine that contradicts it, cannot be true. This the trinity doctrine does, as the following things clearly prove. It makes it impossible that Christ could become a ransom—a corresponding price, a price equal in value to Adam's value as a perfect man—because it makes Him a God-man who must be as much more valuable than a perfect man as God is valuable. Hence a God-man was more than the corresponding price. God's justice must forbid receiving more than the corresponding price, just as much as it must forbid accepting less than the corresponding price. Again, the trinity doctrine makes the Ransom impossible from the standpoint that it makes the death of Christ factually impossible; for the trinity doctrine teaches that Christ, as the God-man, had two natures, Divine and human (a thing that actually makes Him a hybrid), and that the personality of the God-man was that of His Divine nature, not that of His human nature. This it teaches to escape the thought that the God-man is

two persons, and to hold to the thought that He is but one person. But this makes it impossible for the person to have died, since God cannot die. Hence the trinitarian doctrine makes the Ransom impossible, *i.e.*, that a perfect human person died for the perfect human person Adam. Thus we see that the trinity doctrine makes it impossible for Christ to become the Ransom and also to give the Ransom. But, thirdly, the trinity doctrine makes it impossible from another standpoint for Christ to give the Ransom; because if God is a trinity the entire trinity's justice must be satisfied, not simply a part of it. Hence the Son, as a part of the trinity, would have to have His justice satisfied. Hence He could not give the Ransom; He must receive it. The Ransomer would have to be someone outside of the trinity. Hence this point proves that the Ransom could not be received, since it could not satisfy the entire God; and it also proves that a member of the trinity could not bring it. Thus it is apparent that from many vital standpoints the trinity doctrine is in most violent opposition to the Ransom, the central and dominating doctrine of the Bible. Hence it cannot be a true Bible doctrine.

(6) The trinity doctrine must be false because it is contrary to facts; and any teaching that is contrary to facts must be false. The following are some of the facts that the trinity doctrine contradicts: The Father's exclusive past eternity, His all-time supremacy, the Son's creatureship, beginning, inferiority to the Father in all attributes of being and character, His being God's Executive and Mouthpiece in creation, providence, revelation, instruction, justification, sanctification, deliverance for the Church and the world, His carnation, development as a human being and as a new creature, His suffering, His temptation, His trial for life, His dying, His remaining dead parts of three days, His resurrection, the exercise of everyone of the offices of His Saviorhood. It is contrary to

every fact of the Church and the world experiencing through Him the separate, operations of salvation. In a word, the trinity doctrine is in violent conflict with almost every fact in the unfolding of God's plan. This will appear in a clearer light when certain facts as to the nature and office of the Holy Spirit are explained in their pertinent place.

(7) Finally, as being contrary to the seventh axiom for the truth of any interpretation or doctrine, the trinity doctrine is false. The seventh axiom is this: An interpretation or doctrine to be true must be in harmony with the design of the Bible, which is a threefold one: (1) To glorify God as Supreme; (2) to honor Christ as God's Executive and Mouthpiece; and (3) to work out God's plans as to the Church and the world. When the Bible purpose is realized, it will result in there being given "glory to God in the highest," *i.e.*, as supreme (Luke 2: 14; Phil. 2: 11; Rev. 5: 13; 15: 3, 4; Eph. 1: 12; 1 Cor. 15: 28); it will also result in the highest honor under the Father being given to the Son (John 5: 23 [the expression, "as they honor the Father," means not that the Son is to be honored in the same degree, but as a matter of fact as the Father, because He is the Father's Vicegerent. That it does not mean that the Son is to receive equal honor with the Father can be seen from some of the following passages]; Phil. 2: 9-11; Eph. 1: 19-23; 1 Cor. 15: 27, 28; Rev. 5: 13); and finally it will result in the development and deliverance of the faithful Elect and of the faithful non-elect of the world. But the trinity doctrine makes the first of these purposes impossible, for it makes two others share equally with God in the glory of supremacy, acknowledged and yielded to by all the saved. Again, the trinity doctrine makes it impossible to realize the second of these two purposes, for it denies the Son the office of Vicegerent of God, on the alleged ground that He is God Himself, the second person in God, and hence not God's Vicegerent,

but a part of God. It makes the third purpose of the Bible impossible, since in setting aside the Ransom, and making impossible the Saviorhood offices of Christ, there can be no such a thing possible as the realization of the third design of the Bible, the development and deliverance of the faithful elect Church and the faithful non-elect of the world. Hence the trinity doctrine is false. Accordingly, we see from the comparison of the trinity doctrine with the seven axioms of Truth as to an interpretation or doctrine, that the trinity doctrine is a masterpiece of Satanic invention making logically void the entire plan of God, with which it is in most violent conflict. It is therefore not a doctrine of the Bible. It is a doctrine of devils, a masterpiece of Satan, palming off his counterfeit of God on the world of Christendom.

We now offer a third general argument against the doctrine of the trinity: It is contrary to sanctified reason. That the proposition, that sanctified reason, in subordination to the Scriptures, may properly be made a test of truth, so that if anything contradicts it, while it is subject to the Scriptures, it may be regarded as untrue, is true, appears from God's inviting His people to use it (Is. 1: 18); from the fact that it must be used in arriving at Scriptural knowledge (Acts 17: 2; 18: 4; 24: 25); from the fact that the Apostles used it in dealing with the Church (Acts 6: 2) and used it in their writings. Please instance St. Paul's reasoning in his epistles, particularly in Romans, Galatians and Hebrews. Accordingly, any teaching that contradicts sanctified reason, while it is subject to the Bible, must be false. Under our first argument we pointed out that Bible mysteries are reasonable and not contradictory to sanctified reason. Let us here note a few cases where the trinity is unreasonable, as is conceded by its acceptors, and thus is contrary to sanctified reason: It implies that $3=1$, $1=3$, and $3 \times 1=1$, that a son is as old as his father, that a part of God

died, that a part of God prayed to God, was tempted, suffered, remained dead part of three days, that there is a God-man, that a son is his own father and vice versa, that while God is a Spirit Being (John 4: 24), He has in Him a spirit being that is the Holy Spirit, *etc.* These things baffle and contradict sanctified reason, and are untrue; but every one of them is implied in the trinitarian doctrine. Hence it is not a doctrine of the Bible, since sanctified reason is invited to reason on Bible doctrines by God and to be used in arriving at the understanding of Biblical things.

As a fourth general argument against the trinity we present the thought that it entirely lacks genuine Scripture support. Trinitarians admit that there is no Scripture that clearly states their doctrine. Yet they allege a number of passages as direct proofs of it. We will examine each one of these; and we will find that in none of them is their thought stated or implied, but into every one of them they read their thought without its being there, and that by every one of them their doctrine is refuted. In other words, whenever they find a reference to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, or to one or two of them, they assume without proof that they teach or imply a trinity. What they should do but fail to do to prove their doctrine is to produce passages that prove that these are and constitute a trinity; but instead of producing such proof they merely assume that these passages prove the trinity. Hence their course with these passages is the sophistry of eisegesis—reading foreign thoughts into their alleged proof texts. They have been sorely pressed by the fact that no Scripture clearly states their doctrine, and have felt deeply the need of such a Scripture. The sense of the need of such a Scripture led to the fraud of interpolating parts of 1 John 5: 7, 8 into the Bible. But even this interpolation does not teach the doctrine. If it were genuine, it would merely prove that the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit are one in

disposition—one in heart, mind and will, which thought is a Scriptural one. But such a thought is a far cry from the trinity thought, that three persons are and constitute one God. Hence even this fraudulent passage does not teach the trinity doctrine, that three persons are and constitute one God. Hence they treat this passage with the sophistry of eisegesis. Again, Matt 28: 19, "baptizing them *into* [so the Greek] the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit" is quoted by trinitarians as a direct proof of their doctrine. But this passage does not say that these are three persons, though doubtless two of those mentioned in it are persons. Nor does it say nor imply that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are the one God—The Supreme Being. Please note that the passage charges that believers are to be immersed into the name [character] of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. What does this mean? That the Lord's people by the real baptism are to be given such experiences as to their humanity and new creatures as will make them become character images of God and Christ and Their holy disposition (Holy Spirit). Thus this passage does not teach the doctrine of the trinity—that three persons are and constitute one God; hence trinitarians treat it with the sophistry of eisegesis. Nor does 1 Cor. 12: 4-6 teach nor imply the trinity—three persons being and constituting the one Supreme God, for which trinitarians allege it as a direct proof. Those who use it to teach the trinity say v. 4 refers to the Holy Spirit, which is true, that v. 5 refers to Jesus, which is also true, and that v. 6 refers to the Father, which is also true. But please notice that v. 4 does not call the Spirit God, nor does v. 5 call Jesus God, while of these three subjects in vs. 4-6 the Father alone is called God, *i.e.*, in v. 6. On the contrary, v. 5 calls Jesus Lord in contrast to v. 6 calling the Father God, which disproves the trinity doctrine. Thus in vs. 5, 6 the Son and the Father are contrasted, the former as being the Lord (not Jehovah), the latter as being God,

which is the same contrast we find more strongly stated in 1 Cor. 8: 6, where the Father is called the one God and the Son is called the one Lord, which contrast in both passages proves that the Father and not the Son is God. Hence 1 Cor. 12: 4-6 refutes the trinitarian doctrine. Hence they treat it with their habitual sophistry of eisegesis, a bad thing indeed.

Trinitarians quote also, as fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh direct proofs of their doctrine, Eph. 4: 3-6; Matt. 3: 16, 17; 1 Pet. 1: 2; Rev. 1: 4, 5. But even a surface examination of these passages disproves that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are and constitute the one Supreme God. We will consider these passages in the order just cited and thus will begin with Eph. 4: 3-6. While the Spirit and Jesus and the Father are referred to in this passage, they are so contrasted with one another as to show that the Father alone is the Supreme Being. Please note that the passage neither calls the Spirit Lord or God. Please note that while the passage calls the Son the one Lord (*adon* being the Hebrew equivalent, as distinct from Jehovah) it does not call Him the one God, which the passage calls the Father alone. The contrasts in the seven features of Christians' oneness—(1) one Spirit, (2) one body, (3) one hope, (4) one Lord, (5) one faith, (6) one baptism and (7), one God—clearly prove that none of the first six are God, since He is the seventh feature of our oneness. Thus this passage disproves the trinity. Please note the trinitarian sophistry of assuming that the mere mention of the Father, Son and Spirit is of itself a proof of the trinity. This sophistry runs through their use of every passage that they give as direct proofs of the trinity doctrine, whereas not one of them implies, much less states such a thought. The same remarks apply to their use of Matt. 3: 16, 17 as a direct proof of their doctrine. It is true there is mention here made of Jesus, of God and of the Spirit; but the passage certainly does not say they are and constitute

the one God. The fact that the Spirit of God was here poured out on Jesus positively proves that Jesus is not God; for if He had been, He would have had the Spirit from eternity, while here as a new thing it is spoken of as given to Him, and that as a qualification for His ministry (Is. 61: 1, 2). Had He been God, He would always have had supreme qualification for everything that He might attempt to do. Then, too, please note that the passage shows that the Spirit is not God; for It is called not God, but God's Spirit. Hence this passage, which trinitarians quote to prove it, disproves the trinity doctrine. They are in their use of it guilty of their sophistry of reading their doctrine into it. We will continue to stress such sophistry.

Trinitarians use 1 Pet. 1: 2 as one of their alleged direct proofs for the trinity doctrine. In harmony with their course of reading their thought into every passage that they allege as a direct proof of their doctrine, they read their thought into this passage—their habitual sophistry of eisegesis. It neither says nor implies that there are three persons who are and constitute God. On the contrary, the Father here alone is called God, while Jesus is called Lord, the same distinction as we have noted in most of the trinitarians' other alleged direct proofs. Moreover v. 3 refutes the trinitarian doctrine for it directly calls the Supreme Being "The God ... of our Lord Jesus Christ." Moreover the word Spirit in v. 2 evidently does not mean a Spirit being, but our new creature, that which is begotten of God in us (1 John 5: 4); for St. Peter is here showing how our foreknown selection for the kingdom is accomplished—in [so the Greek] the sanctification of the Spirit, the new creature undergoing the sanctification process, the selection being made for developing proper obedience and for the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, *i.e.*, our humanity continuing in the justification experience through the continued imputation of Jesus' merit on our behalf. So also do they read

their thought into Rev. 1: 4, 5, which neither says nor implies that there are three persons who are and constitute the one God. Undoubtedly God is meant by the "Him which is, and which was, and which is to come," though in this verse the word God does not occur. And He is in vs. 4, 5 pointedly distinguished from Jesus Christ; for if the trinitarian doctrine were true Jesus would be included in the terms "Him which is, and which was, and which is to come"; but the expression, "which was," implying God's past eternity, cannot be applied to Jesus, since He had a beginning, hence was not eternal (Col. 1: 15; Rev. 3: 14). Moreover He is proven in v. 6 not to be God; for there God is called His Father (see A. R. V.). The Greek expression for the A. V. rendering, "unto God and His Father," were best rendered, unto *the* God, *even* His Father. Thus Rev. 1: 4-6 disproves that the Son is God Almighty. This Scripture does not mention the Holy Spirit at all. Hence should not be used as an alleged proof of the trinity. The seven spirits of God of v. 4, in harmony with one of the twelve meanings of the word spirit, mean teachings (2 Thes. 2: 2, 8; 1 John 4: 1-3; 5: 6; Rev. 19: 10) and represent the sevenfold teachings of the Bible: (1) doctrinal, (2) ethical, (3) promissory, (4) hortatory, (5) prophetic, (6) historical and (7) typical. Through these grace and peace, as v. 4 teaches, are ministered to us: This passage, like the wished grace and peace in the start of all the apostolic writings that contain such wishes, never mention these as coming from the Holy Spirit, those wishing them mentioning them as coming from God and Christ, which disproves the trinity. Accordingly our investigation of this alleged direct proof passage for the trinity disproves from this and the preceding passages the trinity doctrine. It is a false teaching.

As an eighth direct proof for the trinity, the threefold Aaronic benediction of Num. 6: 24-26 is quoted

by trinitarians. At least it must be conceded that the passage says nothing about there being three persons, nor about their being one God, nor about their constituting the one Supreme Being. Hence the trinitarian doctrine of three persons being and constituting one God is read into this passage. How is it that trinitarians read their doctrine into this passage? They claim that there are three blessings referred to therein; hence they read their trinity into it. But there are six, not three blessings in this passage, which presents these blessings in three pairs; and six blessings in three pairs are not three persons, nor does the fact that six blessings are imparted imply that there must be three persons imparting them; for one person has often conferred even more than six blessings. Nor does the threefold occurrence of the name Jehovah here imply three Gods in one. Hence the trinity doctrine is not here presented. These six blessings refer to the good things that God bestows upon His people in their *three* conditions, as these three conditions are pictured by Israel in its relation to the Tabernacle—the Camp, the Court and the Sanctuary, two blessings for each condition. Hence the threefold occurrence of the name Jehovah in Num. 6: 24-26. The first of these double benedictions applies to the Camp, which pictures the condition of the nominal people of God. These God by His Priesthood blesses with the offer of the first blessing, repentance, and the second blessing, faith, working these in the responsive. The second of these double benedictions applies to the Court, which pictures the justified. These God by His Priesthood blesses with the offer of the third blessing, justification, and the fourth blessing, consecration, and works these in the responsive. And the third of these double benedictions applies to the Sanctuary, which pictures the spiritual condition of the Church in its two phases, spirit-begotten condition (the Holy) and spirit-born condition (the Most Holy). These God by His

Priesthood offers to bless with the favors of the spirit begotten condition as the fifth blessing, and with the favors of the spirit-born condition as the sixth blessing of the Aaronic benediction, working them in the faithful. Moreover the blessing of Jehovah (LORD) is here pronounced. And Jehovah is a name that belongs exclusively to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus. Hence the Aaronic benediction does not teach nor imply the trinity. Trinitarians' use of it is another example of their sophistry—eisegesis.

The ninth and last alleged direct proof that trinitarians offer for the trinity doctrine is the Apostolic benediction: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the participation of the Holy Spirit be with you" (2 Cor. 13: 14). Here again we note that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are referred to, but be it also noted that they are not mentioned as being three persons, though two of them are undoubtedly persons, as the third is not, which we will prove in another connection. It will be further noted that the passage does not say that these three are one God. On the contrary, only the Father is in it called God. Again, instead of Jesus being called God He is called the Lord. Here again we find the same contrast between the Father and the Son that we have found in 1 Cor. 8: 6 and in six of the other genuine passages alleged to prove the trinity directly. The Father here is called God; and the Son is here called Lord. Hence this contrast proves that the Son is not God Almighty, which the Father alone is. Hence this passage disproves the trinity. In it the Apostle Paul wished three things for the Corinthians: (1) that the Lord Jesus' favor exercised through His office as Savior may be theirs; (2) that the love of God may continue to be theirs; (3) that a share in the Holy Spirit may continue to be theirs. But such wishes are a far cry from teaching or implying the trinity—that three persons are and constitute the one God, the Supreme

Being. Thus we have examined the nine alleged proofs offered as direct evidence by trinitarians that God is a trinity—that He as one God consists of three persons; and we have found that none of these passages prove or imply their view, that in the trinitarians' use of them they practice the sophistry of eisegesis; yea, that these passages contradict the doctrine that trinitarians quote them to prove. We will in this chapter examine their suggested indirect proofs. We ask our readers to hold their minds in abeyance on the nature of the Holy Spirit until we treat that subject later in this discussion, for we will give abundant Bible proof that the Holy Spirit is not a person at all, but is (1) God's power, and (2) God's disposition in Himself and in all who are in harmony with Him. Such a proof as to the Holy Spirit does away with the "third person" in the alleged trinity, as we shall see.

We present a fifth general argument against the trinity doctrine: It is an invention of Satan. This follows from several facts. In the first place, as we have seen, the Bible does not at all teach it. Hence it was not God who invented it; for if it were God's view of the subject, He would have revealed it in the Bible, which is given to reveal God truly to us. Since it is an error it must have come ultimately from Satan, the father of lies (John 8: 44); for it is he, the god of this world, who blinds by error the minds of those who believe not, in order to prevent their seeing the glory of God shining in the face of our Lord Jesus (2 Cor. 4: 4). It is he who by his servants puts light for darkness and darkness for light (Is. 5: 20). When doing this he transforms himself and his servants into angels of light and righteousness, *i.e.*, he pretends to be a messenger of light and righteousness (2 Cor. 11: 14, 15). This trinity doctrine has every mark of a Satanic origin. By it he sought to belittle God by making an inferior of His equal to Him; by it he sought to grieve our Lord who is so loyal to the Father that it grieves

Him to be palmed off as the Father's equal; by it he sought to darken God's plan and make it appear unreasonable, self-contradictory and indefensible; by it he sought to make the Bible appear to be a book containing nonsense; by it he sought to baffle the minds of saints, and more or less deprave their hearts through making it impossible appreciatively, and understandingly, to worship and reverence God; by it he sought to make its acceptors amenable to priestcraft and consequent degradation; by it he sought to make infidels out of thinking people, who were by him deceived into believing the Bible teaches such a doctrine; and last, but not least, he sought to deprive the Father of the supremacy and highest reverence and worship in the affections of the people. These fell purposes, germane to the nature and effects of the trinity doctrine, prove it to be of Satanic origin. Hence it is only another lie of the father of lies, and therefore is to be rejected as such; for once seeing an error is to reject it.

As a sixth general argument against the trinity doctrine we note that it is a heathen doctrine, which discredits it, since the heathen gods the Bible says are devils (Deut. 32: 17; 1 Cor. 8: 4, 5; 10: 20). It is the conception of God that is to be found in all the ancient and practically all modern heathen religions. This is true of the Chinese religion, whose emperor offered yearly a sacrifice to the spirit of the trinity. Confucius said: "Tao (God) is by nature one; the first begat the second; both together brought forth the third; these three made all things." The Japanese view is very similar. The trinity of India (Trimurte), Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, is worshiped as three persons, though originally the Divine principle Brahma, was but one. One of its sacred writings declares: "The great Unity is to be distinctively recognized as three gods in one person." One of its hymns reads: "There are three deities; but there is only one Godhead, the great soul." The Chaldean Oracle declares: "The

Unity brought forth the Duality, which dwells with it and shines in intellectual light; from these proceeded the trinity." The names of the Chaldean trinity are Anos, Illinos and Aos. The Babylonian trinity is shown in the three images in the temple of Belus; the Phoenicians' trinity was Ulomus, Ulosuros and Eliun. That of the Egyptians was Kneph or Ammun, Phthas and Osiris. That of the Greeks was Zeus, Poseidon and Pluton. That of the Romans was Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto. The money of the Dalai Lama (Thibet) is stamped with a picture of a threefold Deity. A Tartar coin is stamped with a human figure with three heads, which according to the superscription on the reverse side represents their trinity. The trinity of the heathen Irish was Kriosan, Biosena and Siva; of the heathen Scandinavians, Thor, Wodan and Fricco; and of the heathen Germans, Odin, Thor and Freya. The ancient Indians of North and South America called their three in one God Tangalanga (one in three and three in one) and Trinimaaka (trinity). Accordingly we see that the supreme God of practically all heathen nations is a trinity. But since the Bible teaches that the heathen worshiped devils, we infer that Satan secured the worship of himself and two other devils under the name of the heathen trinities. These facts demonstrate the erroneousness of so-called Christian trinitarianism.

A seventh general argument against the trinity is the fact that it is the counterfeit of the Bible God palmed off on the world by Satan, through the Papal Antichrist. The Roman hierarchy with the pope as its head is Satan's counterfeit of the true Christ; for Antichrist means literally, instead of Christ, *i.e.*, counterfeit Christ. The Bible teaches that Jesus, the Head, and the faithful saints, His Body, are the true Christ, *i.e.*, the true Anointed, since the word Christ means Anointed, as the following points will show: These are all anointed by the Spirit (Matt. 3: 16; Acts 10: 38; 2: 1-4; 10: 45-47; 2 Cor. 1: 21; 1 John 2: 20, 27).

Hence they are called Christ, Christ-partakers, sharers in Christ as parts of Him, are in the Christ company, of the Christ, in Christ, Christ in me or in you (1 Cor. 12: 12, 13; 15: 23; Gal. 3: 16, 29; Eph. 4: 13; Col. 1: 24; 1 Pet. 4: 13; Heb. 3: 14; Col. 1: 27; Rom. 8: 10; Gal. 2: 20; Phil. 2: 21). Being The Christ, they are the one Company in which Jesus is the Head and the faithful saints are the Body (John 17: 23, 26; Rom. 12: 4, 5; 1 Cor. 12: 12-14, 27; Eph. 1: 22, 23). This makes them the one new and perfect (symbolic) man (Eph. 2: 15; 4: 13, 24; Col. 3: 10). The reason the faithful saints are with Jesus called Christ is twofold: (1) Like Him they are anointed (Christed) by the Spirit; and (2) a bride bears her husband's name, the faithful saints being the Bride of Christ (2 Cor. 11: 2; Rev. 19: 7; 21: 2, 9; 22: 17).

This fact that The Christ is a company is the mystery of God and Godliness (Col. 1: 26, 27; 2: 2; Eph. 3: 3-6, 9; 1 Tim. 3: 16). But this mystery stands in contrast with Satan's counterfeit of it, the Antichrist as the mystery of iniquity, the very opposite of the mystery of Godliness (2 Thes. 2: 7). The relation between the two is the following: The mystery of God is The Christ; the Mystery of iniquity is the Antichrist, *i.e.*, counterfeit Christ. This counterfeit arose as follows: Satan was one of the most studious listeners to the preaching and teaching of Jesus and the Apostles. From these he learned every feature of God's plan. Then he proceeded to counterfeit it in every detail. He thus produced Antichrist, papacy, as the counterfeit of the true Christ, in which counterfeit the pope, as the head of the hierarchy, is the counterfeit of Jesus, the true Head of the saints, and in which counterfeit the hierarchy, the body of the pope, is the counterfeit of the true saints, the Body of Christ. This explains the relation between Christ and Antichrist. But every other feature of God's plan Satan counterfeited in the papacy, either in its doctrines, organization,

practices or discipline, and in this counterfeit the true God, Jehovah, the One Supreme God, who is only one Person and Being, was counterfeited by Satan through Antichrist by the trinity—three Gods are one God. Since, therefore, the trinity is Satan's counterfeit of the true God in the Antichrist, it must be a false teaching. Satan, proud of the trinity that he invented in the heathen religions, through Antichrist introduced among Christians his heathen doctrine of the trinity, for which we should repudiate it.

The fruits of this trinity doctrine prove it to be wrong, which we present as our eighth general argument against it. Some of these fruits we showed when pointing out that Satan introduced this doctrine to disparage God, grieve Christ, injure God's real people and enslave the nominal people of God. Here we will give some others: There is no doubt that this doctrine is conducive to superstition, priestcraft, and the degradation of the people by making them believe unscriptural, unreasonable, ununderstandable, self-contradictory and unfactual things, which in turn make them susceptible to believe other unscriptural, unreasonable, ununderstandable, self-contradictory and unfactual things. It has made clear thinkers disbelieve the Bible, which they were deceived into believing taught the trinity and its connected errors. It has also been responsible for persecution, since it naturally makes bigots and fanatics of its whole-hearted believers. Calvin brought Servetus to the stake for disbelieving this doctrine. The inquisition tortured many a disbeliever in the trinity. Its detailed elaboration makes the Father appear repellent, cruel and vindictive, and the Son full of mercy, pleading with this repellent, cruel and vindictive Being to exact vengeance on Him, and let the sinner go free in pardon. This view makes people dread God, not love Him, and results in the actual exaltation of Jesus in the affections of the people above the Father. This doctrine turns faith into credulity.

It makes it almost impossible to love God supremely, as well as results in Jesus being loved more than the Father of all compassion, all mercy and all goodness, and this greatly weakens in its believers the power of godliness to make saintly characters. It certainly undermines hope in God. It makes it almost impossible to obey God from faith, hope and love. Accordingly, by its fruits this doctrine gives evidence of being an error, while the truth that the Father is the only Supreme God conduces to sanctification (John 17: 17). This should move us to concordant acts.

This doctrine is false, because it is based on wrong methods of interpretation and of propaganda. This we present as our ninth general argument against it. It sets aside clear statements and stresses obscure ones. It ignores contrasts between the Supreme Being and Christ that, if heeded, would give the trinity doctrine a death blow. It reads into its main proof texts thoughts that they do not contain, and ignores the features of those texts that refute the doctrine that those texts are by trinitarians supposed to prove. Nowhere in the Bible is it either clearly or even obscurely stated. In a word, it is read into the Bible and not drawn out of the Bible. Or to put it in another way, it is based on eisegesis, not on exegesis. It was not originally accepted by weight of argument; but by the power of Emperor Constantine and his successors, who forced the doctrine upon the Christian world, banishing and degrading its opponents, who had decidedly the better of the argument in the debate on the question. The majority of Christian people at first were on their side and recognized the trinity teaching as a thing foreign to the belief that had prevailed from the days of Christ and the Apostles; but they had to bow to the might of emperors who forced their subjects to receive this error. The controversy lasted several centuries before the opponents of this doctrine were forced to give up, the trinitarians owing their victory to armies, generals

and emperors, which again shows that the doctrine was not spread by the sword of the Spirit, but by the sword of the Roman Empire—a sure proof that it was championed by Satan and Antichrist.

As a tenth general argument against the trinity doctrine we present the following: A right understanding of our Lord's three natures overthrows the thought of His being God Almighty or a part of God Almighty. On this point, as on our preceding and following points, lack of space prevents our giving details; therefore as on all our other points we, on this point, will summarize our pertinent thoughts. According to the Bible Jesus has had three natures: (1) A prehuman nature, lower than the Divine, but higher than the angelic natures; (2) human nature, and (3) a posthuman nature, the Divine nature. If this is true, it destroys the possibility of His being the so-called second person in the trinity. We have treated rather detailedly on His prehuman nature above. As we, as well as trinitarians, believe that Jesus existed as the Logos before He came to earth as the human being, Jesus, there is no need of discussing that phase of the subject here; since details on it are given above. The following things may be said on His prehuman relations to the Father, all of which prove that he was not God Almighty or a part of God Almighty. He is said to have been created by God (Col. 1: 15; Rev. 3: 14), hence had a beginning, was therefore a creature, hence could not have been God Almighty. Instead of being God Almighty, He was then (and since) called the Son of God, the firstborn of, and the only begotten by God (Ps. 89: 27; John 3: 16, 18; 1: 14, 18; 1 John 4: 9; Ps. 2: 7-10). Hence He was not God Himself, but God's Son in His prehuman condition. Being a Son of God, having been begotten by God, He is not so old as the Father; hence He had a beginning; hence is not eternal; hence is not God Almighty. In His prehuman condition He is called: (1) Michael, the Archangel

(Dan. 10: 13, compare with 12: 1; Jude 9, compare with 1 Thes. 4: 16); (2) the Angel, and (3) the Angel of God, or of the Lord (Ex. 14: 19; Judg. 6: 11-22; 13: 3-21; 2 Sam. 24: 16; 1 Kings 19: 7; 2 Kings 1: 3, 15; Ps. 34: 7; Zech. 1: 11, 12, *etc.*). Hence in His prehuman condition He was not God Almighty or a part of God Almighty, but was His Chief Angel or Messenger, which proves that He was in His prehuman condition neither co-eternal, consubstantial (of the same substance or essence) nor co-equal with the Father, things absolutely necessary for Him to have been in His prehuman nature, if He was God Himself, or an essential part of God Himself.

In the passages in which His prehuman condition and carnation are described He is set forth in terms that exclude the thought of His being God Almighty or an essential part of God Almighty. In Phil. 2: 5, 6 He is directly said in His prehuman form to have been a Spirit Being inferior to God. Please see the A. R. V. for the proper translation of this verse. Moreover in v. 7 His becoming a human being is said to have occurred by His emptying [divesting] Himself, a thing a Divine Being cannot do, since such a being is unchangeable. John 1: 14, literally translated, reads thus: "The Word [the prehuman Christ] *became* flesh," *i.e.*, became a human being. Notice the passage does not say, as the trinitarians' thought requires, "The Word remained the Word and assumed into the unity of His person human nature." But this passage shows us that the Word ceased to remain the Word, the highest being next to God, and became a human being, just as the water at Cana ceased to be water when it became the wine in Christ's first miracle. Because of God's invariableness, it would have been impossible for Jesus to become a man had He been God. The same thought is taught in 2 Cor. 8: 9, by the fact that the passage tells us that He who was rich [in nature, *etc.*] became poor, an impossibility for God. Indeed, to harmonize

with the trinity doctrine this passage would have to read something like this: He who was rich became richer, inasmuch as He retained His rich nature and added to it as much more of riches as perfect humanity is worth. Does the passage give such a thought?

Heb. 2: 9, 11, 16, 17 overthrows the trinity doctrine; for this doctrine teaches that He as God remained higher than the angels, and that when He assumed in addition the human nature, He still was higher than the angels, remaining God Almighty. To become a little lower than the angels, *i.e.*, a perfect man as Adam was (vs. 7, 8), He had to give up the nature that was higher than theirs (Heb. 2: 16, see A. R. V.), which would have been impossible, if He were God Almighty. In His prehuman condition He is shown not to be God Almighty by the contrast that John 1: 1, 2 brings out, as the literal translation shows: "In a beginning (hence not in eternity) was the Word; and the Word was with *the* God [the Supreme Being]; and the Word was *a* God. The same was in a beginning with *the* God [the Supreme Being]." It will be noted that there is a strong contrast made here between *a* God, which the prehuman Jesus was, and *the* God. By the latter term the Almighty God is meant; by the former term a Spirit Being inferior to Almighty God is meant. This will become clear, if we remember that about 200 times in the Bible angels, good and bad, are called Gods, as, among others, can be seen in the following: Ps. 97: 7, compare with Heb. 1: 6, where St. Paul gives an inspired comment on Ps. 97: 7; Gen. 3: 5; Ex. 12: 12; 15: 11; 18: 11; Deut. 7: 25; 10: 17; Josh. 22: 22; 1 Sam. 28: 13; Ps. 95: 3; 96: 4; 97: 9; 136: 2; Acts 14: 11; 1 Cor. 8: 5; 2 Cor. 4: 4. Hence the Logos as the Archangel is in John 1: 1, 2 called a God; but the very contrast between *a* God and *the* God shows that he was not the Supreme God, nor a so-called second person of the Supreme God. Hence in this paragraph and the two preceding paragraphs, where His prehuman condition

and His carnation are described, He is set forth in such Biblical terms as disprove His being Divine before and during His carnation. Therefore He was not then God Almighty, which fact proves that He never was nor could be God Almighty, which is fatal to the trinity doctrine as an alleged Bible doctrine.

Then, too, during the days of His flesh, *i.e.*, of His human nature, He is set forth in such terms as disprove His being God Almighty. We have already seen from Phil. 2: 5-7; 2 Cor. 8: 9; Heb. 2: 9, 14, 16, 17; John 1: 14 that He could not have become a human being without giving up His prehuman nature, which could not have been given up, had it been Divine, since Divinity is unchangeable. This, of course, proves that while He was in the flesh He was not in the Divine nature. Hence He never was God Almighty. The Bible is most explicit that He was a sinless man among sinful men for 33½ years. That He was a human being during those 33½ years follows from His having been born of a human mother (Gal. 4: 4), by His growing as a human being into manhood (Luke 2: 52; 3: 23), by His oft-given title as the pre-eminent descendant of Adam, literally, the Son of the man, and the Son of David, by his hungering and thirsting (Matt. 21: 18, 19; 4: 2; John 19: 28), by His becoming weary (John 4: 6), by His weeping (Luke 19: 41-44; John 11: 35), by His praying (Matt. 26: 39-44; Heb. 5: 7), by His temptations (Matt. 4: 1-10; Luke 22: 28; Heb. 2: 18; 4: 15), by His sorrowing (Is. 53: 3; Matt. 26: 38), by His suffering (1 Pet. 2: 21; 3: 18), by His dying (1 Cor. 15: 3), by His crying, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt 27: 46), by His being buried as a dead man (Matt. 27: 57-61) and by His resurrection after being dead parts of three days (Matt. 28: 1-6).

Had He been God Almighty during those 33½ years, He could not have been born of a woman, grown into manhood, been rightly called the Son of the man, and

the Son of David. Nor could He have hungered and thirsted, become weary, weak, prayed to God (which would have been praying to Himself), been tempted, sorrowed, suffered, been forsaken by God, died, been buried and resurrected. Had He been God Almighty, we would have to consider these experiences as a pretense, a *pro forma* exhibition, a sham. The doctrine that He was God Almighty, and that His only personality was the personality of God Himself, must make these experiences a sham, a *pro forma* matter, since the trinity doctrine denies the possibility of His human nature having a personality of its own, and does this to *evade* the logical conclusion that His having two natures at the same time—"The God—man" each of which had its own intellect, sensibilities and will, the constituents of personality, there must be two persons in Him. These facts prove that He was only a human being—a perfect one, it is true—during those 33½ years. Accordingly we see that Christ's having human nature, and only human nature, during those 33½ years, He could then not have been God Almighty. And if He then was not God Almighty, He never was such, since this would imply that God Almighty in His alleged second person was out of existence during those 33½ years. The absurdity that He was during those 33½ years "the God-man" and is such yet is the basis of such absurd trinitarian expressions as: "the Mother of God," "God died" and the words of a trinitarian hymn, "O great woe! God Himself lies dead!" Such absurd and blasphemous expressions never occur in the Bible, because they inculcate a grossly unreasonable and unbiblical thought. Rather the thoughts set forth in this paragraph prove that, Christ having been a human being 33½ years, the trinity doctrine must be false.

The trinity doctrine is false because it implies, among other things, that our Lord had the Divine nature from eternity, whereas the Bible teaches that

he became Divine in nature at and by His resurrection. What was above proven of His nature as the Logos and as a man proves that He was not Divine in nature before His resurrection. We will now prove that He became Divine in nature at and by His resurrection. This will appear from a number of considerations. (1) On condition of being faithful unto death He was offered, among other things, the Divine nature as the joy set before Him (Heb. 12: 2). To reach this condition He had to undergo the resurrection process, which begins with the begetting of the Spirit to the Divine heart and mind, proceeds through the development into perfection of that which is begotten—the Divine heart and mind—and is completed in the birth of the Spirit. The begetting occurs at consecration, the resurrection of the spiritual heart and mind proceeds hand in hand with the sacrificial death and the bestowal of the Divine body or nature occurs at the awakening from death. This resurrection process is a regeneration. That Christ underwent this rebirth is evident from several facts: (1) from the fact that His resurrection process is set forth as forming the pattern of ours (Rom. 6: 4, 5), which this passage proves begins at our consecration and proceeds unto perfection, as we carry out that consecration faithfully unto death; (2) from the fact that our resurrection process is called a rising with Christ (Col. 3: 1; 2: 12, 13; Eph. 2: 5, 6), and the power of His resurrection (Phil. 3: 10); and (3) from the fact that the Bible teaches that we are dying *with* Him (hence undergoing the same kind of a sacrificial death as His) and at the same time rising in life *with* Him. This thought is taught in all the passages quoted under (1) and (2); it is also taught in the following: Rom. 6: 3-11; 8: 10; 2 Cor. 4: 10; Gal. 2: 20. These three points prove that Christ and the Church from their consecration onward until they are raised from the dead undergo the regenerative process, the resurrection process.

The regenerative process as undergone by both Christ and the Church is described as a new creation. It begins with the begetting of the Spirit (John 1: 12, 13; 1 Cor. 4: 15; Phile. 10; Jas. 1: 18; 1 Pet. 1: 3, 23; 1 John 5: 1), which begetting made them embryo new creatures (2 Cor. 5: 17; Gal. 6: 15; compare with 1 Pet. 3: 16; 5: 10, 14). It proceeds through a quickening process (Eph. 2: 5; Col. 3: 13; 1 Tim. 6: 13). It passes through a growth process until developed enough for the birth (2 Pet. 3: 18; Eph. 4: 15; 1 Pet. 2: 2; 5: 10; Eph. 4: 12). The birth from the dead makes them Spirit beings of the Divine nature (John 3: 5; Jas. 1: 18; 2 Pet. 1: 4; 1 Cor. 15: 50-54). This process beginning with the begetting and ending with the birth of the Spirit constitutes the creative acts whereby God brings into existence a new order of beings, that of the Divine nature. This new creation consists of Jesus and His faithful followers. The passages treating of this creative process just given prove that the Church undergoes this creative process unto the Divine nature. The Scriptures teach that Jesus also underwent it. Thus as the Church was begotten of the Spirit, in its Jewish and Gentile parts (Acts 2: 1-4; 10: 44-47)—so was Jesus begotten of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3: 16). As the Church was quickened, so was Jesus (Eph. 2: 5). As the Church is developed unto character perfection and thus fitted to be born of the Spirit in the resurrection, as the passages in the first part of this paragraph prove, so was Jesus (Heb. 2: 10; 5: 8, 9). And after being so perfected He was born of the Spirit in His resurrection as the Beginning and Chief One of the class so to be born (Col. 1: 18; Rev. 1: 5; Rom. 8: 29). This entire re-creation process that changed Him from a human to a Divine being is described in Ps. 2: 7; Acts 13: 33; Heb. 1: 5; 5: 5; Rev. 1: 5, as a bringing to birth. Hence in Jesus' resurrection He was given the Divine nature for the first time.

The following considerations also prove that He was made Divine in His resurrection. Immortality, which the Bible defines as life in oneself (1 Tim. 6: 16; John 5: 26; 6: 53), is an exclusive quality of the Divine nature, as we see from 1 Tim. 6: 16 and from the first clause of John 5: 26. Its second clause shows that while Jesus did not then have it, God had promised it to Him. This promise God fulfilled to Him in His resurrection, as we see from the fact that in the resurrection all the Faithful, one of whom He was, obtain immortality (1 Cor. 15: 53, 54) and from the fact that in the resurrection the saints will be like Him (1 John 3: 2); hence He must then have gotten it, since they partake in His resurrection (Phil. 3: 10). This likeness consists in their having His, the Divine nature, in their resurrection, which is the same kind of a resurrection as His (2 Pet. 1: 4; Phil. 3: 10, 21; 1 Cor. 15: 45-49). Thus in His resurrection He obtained the Divine nature and its kind of life, immortality. That Jesus did not have immortality before His resurrection is evident from the fact that He died, which an immortal being cannot do. And since immortality is an inherent quality exclusively of the Divine nature (1 Tim. 6: 16), before His resurrection Jesus was not Divine since before that He died; and since His resurrection changed him from a human into a Spirit being (1 Cor. 15: 45-49), it was in His resurrection that He became Divine. But we have yet more proof for it.

His exaltation to the Divine nature, whereby He became "the exact impress of the Father's substance [Divine]," is clearly shown to have occurred in His resurrection by Heb. 1: 3-5; for the whole passage treats of Him after His resurrection at the time of His glorification. We will quote it from the Improved Version, asking our readers to note particularly the tenses of the verbs: "Who, being the effulgence of His Glory [like God in splendor of character] and the very image of His Substance [a body just like God's,

hence Divine in nature] and upholding all things by His powerful Word [acting as God's Vicegerent throughout the universe (Matt. 28: 18)], after making a purification of sins [sprinkled His blood on the Mercy Seat], sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the highest, *after becoming* [a thing that He while in the flesh (Heb. 2: 9) had not been; but yet a thing that prior to His sitting down at the right hand of God He had become] by so much superior to angels as He has inherited a more excellent name [nature] than they; for unto which of the angels did He ever say, "Thou art my Son; today I have brought Thee to birth." Please note that in Acts 13: 33 St. Paul quotes the last two clauses from Ps. 2: 7 as a proof of Christ's resurrection, which proves that he quotes them here to prove the same thing. Hence this passage proves that Jesus in His resurrection inherited the more excellent name [nature], the Divine nature, than angels have.

Here it is important to note that the word *name* in the Bible has seven meanings, three of which are nature (Is. 62: 2; Rev. 3: 12), honor (Ex. 9: 16; Neh. 9: 10) and official authority (Ex. 5: 23; Esth. 8: 8, 10). While in Heb. 1: 4 the word undoubtedly means nature, which is proven by the fact that the resurrection passage in Ps. 2: 7, compared with Acts 13: 33, is quoted in proof that His resurrection made Him higher than angels, whereas, while a man, He was a little lower than angels (Heb. 2: 9), all three of these meanings occur in Phil. 2: 9-11, where the "name above every name," the Father's of course excepted (1 Cor. 15: 27), means nature, honor and official authority. Here the Apostle tells us that because of our Lord's emptying [divesting] Himself of His prehuman nature in becoming a man and then obeying God even unto the death of the cross, God highly exalted Him, by giving Him a name above every other name, *i.e.*, a nature, honor and official authority above every other nature, honor and official authority. The same thought

of God's exalting Christ in His resurrection above every other name (nature, honor and official authority) we find in Eph. 1: 19-22. Col. 2: 9 assures us that in Christ now all the fullness of the Deity dwells bodily, *i.e.*, in Christ as God's Vicegerent lodges God's character, nature, honor, power and official authority; but a comparison of Col. 1: 18, 19 proves that this is since Christ's resurrection, and is a reward for His faithfulness to God unto death. Having thus proven that Christ attained the Divine nature in His resurrection, it follows that the trinity doctrine cannot be true; for it implies that Christ always has been Divine in nature.

Trinitarians seek to meet this argument by the claim that Christ's exaltation in His resurrection was not in His Divine nature, which they claim was always exalted, but in His human nature. To this we answer, the Bible never says that He was exalted in His human nature in His resurrection; but it says that He, the person, and not a part of Him was exalted. Again, the Bible by at least 21 separate lines of thought teaches that Jesus was not resurrected as a human being, which would have made Him take back the ransom price, and thus vitiate the whole plan of salvation, but was resurrected as a Spirit Being of the Divine nature (P' 28, 11-15). Hence their evasion falls to the ground. If it were kept in mind that God, among other things, set before the Logos the joy of His exaltation to the Divine nature, honor and official authority, if He would give up His prehuman nature, become a sinless human being and give Himself as such to become man's ransom price to be laid down by a sacrificial death and to be paid to God after Jesus' ascension (Heb. 9: 24; 1 John 2: 2; 4: 10), God would as a reward exalt Him in His resurrection to the Divine nature, honor and official authority (Heb. 12: 2; 1: 3-5; Phil. 2: 9-11; Eph. 1: 19-22; Col. 2: 9; 1: 18, 19), the futility of this evasion will at once be recognized. Why did God require such stringent tests of our Lord before exalting

Him to the Divine nature? He desired a Vicegerent that could be absolutely depended upon to take God's side—the side of truth and righteousness—and be faithful to that side, regardless of any pressure whatsoever to the contrary. Hence He deferred His exaltation until by His obedience in carnation, life and death He proved Himself worthy—"Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and glory and blessing" (Rev. 5: 12). If He received these after He was slain, as appears from Matt. 28: 18 and the last passage quoted, He did not have them before, hence was not Divine before He was slain. The trinity doctrine cannot stand up in the presence of the Bible and the Plan of God therein contained. The fact that Jesus was raised to the Divine nature in His resurrection gives a fatal blow to the trinity doctrine, as we trust our readers see.

Having proven that our Lord is not God Almighty and hence that the trinity doctrine is not true, we will now proceed to discuss the Holy Spirit in relation to the trinity doctrine, as our twelfth general argument against it. We will first briefly define the Holy Spirit: It is (1) the power or influence, and (2) the disposition of God, either in Himself or in those in harmony with Him. One or the other of these two definitions will fit every occurrence of the expression Holy Spirit in the Bible. We will now give, first in its first sense, afterward in its second sense, proof of the correctness of this definition. That the Holy Spirit is God's power or influence is evident from Luke 1: 35: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee; and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." Here the Holy Spirit is defined as the power of the Highest. How do we know this? Because Gabriel in using this language used a parallelism, which is one of the ways the Hebrews made their poetry. While English poetry is made by rhythm of words, often accompanied by rime of words, Hebrew poetry, among other ways, is made

by rhythm of thought, whereby the same thought is repeated in different words, called parallelism. Accordingly the expression, "The *Holy Spirit* shall come upon thee," means the same thing as, and is defined by the expression, "The *power of the Highest* shall overshadow thee." This parallelism proves that the word *kai*, which in Greek means *and, also* and *even*, in this passage means *even*. Hence this passage proves that the Holy Spirit means the power or influence of God. Luke 24: 49 defines the Holy Spirit "power from on high," which also proves the first sense of our definition. So also does John 20: 22, 23 prove the first sense: "He (Jesus) breathed on them and said unto them, Receive a [so the Greek] Holy Spirit [power. That holy power is shown in the immediately following words to be the holy power to declare as God's mouthpieces the forgiveness of sins to penitent believers and the retention of sins to the impenitent]; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." In other words, Christ by His death, providing the ransom price as the basis for forgiveness of sins, in John 20: 22, 23 gave the disciples the holy power to act as His representatives in declaring the basis and conditions on which sins are to be forgiven or retained, and to assure those concerned of these two facts. Before Pentecost (when for the first time the Holy Spirit was given in the sense of the spiritual disposition to any of Adam's fallen race, John 7: 39) whenever the Spirit is spoken of as acting in nature or on fallen men, it is always in the sense of God's holy power or influence. This is implied in John 7: 39, since it shows that before Pentecost the Spirit was not on or in any fallen man in the sense in which it has been since Pentecost.

The second sense of the words Holy Spirit is the disposition of God in Himself and in others, *i.e.*, those who are in harmony with His disposition, His Spirit. It is in them a holy mind, holy affections and a holy

will. During the Gospel Age this is in saints a spiritual disposition begun in them at their begetting of the Spirit, and developed in them unto perfection by the Spirit (in the sense of power), Word and providences of God, working in and upon them. In the saints it is therefore called: the Spirit [disposition] of God and Christ (Rom. 8: 9, 14; Phil. 1: 19; 1 Pet. 4: 14); the Spirit [disposition] of Holiness (Rom. 1: 4); the Spirit of sonship [a filial disposition Godward], in contrast with a servile, cowardly and time-serving disposition (Rom. 8: 14, 15); the Spirit of meekness [a meek disposition] (Gal. 6: 1); the Spirit of power [a strong disposition], of love [a loving disposition] and of a sound mind [a wise disposition], in contrast with the spirit of fear [a cowardly disposition] (2 Tim. 1: 7); the Spirit of the Truth [the disposition worked in us by the Truth, John 17: 17] (John 14: 17); the Spirit [disposition] of the Truth, contrasted with the spirit of error [erroneous disposition] (1 John 4: 6); the Spirit of the promise [the disposition wrought in us by the Oath-bound promise] (Eph. 1: 13, 14); a watchful Spirit [disposition] in contrast with the spirit of slumber [a sleepy disposition] (Rom. 11: 8; 1 Cor. 16: 13); the Spirit of wisdom, understanding, counsel, might, knowledge, and reverence [a disposition that is wise, understanding, practical, strong, intelligent and God-fearing] (Is. 11: 2); the Spirit of glory [the glorious disposition, because transforming our characters into God's glorious likeness] (1 Pet. 4: 14); the Spirit which is of God [the Divine disposition], in contrast with the spirit of the world [worldly disposition] (1 Cor. 2: 12), and the Spirit [spiritual disposition], in contrast with the flesh [fleshly disposition] (Rom. 8: 5-9; Matt. 26: 41; Gal. 5: 16-25).

These passages all clearly prove that God's Spirit therein referred to is His disposition, either in Himself or in those in harmony with Him in disposition. Especially do the contrasts between the filial and the servile

and cowardly spirit in Rom. 8: 15, between the cowardly spirit and the strong, loving and wise spirit in 2 Tim. 1: 7, between the Spiritual and fleshly spirits in Rom. 8: 5-9; Matt. 26: 41; Gal. 5: 16-25, between the Truth Spirit and the erroneous spirit of 1 John 4: 6, between the watchful Spirit and sleeping spirit of Rom. 11: 8; 1 Cor. 16: 13, between the Divine Spirit and the worldly spirit in 1 Cor. 2: 12, prove that the Lord's Spirit is His disposition. Certainly the servile, cowardly, erroneous, sleeping and worldly spirits of these passages are not spirit beings, but are dispositions; hence the filial strong, loving, wise, heavenly, Truth and Divine Spirits of these passages are, by the contrasts drawn between them and the servile, cowardly, worldly, erroneous, earthly and sleeping spirits, shown to be dispositions. Hence these passages prove that the Holy Spirit in its second sense is God's Holy disposition, in Himself and in all in harmony with Him—Christ, the good angels and the saints.

We ought also to remember that in Is. 11: 2 a definition of the Holy Spirit is given. "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him [the Christ]—*the Spirit* [disposition] *of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit* [disposition] *of counsel and might, the Spirit* [disposition] *of knowledge and reverence of the Lord.*" Please note that in John 14: 17; 15: 26; 16: 13 the Holy Spirit is defined as the Spirit of *the* [so the Greek] Truth, *i.e.*, the disposition that God's Word, *the* Truth (John 17: 17); works in His people. So in Eph. 1: 13 it is defined as the Spirit of *the* [so the Greek] promise [the disposition that the Oath-bound promise works in the saints]. These definitions prove that the Holy Spirit is not a person, but is God's disposition, in Himself, His Son, Jesus, His saints and the good angels. The same conclusion follows from St. Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 2: 10, where we are told that "the Spirit searches [studies out] all things, even the deep things of God." If the Spirit were God Almighty,

It would know all things intuitively, as God does, and would not study out anything; but God's mind, disposition in the saints, does not know everything, and must study out the deep things of God to understand them. This same thought is implied in Rom. 8: 26, 27, where we are told the Spirit groans, unable to express its feelings. But God Almighty neither groans nor is He unable to express His feelings; but His disposition in His saints often groans (Rom. 8: 23), and often is unable to express its feelings. Again, when we are exhorted in 1 Thes. 5: 19 not to quench God's Spirit, we are admonished not to do anything that would put out the holy fire of God's disposition in us. To understand God's Spirit here to mean Almighty God would imply that we can put God Almighty out of existence! Every passage in the Bible using the expression Holy Spirit, not using the words, Holy Spirit, in the sense of power, influence, uses them in the sense of God's disposition, in Himself and in His faithful—the mind, heart, will of God. This view stands all tests of the Bible.

While God is a person and while Jesus is a person, The Holy Spirit is not a person. There is no Scripture, apart from mistranslation, that speaks of It as a person, yet numerous passages do speak of God and Christ as persons. The trinitarian mistranslation, Holy Ghost, and certain other mistranslations, suggest this thought, which translation—Holy Ghost—was rightly rejected by the A. R. V., *etc.*, in favor of Holy Spirit. On the contrary, the Bible statements with reference to It are of such a kind as are incompatible with the thought that It is a person. That the Holy Spirit is not God Almighty is evident from the fact that It can be quenched by us (1 Thes. 5: 19), which would mean, if It were God Almighty, that we can destroy God Almighty! How Almighty would God be, if we could quench, destroy Him? The Bible says that Jesus (Acts 10: 38) and the saints (2 Cor. 1: 21) are anointed with

the Holy Spirit. It is absurd to say that we could be anointed with a person, *i.e.*, that a person is the symbolic oil with which the anointing is done. But how reasonable is the thought that we can be anointed with God's disposition, His thoughts, affections, graces and will; for this is just what the anointing is (Is. 11: 2, 3; 61: 1-3). Again, the Bible teaches that we are baptized with (not by) the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3: 11; John 1: 33; Acts 1: 5). How could we be baptized with, as distinct from by, a person? But we can be and are baptized with God's disposition and into God's disposition (Matt. 28: 19; 1 Cor. 12: 13, the phrase "by one Spirit," in the Greek reads, "*in* one Spirit"). Again, we are exhorted to be filled with God's Spirit (Eph. 5: 18). How could we be filled with the Spirit, if the Spirit is God Almighty, a person? But we could be and are filled with God's disposition. Again, if the Spirit is God Almighty, a person, how could He be given (Luke 11: 13) to us and thus be owned by us? But if It is God's disposition begun, developed and completed in us, we see that It has been given to and is owned by us (Rom. 8: 15; 2 Tim. 1: 7). So, too, the Bible assures us that the Spirit was given to Jesus not by measure (John 3: 34), *i.e.*, not with any limitations, because of His perfection, while, by reason of our imperfection (2 Cor. 4: 7), to us it is given by measure, limitedly, and that variously (Rom. 12: 6-8; 1 Cor. 12: 11-14, 27; Eph. 4: 7). But how could a person be given to one without limitations and to others by limitations? But a disposition could and must be so given as between perfect and imperfect beings and the varying imperfections of imperfect beings. Then, the Bible tells us that we are sealed with the Holy Spirit (Eph. 1: 13, 14). A person cannot be a seal and thus be used as a seal of others; but God does seal us as His own by giving us His holy disposition. If the Holy Spirit were a person, how could He be poured out. (Joel 2: 28, 29; Matt. 3: 16;

Acts 2: 1-4; 10: 44, 45)? If It is a holy power and a holy disposition, we can see how this can be. In a prophecy (Ps. 133: 1-3) the Spirit is shown (v. 1) to be the good and pleasant disposition of the saints in unity, the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace (Eph. 4: 3). In v. 2 its bestowment is spoken of as pictured by the anointing of Aaron. Then in v. 3 it is represented by the dew of Herman descending on Zion's mountains, because It tempers the heat of temptation and produces the blessing that gives everlasting life, *i.e.*, a character like God's—God's disposition.

Other things Scripturally said of the Holy Spirit could be brought forward, proving that It is not God Almighty, a person; but is God's power and disposition, in Himself and in all in harmony with Him; but enough has been given, we believe, proving this thought. Accordingly, we will now end this feature of our discussion, and will leave for study later on the examination of the arguments that trinitarians use as alleged *indirect* proofs of their doctrines, since in this installment we have reviewed their alleged *direct* proofs.

Having presented twelve general arguments against the trinity doctrine, in the course of which we refuted the nine alleged *direct* Biblical proofs that trinitarians offer for their doctrine, we will now examine the alleged indirect proofs that they offer for it; and our examination of these will prove them to be likewise fallacious. One of the alleged indirect proofs that they offer for the trinity is the unity of the Father and Son (John 10: 30), "I and the Father are one" (*hen*, neuter in Greek, not *heis*, masculine, or *mia*, feminine). The same refutation applies to their use of John 10: 30 as we gave of the same view based on the Father, Word and the Holy Spirit being *one* (*hen*) in the interpolated passage forming parts of 1 John 5: 7, 8 in the A. V. (but omitted in almost all translations since 1870), a refutation offered on the contingency that 1 John 5: 7, 8 be conceded to be genuine. Additionally we might

say, if the logic were valid that the Father's and Son's oneness of John 10: 30 must be that of being, we would have to say that Paul and Apollos were one being (1 Cor. 3: 6-8)! Of course they were two separate beings. *Hen* being used of them in 1 Cor. 3: 8 (not *mia*, which would be necessary to agree with the feminine *ousia*, being) proves that their oneness was not one of being but of spirit, disposition (Acts 4: 32; 1 Cor. 1: 10; Eph. 4: 3-6, 13; Phil. 1: 27; 2: 2; 4: 2). Hence John 10: 30 does not by the Greek word *hen* prove that the Father and Son are one being any more than 1 Cor. 3: 8 proves by the word *hen* that Paul and Apollos were one being; but the same word and form of that word, proving Paul and Apollos to be one in heart, mind and will, gives presumptive evidence that the same word and form of that word in John 10: 30 proves the same of the Father and Son.

But we have more than presumptive proof for this; for Jesus praying (John 17: 11, 21, 22) that all of the saints may be one (*hen*, not *heis*, nor *mia*) did not pray that they be all one being, which would be nonsense, but that their unity may be one in mind, heart and will. Since the oneness for which He prayed for them was not a oneness of being, the oneness between Him and the Father cannot be that of being, because Jesus in John 17: 11, 22 prays that the oneness for which He prayed on their behalf be patterned after the oneness that exists between the Father and Himself, "That they may be one *as we are*." Hence the oneness between the Father and Him is not one of being, but one of mind, heart and will. Moreover Jesus defines this oneness in v. 21 as follows: "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me [God was in Him by His Holy Spirit, disposition, even as Jesus is in the saints by the Holy Spirit, disposition, (John 14: 17, 20)] and I in thee [Jesus was in the Father (John 14: 10, 11, 20) by accepting and keeping the Father as His Head, *i.e.*, by His being

and remaining in the consecrated attitude (1 Cor. 3: 23; 11: 3, passages that also strongly prove Christ's inferiority to the Father, and the Father's being the Supreme Being)], that [thus the Father and the Son, by their Spirit, disposition, being in them and they by their spirit of consecration, being in Them (1 John 5: 20; Col. 3: 3; 1 Cor. 12:12, 13)] they also may be one in us ... that they may be one, *even as we are one.*" Thus these verses prove that the same kind of oneness as exists between the saints, exists between the Father and the Son and vice versa; but since the oneness that exists between the saints is not one of being, but one of heart, mind and will, the oneness that exists between the Father and Son is not one of being, but one of will, heart, and mind. Furthermore, if the Father and Son were but one Being, they could not be the two Beings bearing required witness, as John 8: 17, 18 says they were, since the law required at least two different beings to be witnesses sufficient to establish a matter. But since they gave sufficient witness, they must be two Beings. Hence their oneness is not that of being; for they are two Beings. It must be that of mind, heart, and will. Accordingly, John 10: 30 does not prove the Son's equality with the Father; rather it proves the Son's subordination to the Father; for John 17: 21, which shows the kind of unity that exists between them to be connected with the Son's being in the Father, implies that the Father is the Son's Head and that the Son is His in the sense that we are Christ's, in subordination to Him; hence He must be subordinate to the Father (1 Cor. 3: 23; 11: 3), even as the headship of Christ makes the Church subordinate to Christ (Col. 1: 18; Eph. 1: 22, 23; 4: 15; 5: 23, 24, compared with Col. 3: 19).

Sometimes, as a second alleged indirect proof of the trinity, John 14: 9 is used: "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." Unless one should hold that the Father and the Son are one and the same person,

which of course the passage does not say nor mean, nor do the trinitarians profess to believe such, it is difficult to understand the mental process of one claiming this passage to teach the trinity. The thought rather is that the Son, being the character image of the Father (Heb. 1: 3; Col. 1: 15), is a picture of the Father, and thus He could say that whoever sees Him as the character picture of the Father sees the Father, *i.e.*, in His character, but of course not in His body, even as we would say that one who sees a statue of Lincoln, sees Lincoln, or as we would say of it, That is Lincoln. Thus we cannot see God's body or shape (John 5: 37); but we can see how He looks in character, when we see Jesus' character. This is evidently our Lord's thought in these words, and is given by our Lord to disabuse Philip of the thought of Christ's showing him and the other disciples God's body, which Philip requested. Another, a third, alleged indirect proof that God is a trinity is the following: The perfection of God requires a trinity, *e.g.*, God is perfect in active love. But one cannot love unless there is an object to love. Hence God had from all eternity an object to love, *i.e.*, His Son, and eternally must have had a channel for manifesting this love, the Holy Spirit; hence, like the Father, both of these must be eternal, and therefore must be God! This is certainly far-fetched. Replying further we would say: (1) Since, under the theory that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are God, this object of God's love would have to be one outside the trinity, since it is God, *i.e.*, the One alleged to be the trinity, that does the loving, there would be no need of concluding that there is a trinity from the standpoint that God's love from eternity would have to have an object to love; and (2) if we can love things not existing, but whose existence we expect in the future, *e.g.*, the Millennial Kingdom, the new heavens and earth, *etc.*, God could

of course from all eternity have loved the Son, the Church, the World, before any of these existed.

But the two main indirect proofs that trinitarians offer for there being a trinity are, they allege, that the names, attributes, works and honors that belong to God exclusively are by the Bible expressly ascribed to the Son and to the Holy Spirit; hence, they conclude that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are God, *i.e.*, are a trinity. We will examine these two alleged indirect proofs separately, first considering that respecting the Son as their fourth alleged indirect proof of the trinity, and will in their turn consider the four things alleged to prove His Supreme Deity. First, then, trinitarians allege that the Bible ascribes to Jesus the names that belong exclusively to God. They further say that these names are Jehovah, God and Lord. To begin, we deny that the name Jehovah is given our Lord Jesus as His name, though there are certain Scriptures wherein He speaks, is spoken to, or is spoken of as God's Representative, *i.e.*, speaks, is spoken to or is spoken of as Jehovah, because Jehovah in these situations speaks, is spoken to or spoken of in Him as His Representative. As we have already seen from a variety of standpoints, He is pointedly distinguished from Jehovah, *e.g.*, as Lord in contrast with Jehovah, as *the* Angel, as the Archangel, as Michael, as the Angel of Jehovah, as the Servant, Arm, Son, Firstborn, Companion, appointed King, *etc.*, of Jehovah. Jehovah is said to be His God, in whose strength, hence not in His own, He will stand and feed God's Flock in His glorified condition (Mic. 5: 4). These passages clearly show Him not to be Jehovah; and be it noted that such passages should be the controlling ones in this matter, and not passages where He speaks or acts or stands as Jehovah's Representative; for, properly regarded, this latter set of passages disproves His being Jehovah from the standpoint that He is in them acting as Jehovah's

Representative, not as Jehovah Himself, and a representative of course is not the one whom he represents.

We will now examine briefly the main occurrences of the name Jehovah, claimed by trinitarians as applicable to Jesus. We have already refuted their use of Jer. 23: 5, 6, and from it proved the reverse of their claim. In Gen. 18 the chief Messenger of the three was undoubtedly our prehuman Lord; but in that chapter He speaks as Jehovah, because He there acted as God's Angel, Messenger, Representative, just as in the case of His speaking as Jehovah in Gen. 22: 16, compare with vs. 11, 15; and in Ex. 3: 4-7 compare with v. 2. To the claim that the expression in Is. 40: 3, "Prepare the way of Jehovah," applies the name Jehovah to Jesus, because the charge was given to John the Baptist to prepare the way for our Lord, we reply: In preparing the way for Jesus, John was preparing the way for Jehovah, *i.e.*, making preparations for the fulfillment of God's plan, which is the "way of Jehovah"; and in the carrying out of that plan Jesus acts as Jehovah's Executive and Plenipotentiary. Hence the name Jehovah is not in this passage applied to Jesus. To the claim that in Is. 2: 2-4; Mic. 4: 1-3 the expressions, "mountain [kingdom] of the house of Jehovah" and "mountain [kingdom] of Jehovah," apply the name Jehovah to Jesus, because He will be the Millennial King, we answer as follows: In the first expression, "the house [family] of Jehovah" means Christ and the Church (Heb. 3: 6). Hence Jehovah is shown to be different from each member of His house or family, in which Jesus is the Firstborn (Rom. 8: 29). The second expression is shown by our Lord's prayer not to give the name of Jehovah to our Lord (Matt. 6: 10). Moreover, as the Millennial King, our Lord will act as Jehovah's Representative (Ps. 2: 6).

Combining the clause of Mic. 5: 2, "goings forth have been from old, from everlasting," with the clause

of Ps. 90: 1, 2, "Jehovah ... from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God," some trinitarians claim that our Lord is Jehovah. We answer that Jehovah being spoken of in Mic. 5: 4 as our Lord's God disproves such a thought. The expression of Ps. 90: 2, "from everlasting to everlasting," describes God's eternity, while the "goings forth," *etc.*, of Mic. 5: 2 refer to the giving of prophecies of the Messiah's first and second advents (of old) and to God's fixing these prophecies in His plan before the world was (from everlasting). In answer to the claim that by the expression in Is. 25: 6, "In this mountain [kingdom] Jehovah of hosts will make a feast of fat things," the name Jehovah is applied to Jesus, we answer no, on the basis of Matt. 6: 10. Moreover St. Paul's quotation of part of the words of this passage (v. 8), "Death is swallowed up in victory," and his comment thereon, "Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord" (1 Cor. 15: 57), prove that Jehovah here is God, not Christ. Is. 40: 1, 9, 10 is quoted by some trinitarians as proof that Jesus is called Jehovah. We answer, it proves the opposite; for Christ is here called Jehovah's Arm, Representative, Executive (Is. 53: 1; 51: 5, 9; 52: 10; 59: 15-20). To the claim that Is. 8: 13, 14 is a proof that the name Jehovah is applied to Jesus, we answer: The connection shows that Jesus is spoken of as waiting on Jehovah and calls attention to the children of Jehovah that Jehovah has given Him as brethren (Is. 8: 16-18; Heb. 2: 13). Trinitarians claim that the fact that in Is. 54: 13 Jehovah is said to be the Teacher of God's children, and the further fact that our Lord is said to be their Teacher (Matt. 23: 8), prove that our Lord is Jehovah. We reply, Jesus quotes the word from Is. 54: 13 as a proof that His Father is the one who teaches God's children (John 6: 45). However, the Father in teaching us does it through our Lord (1 Cor. 1: 30; 8: 6). The foregoing are the main passages

that trinitarians use to prove that the Bible applies the name Jehovah to our Lord. They not only do not do so, but in their connections there are such expressions used as refute their claims, while the passages that we quoted in proof that Jesus is not Jehovah completely refutes their idea. So, then, their claim that this name, which belongs exclusively to God, is Scripturally expressly applied to Jesus, is found to be untrue, which makes the pertinent conclusion based on this claim fall to the ground, as to this name.

Next, they claim that the name God applies exclusively to Jehovah, and is expressly applied to Jesus in the Bible, which they claim proves Him to be God Almighty, and thus the second person of the trinity—a proof of the trinity. This claim by an examination of the pertinent Scriptures will be found to be as erroneous as the claim that the exclusive name of God, Jehovah, is Scripturally applied to our Lord. In the first place, we deny that the term God applies exclusively to the Supreme Being. In a former part of this discussion we stated that the word god (Hebrew, *el*, *elohim*, and Greek, *theos*) is in the Bible used about 200 times for angels, good and bad, and gave about 20 references in proof of our statement. But it is because the word *el* and *elohim* mean mighty one, the latter also meaning mighty ones, that they are also used of prominent and powerful humans (Gen. 23: 6; Ex. 7: 1; 21: 6; 22: 8, 10, 28, compared with Acts 23: 5 for an inspired comment; Ps. 82: 1, 6; see John 10: 34, 35 for Jesus' comment thereon). So, too, *theos* is used in the Greek New Testament (2 Thes. 2: 4 twice, John 10: 34, 35). Accordingly, the claim that the word God is exclusively applicable to the Supreme Being is an error. The following will enable us to see clearly in this matter: The word God is both a proper noun, and that the name of but one person, and it is also a common noun, a substantive applicable to many persons, human and spiritual. As

a proper noun it belongs to the Supreme Being exclusively; But as a proper noun it is never applied to Jesus, though it may be as a common noun.

It is applied to Jesus as a common noun and to God as a proper noun in John 1: 1, 2, as can be seen in the Greek, which, as we have shown, distinguishes between Jesus as a God and the Father twice, as *the* God. As a God Jesus is a very mighty one, mightier than any of the other gods (angels); but He is not *the* Almighty, which the Father alone is. Again, in Ps. 45: 6, 7, quoted by St. Paul in Heb. 1: 8, 9, the common noun use of *elohim* and *theos*, "O God" (O Mighty one), is applied by St. Paul to Jesus; but the proper noun use of it is applied to the Father, "*Thy God*," which expression proves the Father's superiority over the Son, since it calls Him our Lord's God. So, too, in Is. 9: 6 the word *el*, God, is used for our Lord; but it is a common noun, and refers to Him as *a*, not *the* Mighty God; for the article "*the*" before the words "Mighty God" should not have been used, as it is not in the Hebrew, neither is it in the Hebrew before the words, "Everlasting Father and Prince of Peace," the former title referring to His millennial and post-millennial fatherhood of the race, and the latter to His millennial rule of peace and prosperity. Some trinitarians quote 1 John 5: 20 as a proof that Jesus is God Almighty, though most of them and the ablest of them have given it up: "This is the true God." But the preceding part of the verse refers to the Father as the True One; for it shows that the True One is Jesus' Father, whom Jesus reveals to us. It will be noted that the word *even* before the expression, "in His Son" is in italics, *i.e.*, it is inserted without having a corresponding word in the Greek. The connection, showing that we are in the Father (Col. 3: 3), proves that the word *and*, not *even*, should have been put into italics. Since the preceding part of v. 20 shows that Jesus has given us an

understanding of God as the True One, in whom we are, as well as in His Son, the expression, "This [one] is the true God," evidently refers to the Father, as now most of the ablest trinitarians concede.

Some, a minority of trinitarians, use the expression, "God was *in* Christ, reconciling the world to Himself" (2 Cor. 5: 19), as a proof that Christ is God Almighty. But note that God is here and also in vs. 18, 20, 21 markedly distinguished from Christ; for not only do vs. 18, 19, 20, 21 show them to be doing different things in the work of reconciliation, but also show that God is the Reconciled One, not Jesus, and that God used Him to do the work of reconciliation. Moreover the Greek word here translated "in" should, as in very many places it is, be translated with the word by or through, because it is through Christ that the reconciliation is effected. Rom. 5: 10, 11, as well as 2 Cor. 5: 18-21, proves the same thing. Hence this verse does not teach that Jesus is God Almighty; for He is not here even called God, as a common noun, let alone as a proper noun, which the Father alone is here called. 1 Tim. 3: 16, "God manifest in the flesh," was formerly used as a proof of the trinity; but the word God was mistakenly read into this passage for the word who, as even all trinitarian scholars now admit and as can be seen by the note to this verse in the A. R. V., or in critical recensions.

Tit. 2: 13 is also alleged as a proof of the trinity by some, who to find in it their thought, render the words in question as follows: "the appearing of the glory of our Great God and Savior Jesus Christ." This rendering is not preferred by a majority of the learned trinitarians, though it is a possible rendering. Rendered as in the A. V., A. R. V. text, and a majority of modern translations, not our Lord Jesus but the Father is here called God. The fact that, properly translated, Paul never calls Jesus God, but always contrasts Him as Lord with the Father as God, is decisive

on which is the right translation. Again, the connection (v. 11) naturally suggests that the bright shining is of the Father and of the Son. St. Paul's use of language, calling the Father God over 500 times and never once calling Jesus God, must rule in this case as to which is the right translation. Force, too, is added to our view by the words [A. R. V.] *the glory of the Great God*. This leads us to remark that while Thomas' exclamation, "My Lord and my God" (John 20: 28), is not that of an inspired man, it is nevertheless true; for Jesus is not only our Lord (Head), but also our God (Mighty One); but not our Almighty One, which the Father alone is. Hence this uninspired utterance of Thomas does not prove the trinity, as some trinitarians claim. Acts 20: 28, "Feed the Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood," is quoted by some trinitarians to prove the trinity. If, by the term God, the Father here is meant, it is used as a proper noun, and therefore cannot refer to Jesus. But if the Father is here meant we would have to say that God has blood, which is nonsense, for a spirit does not have flesh, bones or blood. There is, then, an unsolvable difficulty here by taking the passage as the A. V. reads. But considering that the great majority of the Greek MSS. have here, instead of the word God, the word Lord, which is the proper reading (A. R. V.), the difficulty vanishes: "Feed the Church of the Lord, which He purchased with His own blood." So read, there is nothing in this passage in favor of trinitarianism, rather a disproof of it.

Some ancient MSS. read in John 1: 18, "an only-begotten God," instead of "the only begotten Son"; and this reading is seized upon by trinitarians as a proof that Jesus is Almighty God, and that therefore the trinity doctrine is true. If this reading is correct, it gives trinitarians sorry comfort, for it carries on its face the proof that the word God here is a common noun. An only-begotten God implies that there are

other Gods who are not only-begotten; hence this proves that Jesus is not God Almighty. It, however, proves that He was the only direct Creation of God, God having created all the other gods, angels, through His agency (John 1: 3; Col. 1: 16). Sometimes in 2 Pet. 1: 1 the expression, translated in the A. V. as follows: "through the righteousness of God and our Savior Jesus Christ," is by trinitarians rendered as follows: "the righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ," and in this form is used to prove the trinity. But the Sinaitic MS. reading, Lord, instead of God, is by Biblical numerics proven true, and thus we are relieved of another supposed argument for the trinity, based on the word God being allegedly used of Jesus. The expression, "our Lord and Savior," is a favorite one in 2 Peter—1: 11; 2: 20; 3: 2, 18—to designate Jesus. Finally, trinitarians allege Rom. 9: 5 as a proof that Jesus is God Almighty, and that therefore the trinity doctrine is true. They translate it thus: "Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen." The A. R. V. offers in its margin what we consider a better translation: "Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh; He who is over all, God, be blessed forever. Amen." According to this translation it is not Christ who in this verse is spoken of as over all; but it is the Father.

The following things favor this rendering: The word Amen at the end of the sentence favors the idea of the last clause of v. 5 being a doxology. A doxology is in place here in view of the great favors, as the connection shows, that St. Paul enumerates as having been given his people, culminating in Christ's Advent, which is a prophecy of the return of special favor to Israel, because of those that they had had, as enumerated in vs. 4, 5. While St. Paul almost never in his writings makes a doxology to Christ, 1 Tim. 6: 16 being the only undoubted one, he frequently does to God. Again, the Greek words, *ho on*, should not be

translated *who*, as trinitarian translators give this passage, for they so translate it to make the last clause refer to Jesus. But they should be rendered, "*He who*," which proves that at least a semicolon, but preferably a period, should follow the word *flesh*, so that the rest of the verse is a coordinate or full sentence. Finally the trinitarian interpretation of this verse makes it contradict the universal teaching of the Bible that Christ is not God over all, *i.e.*, the Supreme Being; but the Father, as God Almighty alone, is such. Thus we have examined every passage that trinitarians allege speak of Christ as God and have from these very passages shown that whenever the word God is applied to Him, it is as a common noun, which proves that He is not the Supreme God. Whenever the name God refers to the Supreme Being, it is used as a proper noun, and belongs alone to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus. This fact overthrows the contention of the trinitarians that the ascription of the word God to Jesus proves the trinity; for used as a common noun, as it is, when used of Jesus, it is not an exclusive name of God, since, as we have shown above, as a common noun it applies to angels and powerful and great men. Hence their argument that the name God is an exclusive appellation of the Deity, and, being applied to Jesus, proves Him to be the Deity is an error. It is not an exclusive appellation of Deity. Hence where to Jesus it is applied they must have other pertinent things beside to prove their point, which trinitarians have not yet been able to produce.

Trinitarians claim that the title Lord, applied to our Lord Jesus, proves that He is God Almighty. They darken this phase of the question by ignoring several facts: (1) That the word lord is a common noun, and not a proper noun; and (2) by conveying the impression that the Greek word Kyrios, Lord, means Jehovah, which it does not mean. That the word kyrios is a common noun, and not a proper

noun, is manifest from the following passages: Matt. 6: 24; 10: 24, 25; 15: 27; Luke 19: 33; John 12: 21; 15: 15, 20; 20: 15; Acts 16: 16, 19, 30; 25: 26; 1 Cor. 8: 5; Gal. 4: 1; Eph. 6: 5, 9; Col. 3: 22; 4: 1; 1 Pet. 3: 6; Rev. 7: 14. Accordingly, it is a title for rulers, nobles, owners, superiors, and is used in polite address. Hence it is not a title of God exclusively; therefore its use in connection with our Lord does not prove Him to be God Almighty. Trinitarians try from this title *Kyrios* to convey the thought that our Lord is Jehovah, because the latter word is translated Lord in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, and is in the Greek of the New Testament when quoting from the Septuagint given by *Kyrios*. In reply we would say, because the Jews in their superstitiousness refused to pronounce the Hebrew word translated Jehovah, the Jewish translation of the Old Testament into Greek, the Septuagint, never uses the word Jehovah, but in its stead uses the word *Kyrios*, whereas the word Jehovah, being a proper noun, should have been transliterated into Greek. It should never have been translated Lord; for it is a proper name, as it is *Jehovah*.

The course of the Septuagint led to the fact that the name Jehovah was never carried over into Greek; hence the New Testament uses the word Lord for *Jehovah*, *Adon* and *Adonai* without any distinction, which fact, since in the Old Testament the name Jehovah is the exclusive name of the Father, refutes the trinitarians' claim that the title Lord, applied to Jesus, proves Him to be Jehovah, and thus God Almighty. *E.g.*, using *Kyrios* for both *Jehovah* and *Adon*, Jesus, St. Peter and St. Paul quote Ps. 110: 1, "The Lord [*Jehovah*] said unto my Lord [*Adon*]," and apply the word that stands for *Adon*, not the word that stands for *Jehovah*, to our Lord, while the word that is used for Jehovah they apply to the Father (Matt. 22: 41-45; Acts 2: 34-36; Heb. 1: 13),

which, among other examples, proves that Jehovah as a name did not go over into Greek, but through a Jewish superstition it was rendered into Greek by *Kyrios*, Lord. Trinitarians to ward off the force of the one God and one Lord and the God and Lord contrasting passages, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. 8: 6; Jude 25, see A. R. V., *etc.*, claim that calling the Father here the one God, no more proves that Jesus is not God than calling Jesus the one Lord proves that the Father is not Lord. To this we reply that Deity in its very nature always implies lordship, while lordship does not necessarily imply Deity, as the examples above show. Hence this evasion of theirs does not meet the point. Our examination of the trinitarians' claim that the names, Jehovah, God, Lord, belong exclusively to God, and being applied to Jesus prove Him to be God Almighty, and thus prove the trinity doctrine, has resulted in this, that the only one of these words that is exclusively applicable to God, Jehovah, is never applied to our Lord as His name, that the word God, when used as a proper noun, is the name of the Supreme Being alone, and is never applied to Jesus in the Bible, though the common noun God is, and that the word Lord is a common noun, and is applied in the Bible to any superior or any one treated as a superior in politeness. Hence the trinitarian argument on the alleged exclusive names of God being applied in the Bible to Jesus, falls to the ground, which leaves the point intended to be proved by it hanging in the air.

We will now take up their second argument for their fourth alleged indirect proof of the trinity, *i.e.*, the attributes that the Bible exclusively ascribes to God it expressly ascribes to Jesus Christ. These attributes they claim are, past eternity, supremacy, omnipresence, omnipotence and omniscience. We have already refuted their idea that our Lord always was and is God's equal, and hence is supreme. We have also shown that their claim of the Logos' being from

eternity is not proven by Mic. 5: 2 (goings forth have been from old, from everlasting); nor by Is. 9: 6 (everlasting Father); nor by John 1: 1, 2 (in *a*, not *the* beginning). The Bible teaches many beginnings, none of them meaning *without* beginning, which is meant by the past eternity, *e.g.*, of the universe (Gen. 1: 1), of man (Matt. 19: 4, 8), of the Gospel Age (Luke 1: 1, 2; 2 Thes. 2: 13), of the second world (Heb. 1: 10), and of the period of angelic creation before the creation of the universe (John 1: 1, 2). In every one of the passages just cited the original read in *a* beginning, not in *the* beginning; the very word means the reverse of eternity, which is without a beginning. They quote Heb. 13: 8, "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today, and forever," as an alleged proof of our Lord's past eternity, interpreting its yesterday as meaning the past eternity, its today as the present, and its forever as the future eternity. Our understanding of this verse is that the yesterday refers to the Jewish Age, which is Biblically referred to as a day, while eternity is never Biblically called a day (Rom. 10: 21; Heb. 1: 2, literally, "the last one of these days." These days are the three Days or Ages of the second world, (the Patriarchal, Jewish and Gospel Days or Ages], whose last day is the Gospel Day or Age); its today refers to the Gospel Age (Rom. 8: 36; 2 Cor. 6: 2; Heb. 3: 13, 15) and its forever refers to the future eternity. Had St. Paul here referred to Jesus as having existed from eternity he would not have used the word yesterday, which does not imply duration without a beginning, just as the word today does not mean eternity; rather he would have used some term meaning the past eternity, even as when he refers to the future eternity he does not use the word tomorrow but uses a term expressive of eternity. That in this verse St. Paul did not mean that our Lord was without a beginning is manifest from the fact that he believed Him to have had a beginning,

as the firstborn of every creature (Col. 1: 15, compare with Rev. 3: 14). Hence neither this verse nor any other teaches that Christ is from eternity.

We have already in the following passages given sufficient proof to the effect that Jesus is inferior to the Father: John 14: 28; 10: 29; 1 Cor. 3: 23; 11: 3; 15: 28; Phil. 2: 6, A. R. V.; 1 Pet. 1: 3; Ps. 45: 6, 7; Mic. 5: 4, which are a few among many that might be quoted to prove it. The only passage that they quote to prove He is the Father's equal is John 10: 30, which says nothing about the subject. We have already discussed the passage as not proving that He and the Father are one God. To their use of Matt. 18: 20, "Where two or three are gathered ... there am I in the midst," and Matt. 28: 20, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the Age," to prove His bodily omnipresence, we reply: Their interpretation must be wrong; for His bodily presence throughout the Age has been in heaven (Acts 3: 21). Moreover His presence with His Church has been by the Holy Spirit as His Representative (John 14: 16-18, 26; 15: 26; 16: 7). To their use of Matt. 28: 18, "All authority was given me in heaven and on earth," as a proof of His being omnipotent, we reply: (1) This passage proves that there was a time when He did not have all authority in heaven and earth (*has been given* unto me), which disproves His having omnipotence as an inherent quality; (2) this passage proves that He is God's appointed Vicegerent; (3) this passage ascribes to Him as God's Vicegerent not all power (*dynamis*), but all authority (*exousia*); (4) this passage proves that whatever authority He exercises, He exercises it not as His own, but as God's, whose Vicegerent He was made in His resurrection (Heb. 1: 3-5; Phil. 2: 9-11; Eph. 1: 19-23; Rev. 5: 9-13). No passage of the Bible ascribes omnipresence and omnipotence to Christ, as inherent qualities of His own. To their use of John 21: 17, "Lord, thou knowest

all things," as a proof of His having omniscience, we reply: Peter did not utter these words by inspiration. Moreover, Peter likely meant by the expression, "Lord, thou knowest all things," not that Jesus was omniscient, but that He knew everything about Peter and therefore knew that Peter loved Him. There is no inspired Scripture that teaches that Jesus is omniscient. Mark 13: 32; Acts 1: 7 prove that He is not omniscient. Eternity, supremacy, omnipresence, omnipotence and omniscience are attributes that belong exclusively to the Father inherently. Hence the assertion of trinitarians to the effect that the attributes which the Bible exclusively ascribe to the Father are by the Bible expressly ascribed to Jesus, is a false statement, as to matters of fact; hence their second argument for their fourth alleged indirect proof of the trinity falls down.

The third argument for the fourth alleged indirect proof that trinitarians give for their doctrine is, that the works that the Bible ascribes to God alone are expressly in it ascribed to Jesus. These works they enumerate as follows: Creation and preservation (John 1: 3; Heb. 1: 3), power to forgive sins (Matt. 9: 6) and the execution of judgment (John 5: 27). To this we reply, that these powers were all used by our Lord, not of His own inherent possession, but as God's Agent and Representative. This is proven as to creation and preservation by the following passages: 1 Cor. 8: 6; Eph. 3: 9; Heb. 1: 2, 3. In none of the passages treating of His creating all things (John 1: 3; Col. 1: 16) is the preposition *hypo* (*by*) used, but the prepositions *en* and *dia* (*through*) are used, which do not indicate original creatorship, as *hypo* does, but agent or subordinate creatorship. Accordingly, His acting as God's Agent in creation not only does not prove that He is God Almighty, but disproves it. That original authority to forgive sins belongs to God alone, and that God delegated to Jesus, by virtue of His bringing the Ransom, authority as God's direct Agent

to forgive sins, is evident from the following passages Rom. 4: 8; 2 Cor. 5: 18-21; Eph. 4: 32; Col. 2: 13; 1 John 1: 7, 8; Luke 24: 47; Acts 2: 38; 10: 36; 13: 38, 39; 1 John 2: 1, 2. Thus in this matter His authority is a derived, not an original one, which is evident from the fact that sin is an offense against God, not against Christ, and that God to forgive sins arranged for Christ to provide the Ransom for its forgiveness. The same principle applies as to matter of executing judgment. God is the original judge (Heb. 10: 30; 12: 23, please note how He is in v. 23 contrasted, as judge, with Jesus, as Mediator, in v. 24; Rom. 3: 6); but He delegates to Jesus, as His Agent, the judging work, as the following passages show: John 5: 22, 27; Acts 17: 31; Rom. 2: 16. Thus the relation of the Father and Son in the work of judging proves that the Son is God's Agent therein, and does not act as original judge; hence this work of executing judgment does not prove Him to be God. Accordingly, none of God's exclusive works does He do, which disproves the third argument for the fourth alleged indirect proof that the Son is God Almighty; and this fact of His being God's Agent in these works, accordingly, does not prove the trinity doctrine; rather it disproves it; for an agent is inferior to his employer.

The fourth and final argument for the fourth alleged indirect proof that trinitarians offer for Jesus being God Almighty, and that they claim, accordingly, proves the trinity doctrine, is that in the Bible the honor that belongs to God alone is expressly ascribed to our Lord. This honor they say is worship, reverence.

In proof that Jesus is given such honor and worship they cite John 5: 23; Phil. 2: 10; Heb. 1: 6. We agree that our Lord is to be honored by our exalting Him highly in our motives, thoughts, words and deeds, and is to be worshiped. But we deny that He is to have such equally with the Father; but is to receive them as the Father's Representative and Plenipotentiary.

We have already shown that John 5: 23 does not teach that an equal honor is to be given our Lord with the Father. The honor to be given them is not to be one of the same degree, but one of fact, because the Son is the Father's Representative and Plenipotentiary in all things. Thus they honor Him as the Father in a Representative. Phil. 2: 10 indeed shows that every knee will bow to Christ; but it is to Him as God's Representative, and not to Him as the final goal of every creature's honor; but, as the next verse shows, Christ's exaltation is a means to a higher end—that God be the one finally honored. Indeed our Lord is to be worshiped. But a Divinely pleasing worship is not a thing given exclusively to God; for God says that He will cause the enemies of the Church to worship Her (Is. 60: 14; Rev. 3: 9). When Protestant trinitarians stress Matt. 4: 10 as a proof that God alone may receive worship in harmony with God's will, they leave out of consideration numerous Scriptures to the contrary, and the implied contrast in Jesus' warding off Satan's suggestion that He worship him. What is forbidden is to worship anyone not in harmony with God, or one in rivalry with God, *e.g.*, Satan, Antichrist. In His own God alone may be worshiped, which includes the Bible worship given God's representatives as such, as was frequently done to the angelic representatives of God in the Bible, as is done to Jesus, and as will be done to the glorified Church by mankind in the Millennium.

A consideration of the Greek and Hebrew words translated worship will show this. The Hebrew word, *shachah*, is the one usually translated worship and means to bow down in reverence. In the 170 occurrences of this word only about one half refer to the worship of God, which is hidden from the English reader, because the word in nearly half of its occurrences is translated to bow, bow down, do reverence, do obeisance, as can be seen from the following passages:

Gen. 18: 2-4; 19: 1; 23: 7, 12; 27: 29; 1 Sam. 24: 8; 25: 23, 41; 2 Sam. 9: 6; 14: 4, 22. The Greek word usually translated worship is *proskyneo*, and means to kiss the hand, as a dog licks one's hand. Like the Hebrew *shachah*, it means reverence. Is. 60: 14; Rev. 3: 9 are conclusive proof that it is permissible to worship God's representatives, as the Israelites did to the Lord's angels who came to them with God's message. Had the Jews the extreme view of Protestant trinitarians on this subject, they would have stoned those who worshiped our Lord; for none of these Jews believed Him to be God Almighty, they understanding the prohibition of worship to be limited to idols and rivals of God. Hence Jesus' receiving worship by God's sanction no more implies that He is God Almighty, than the Church (Is. 60: 14; Rev. 3: 9), the herald angels, David, *etc.*, receiving worship by God's sanction are thereby proven to be God Almighty. Our study of the four arguments for the fourth alleged indirect proof that Jesus is God Almighty, *i.e.*, the names, attributes, works and honors that belong to God alone are by the Bible expressly ascribed to Him, proves that they fall to the ground for the reason that, as we have seen, none of the names, attributes, works and honors that are exclusively God's are ever ascribed to our Lord of His own inherent right; as we have found that Jesus' relation to God in these four respects is never more than that of a Representative, Executive, Vicegerent, Plenipotentiary, or Mouthpiece.

The fifth alleged indirect proof that trinitarians offer for the trinity doctrine, like the fourth, is alleged to be demonstrated by four separate arguments. It is this: The Holy Spirit is God Almighty, because in the Bible the names, attributes, works and honors that belong to God alone are expressly ascribed to Him. But if we remember that the words Holy Spirit mean (1) God's power and (2) God's disposition—His

mind, heart and will—we will find that their attempted proof breaks down at every point. In the first place, they cannot quote one passage that expressly calls the Holy Spirit, as such, Jehovah. They try to read it into Num. 6: 24-26 and Is. 6: 3; but the words Holy Spirit do not occur in either passage. Our explanation above disproves the thought that the trinity is referred to in Num. 6: 24-26. They think that the threefold use of the word "Holy" in Is. 6: 3 proves it. Surely a farfetched proof! The three double blessings, one for each one of three pertinent conditions of God's people implied in Num. 6: 24-26, being the things for which holiness is ascribed to God, because they are the way God's wisdom, justice, love and power (the seraphim of Is. 6: 2 and the four living creatures of Ezek. 1; Rev. 4) operate, symbolically speak, are doubtless the occasion of using the word holy three times of God in Is. 6: 3. Not only is the name Jehovah never applied to the Holy Spirit in the Bible, but even the Hebrew words *Adon*, *Adonai*, and the Greek word *Kyrios* are never applied to the Holy Spirit. That leaves only one other proper name ascribed to the Father only, God, in the supreme sense, to be considered. Does the Bible ever call the Holy Spirit God? We answer, it does not!

Trinitarians claim to find a proof that the Holy Spirit is God in Acts 5: 3, 4, "Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Spirit? ... thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." They reason as follows: Lying to the Holy Spirit is lying unto God; Ananias lied to the Holy Spirit; hence the Holy Spirit is God. We, too, claim that lying to the Holy Spirit is lying to God; but deny that the Holy Spirit is God. An illustration will show this: Whatever one does, *e.g.*, to one of the English King's judges in their capacity as judges, who while acting as such are the King's representatives, they do to the King; but who would say that such

judges are the King? So Ananias lied to Peter, who, acting on the occasion as an Apostle, God's representative, was as such not only then the instrument of the holy power of God, but also a partaker of the heart, mind and will of God, God's Holy Spirit, disposition. Hence he lied to the Holy Spirit; and because the Holy Spirit both as God's power and disposition in Peter represented God on that occasion, Ananias in lying to God's representative lied to God. This proves that this passage does not show that the Holy Spirit is God. Therefore this peculiar name of God is in the Bible not ascribed to the Holy Spirit. Hence the first argument for the fifth alleged indirect proof of the trinity—that the Bible ascribes God's peculiar names to the Holy Spirit—falls to the ground. Trinitarians cite passages where the terms, Spirit of God, Spirit of the Lord and His (God's) Spirit, occur, and claim that these expressions prove that the Spirit is God. As logically could we say that the terms, the hair of the head, the scabbard of the sword, the tail of the horse, mean respectively the head, sword and horse. This is the same kind of logic that claims, the expression, "Son of God," proves that Jesus is God, which means that one can be his own father and his own son, and that at the same time! Trinitarians, with a combination of their logic on Acts 5: 3, 4 and of that which we have just exposed on the expressions, Spirit of God, *etc.*, use, as a proof that the Spirit is God, 1 Cor. 3: 16, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." This passage neither says, nor implies that the Holy Spirit is God. The saints are God's temple, and that because God's Spirit dwells in them; but that does not prove the Spirit of God is God. God is in us not personally; for personally He is in Heaven; but He is in us, and dwells in us by His Holy Spirit, holy power and disposition, as His Representative, which makes us God's habitation as His temple (Eph. 2: 20-22).

But this passage does not say or imply that the Spirit is God. Thus our examination proves that trinitarians have failed to give any passage that calls the Holy Spirit Jehovah, God or Lord. Hence the first argument for their fifth alleged indirect proof of the trinity is not a matter of fact; it is a false claim, and therefore as a proof falls to the ground, and leaves the thing that it was intended to prove, the trinity, high up in the air without any support.

The second argument for their alleged fifth indirect proof of the trinity, that the Holy Spirit is God, is that God's exclusive attributes are in the Bible expressly ascribed to the Holy Spirit. To their claim that Ps. 139: 7-10 proves the Spirit has as an attribute omnipresence, which doubtless is exclusively an attribute of God, we reply, first, by a question: How is God omnipresent? Certainly not by His body, which is in Heaven (1 Kings 8: 30), but by His attributes, according to Ps. 139: 7-10, of power and wisdom. This is proven by vs. 7, 8, 10 where the word Spirit is used in the sense of power and wisdom, not in that of a personal being; for according to v. 8 God is said to be in hell, the death state, oblivion. This cannot be true of Him as a person. It doubtless refers to His wisdom, that permeates even the death state, and to his power that will sometime empty it. Hence it is by His wisdom and power that He is in hell, oblivion; and thus by His power and wisdom, not by His body, He is omnipresent. That God's wisdom and power are in this passage meant by His Spirit is very plain from v. 10, where His hand (power) and right hand (wisdom) are used synonymously with the word Spirit in v. 7. This whole passage proves that nowhere in the universe can one remove himself from the power and knowledge of God. Of course in this sense His Spirit—power, knowledge—extends throughout the universe; but this does not prove the Spirit to be God; it disproves it. To the trinitarians' claim that

the words, "The Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2: 10), are a proof of the Spirit's omniscience, another exclusive attribute of God, we would say that the Spirit here is evidently not God Almighty; for He knows all things that He desires to know, intuitively, and hence needs not to search (study out) the deep things of God. Evidently here, as the connection shows, the Spirit means not God's mind in Himself, but His Spirit, God's mind in us, our new creature, which searches the deep things of God. This experience proves to be true. God's Spirit as His disposition in Himself, through its mental faculties, knows all things that He desires to know without searching; but God's disposition in Himself or in us is no more Himself than our dispositions are ourselves. Hence this passage does not treat of the Spirit's omniscience; hence does not prove the thing it is quoted to prove. Trinitarians quote 1 Cor. 12: 11 to prove that the Spirit is omnipotent. Of course God's Spirit in the sense of power is omnipotent; but here the word Spirit is used in both senses, power of God and disposition of God. But God's power is not God, neither is His disposition. Thus these three passages prove that God in His power is omnipresent and omnipotent and in His disposition in Himself is omniscient. But that does not make His power and His disposition (His Spirit) Himself. Hence these passages do not prove the trinitarians' contention that the Spirit is God Himself. The Spirit manifests Itself in these exclusive attributes of God for the reason that the Spirit is these attributes themselves, plus more beside; and, of course, God's attributes are not Himself; they are merely qualities of Himself as a person. Thus this second argument for their fifth alleged indirect proof of the trinity falls down.

The third argument for the fifth alleged indirect proof of the trinity is that God's exclusive works are in the Bible attributed to the Holy Spirit, hence the

Holy Spirit must be God. They enumerate among these works first, Creation, for which they quote Gen. 1: 2; Ps. 33: 6; Job 33: 4 as proofs. Of course God's power and wisdom produced creation, as these passages say, Gen. 1: 2 and Job 33: 4 referring to His Spirit in the sense of power, while Ps. 33: 6 refers to His Word, the "breath of His mouth," in the sense of His wisdom, that part of His disposition that exercises knowledge—His mind. But of course God's power and wisdom are not Himself; they are qualities of Himself. Another of the works that the Spirit does, and that trinitarians allege proves that the Spirit is God, is the begetting, renewal and birth of the Spirit (John 3: 3, 5; Tit. 3: 5). We grant that the Spirit does these works, and that only God can do them. But God does them by His power, Spirit; and certainly God's power is not Himself. So the fact that the Spirit did the works of Creation, and now does the work of regeneration does not prove that the Spirit is God Himself; it merely proves that the Spirit is God's power, which is not a person but an attribute of a person. So the third argument for the fifth alleged indirect proof of the trinity falls down.

Their fourth argument for their alleged fifth proof of the trinity is that God's exclusive honor—worship—is by the Bible expressly ascribed to the Spirit. But they are even more straitened to find a proof passage on this subject than on their first argument for their fifth alleged proof for the Holy Spirit's being God—God's exclusive names Scripturally attributed to the Spirit. Their main alleged proof is Is. 6: 3, the words of the seraphim, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts." We have already refuted the use of these words as applying to the Son or the Spirit. We may further add that if the Holy Spirit were a person separate and distinct from the Father and Son, Is. 6 (which certainly refers to the Son by its *Adonai* and to the Father by its *Jehovah*, though

disproving that the Son is God Almighty by the title it gives Him as distinct from the Father's title) is surely the place where we ought to find reference made to the Holy Spirit as a person; for Is. 6 describes a scene in Heaven connected with the execution of God's plan. But no mention of the Spirit is made at all in the whole chapter. How straitened must those be for proof of worship ascribed to the Holy Spirit who quote Is. 6: 3 for it! More desperate still is their use of Matt. 28: 19, "Baptizing them into the name [character likeness] of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit," as a proof of worship given to the Holy Spirit, for the passage has nothing to say of worship or honor. If they did have real proof texts for their thought, they would never quote Is. 6: 3; Matt. 28: 19 on this point. There is no Bible passage referring to worship given to the Holy Spirit. Hence the Bible does not teach it. But understanding the Holy Spirit in its second sense—God's disposition in Himself—His holy mind, heart and will—we would not say it would be wrong to worship It, understanding such worship to be intended for God in His holy character; because the chief reason we have for worshiping God is His holy character. We therefore in such worship endorse singing such hymns as "Holy Spirit, banish sadness," and "Holy Spirit, faithful Guide"; for if the Bible had charged or endorsed such worship, which it nowhere expressly does, it would mean worshiping the Father (also the Son) in their holy dispositions, thus not meaning that the Spirit is a person, but the disposition of the Father primarily, and secondarily of the Son, and then of the holy angels and of the saints. Accordingly, the fourth argument that trinitarians allege for their fifth indirect proof of the trinity falls to the ground; and thus we have found every one of these arguments to be false, which proves their fifth alleged indirect proof to be false. With this and the fourth one, *i.e.*, as to the Son, goes

to pieces their theory that the Father's, Son's and Holy Spirit's cooperating in the work of Creation, preservation, and salvation, proves the trinity; for this cooperation by the Son is that of an Agent, and by the Spirit is that of God's attributes.

Trinitarians seek as a sixth indirect proof of the trinity to show that the Holy Spirit is a person; and think they find this proof in the fact that the Spirit in the Bible is set forth as thinking (1 Cor. 2: 10), feeling (Eph. 4: 30) and willing (1 Cor. 12: 11). We agree that the Spirit thinks, feels and wills, which proves the personality of the Spirit in the sense of God's disposition, His mind, heart and will, in Himself, in our Lord, in the holy angels and in the saints; for the personality of the Holy Spirit is not a person, but is the Father, Son, good angels and saints in their dispositions. We believe in the personality of the Holy Spirit; but deny that the Holy Spirit is a person. But one's disposition is not a person, it is the sum total of his mental, moral and religious qualities as a person. Thus God's Spirit, in the second sense of that word, is the sum total of God's, Christ's, the holy angels' and the saints' mental, moral and religious qualities as persons. But the sum total of one's mental, moral and religious qualities as a person is not himself, a person; rather it is the attributes of himself, a person, who should not be confused with his attributes. So the sixth alleged indirect proof of the trinity falls to the ground. Trinitarians seek also to prove their thought, that the Holy Spirit is a person, by referring to the masculine pronouns used of It in John 14: 17, 26; 15: 26; 16: 7, 8, 13-15.

On this point we make several replies: (1) The trinitarian translators have sectarianly given a bias in their favor to this subject in John 14: 17, where in the Greek all the pronouns referring to the Holy Spirit are neuter, in John 14: 26, where one of the two is neuter, in John 15: 26, where one of the three is neuter,

and in John 16: 7, 8, 13-15, where they are mainly masculine, and in the other cases the gender is not definitely expressed, since in those forms the masculine and neuter genders are alike. (2) This raises the question, Why this diversity? Our answer to this question will show our second point on this subject. The diversity is due to the fact that in Greek gender is not based on sex and non-sex, as in English, but on the endings of the nouns, regardless of sex or non-sex, *e.g.*, the Greek word for Comforter is *Parakletos*, and is masculine, because it is a noun of the second declension ending in *os*, all of which with this ending, with very rare exceptions, are masculine, while the Greek word for Spirit is *Pneuma* and is neuter, because it is a noun of the third declension ending in *ma*. When in the Greek of these passages the pronouns refer to *Parakletos*, they are always masculine; but when they refer to *Pneuma*, they are always neuter. The reason is this: Pronouns in Greek must agree, among other ways, in gender with the nouns to which they refer; hence properly in referring to *Parakletos* they are masculine in the Greek, and properly in referring to *Pneuma* they are neuter in the Greek. And hence (3) from the gender of the pronouns used in connection with these two words we cannot infer anything one way or the other, on whether the Holy Spirit is a person or not. This must be found out from what the teachings of all the Scriptures using the term Holy Spirit are. Our study has surely given us proof in abundance that the Spirit is not a person. Our trinitarian translators know these rules of grammar just given; but seemingly in their sectarianism, which they doubtless honestly held, they gave a bias to these passages favorable to their view. Accordingly, the masculine pronouns of John 14: 17, 26; 15: 26; 16: 7, 8, 13-15 do not prove that the Holy Spirit is a person, just as the neuter pronouns of these passages do not prove that the

Holy Spirit is not a person. Hence the trinitarian contention, based on the masculine pronouns of these passages, that the Holy Spirit is a person, falls to the ground. However, since it is customary to designate powerful things, *e.g.*, the sun, by masculine pronouns, and delicate things, *e.g.*, the moon, by feminine pronouns, we often refer to the Holy Spirit by masculine pronouns, but do not mean thereby that It is a person. We have, however, in this article referred to the Holy Spirit by neuter pronouns designedly, for the sake of clarity, to emphasize its contrast with the error that we have been combating on the subject.

Finally, trinitarians offer a seventh alleged indirect proof of the trinity—man's creation in God's image (Gen. 1: 26); for they allege man is a trinity—body, soul and spirit in one being; hence they conclude, God, whose image he is, must be a trinity! To this alleged proof of the trinity we offer several refutations: (1) Nowhere does the Bible indicate that God's image in man is man in his body, soul and spirit; (2) God's image in man is His mental, moral and religious likeness to God (Eph. 4: 23, 24; Col. 3: 10); (3) God's image as such in man has been effaced, proven by the fact that it is being renewed in the saints (Eph. 4: 23; Col. 3: 10; Rom. 12: 2; Tit. 3: 5); but man's body, soul and spirit are not effaced; hence God's image in man does not consist of these; and (4) man is not a trinity. He is a unity; for man is a soul that has two parts, body and spirit (in the sense of life principle, Gen. 2: 7). Thus God is a unity, not a trinity, for He is a soul (Is. 42: 1; Matt. 12: 18; Heb. 10: 38) that has two parts, body (John 5: 37) and spirit (which word does not here have the meaning of the Holy Spirit, but the life principle, John 5: 26). This fact is true of every other sentient being in the universe, Christ, angels, *etc.* Accordingly, this alleged proof falls to the ground.

Thus we have brought our examination and refutation of the trinity doctrine to an end. As pointed out in the beginning, we have had to be terse in dealing with so vast a subject; but we believe we have fairly presented and sufficiently refuted this error, whose wide prevalence among all nations during the time that darkness prevails among the nations (Is. 60: 2), is a sure proof of its being championed by the god [ruler] of this world, Satan (2 Cor. 4: 4).

With our discussion of tritheism—trinity—we bring our discussion of false views of God to an end, and therewith conclude our discussion of God. In this discussion we have proved that there is a God: from the universality of the belief as a proof of its being grounded in the constitution of man, from cause to effect, from the order and the reign of law in the world, from design everywhere manifest in the universe, from man's mental, moral and religious nature, from experience and from the impossibility of disproving His existence, or of proving that He does not exist. We have, further, discussed God's attributes of being and shown that the main ones are His personality, corporeality, spirituality, self-existence, eternity, self-sufficiency, immortality, invisibility, unity, omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, supremacy, unfathomableness, all of which attributes of being naturally evoke reverence in a responsive heart. We have learned that the elements of God's character are His righteous attitude toward evil, holy affections, the graces, strength, dominance by the higher primary graces, balance and crystallization. Thereafter we considered God's graces. First we considered His higher primary graces: wisdom, justice, love and power, and found their function to be that of properly coordinated rulership over all other elements of character. Then we considered His lower primary graces of self-esteem, approbateness, restfulness, vitativeness, self-defensiveness, aggressiveness, carefulness, secretiveness,

providence, intelligence, agreeableness, conjugality, fatherliness and kingliness. Next God's secondary graces of modesty, industriousness, longsuffering, forbearance, forgiveness, courage, candor and liberality engaged our attention. After this we studied His tertiary graces, particularizing on His meekness, zeal, moderation, magnanimity, or goodness, and faithfulness. And, finally, we reviewed the various false views of God: in their infidelistic forms of atheism, materialism, agnosticism, pantheism and deism, as well as in their heathen forms of polytheism and tritheism.

In this discussion we omitted a study of God's works, designing it for later treatment. Nor did we attempt to treat exhaustively any of the phases of God under discussion, since that would have carried us into too great detail. But we discussed our subject from general standpoints, designing to give the reader clear, Biblical views of God, so that both by head and by heart he might be drawn to a proper appreciation of, love for, and devotion to God, whose glorious person, Holy Spirit, marvelous plan and great works, properly appraised, will draw the good head and heart into spontaneous appreciation, love and worship of Him. Surely, our study should move all of us to enter in spirit into a life-long realization of the Psalmist's exhortation, "O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord, our Maker" (Ps. 95: 6); for in its heart of hearts this passage implies such an appreciation, love and devotion, and of these God is supremely worthy.

Praise God from whom all blessings flow;
Praise Him all creatures here below;
Praise Him aloud with heart and voice,
And always in His Son rejoice!