

The Present Truth [UK] Articles (1887-1903)

The Present Truth, Vol. 3 (1887)

August 18, 1887

"Comfort Ye, Comfort Ye My People" *The Present Truth* 3, 16 , p. 245.

"COMFORT ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God." This is the word of the Lord by the prophet Isaiah. The Lord knows our trials, our afflictions, our troubles, and in his great pity sends comfort. "Although affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground; yet man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward." Job 5:6, 7. Trouble is the common lot of all men. Who in this world is free from it? None. And the Lord, knowing our frame, remembering that we are dust, says, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people."

Paul, in contemplating this, exclaims, "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of *all comfort*; who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God." 2 Cor. 1:3, 4. The Bible is a perfect storehouse of all the needs of human experience, and trouble is as universal as is the human race. "Although affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground; yet man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward." Job 5:6, 7. Solomon, in considering the oppressions that are done under the sun, said: "Behold, the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors there was power; but they had no comforter." Eccl. 4:1. It is had enough to be oppressed, but to be oppressed and have no comforter is terrible. It is true that there are many such, but it is equally true that there *need* not be any such; for all that are oppressed, all that are afflicted, all that are troubled, may do as one of old, "I would seek unto God, and unto God would I commit my cause," and he, "the God of all comfort," will "comfort all that mourn." His tender mercies are over all his works.

It is a fact that the Lord has not, in his word, told us to do anything without telling us how to do that thing. It is so in this. He has not only told us, "Comfort ye my people," but he tells us how to comfort them. We will notice an example or two.

In John 13 to 18 we have Jesus' last talk to his disciples before his crucifixion. He was about to leave them to go again to his Father, and in John 13:33 he said: "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so not I say to you." This is a very important statement, "Whither I go ye cannot come." But not only that, the Lord refers us to something else, "As I said unto the Jews, . . . so now I say to you."

Therefore to obtain the full meaning of this word, whither I go ye cannot come, we must find what it was he had said to the Jews. The only place in which he spoke these words to the Jews is John 8:21: "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; whither I go, ye cannot come." This it is to which he referred in John 13:33. "As I said unto the Jews, Whither I go ye cannot come; so now I say to you." Therefore, so far as going to the Lord is concerned, it is positive by his own words, that his disciples have no pre-eminence above men who die in their sins.

When Jesus said this to his disciples, they were troubled. Could it be possible that they who had left all and had followed him; that these whom he had chosen out of the world; that these whom he had loved unto the end; could it be possible that they, after all their experience with him and his love for them, should now be left on the level of those who die in their sins? Why should they not be troubled? He had asked them once, "Will ye also go away?" and Peter had replied, "Lord, to whom shall we go" thou hast the words of eternal life;" and now after having trusted in him for eternal life, to be told that when he should go away, they could not go where he went, that was enough to trouble them.

But Jesus did not allow them to be long troubled thus. He comforts them. He said: "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And *if I go* and prepare a place for you, *I will come again, and receive you* unto myself; *that* where I am, there ye may be also." John 14:1-3. This relieved them of all their trouble on that point, this was comfort indeed. And, mark you, it is the Lord's own word. It is Christ's own message of comfort to his disciples. And that message of comfort is, although it be that "whither I go, *ye cannot come*," any more than can men who die in their sins, yet, "*I will come again* and receive you unto myself; *that* where I am there ye may be also." And this word "that" shows that it is only by his coming again that his children can ever be where he is.

Now why should the Saviour, who loved his disciples so tenderly, stir up this trouble in their hearts? They were with him when he told the Jews, "Ye shall die in your sins, and whither I go ye cannot come." They understood the full force of that fearful sentence. Now why should he plunge them into fear and trouble, by saying the same thing to them, and this too, by the phrase, "As I said unto the Jews," so emphatically that they could not possibly misunderstand him? Why was this done? The sequel shows plainly that it was for the purpose of making such an impression upon them as they never could forget; and so to fix ineffaceably upon their minds the truth that without his coming again, there is absolutely no hope of ever being where he is; and thus to set them in view of one event as the consummation of all their hopes, and that event the *coming again* of the Lord. That is the comfort of Christ himself.

Another instance: The Thessalonian brethren were sorrowing because some of their number had died. And now the Lord, by Paul's pen, sends them comfort. And what is his comfort? The same Jesus gave to his disciples, for it is Jesus who sends this. Here it is: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead

in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore *comfort one another with these words.*" 1 Thess. 4:16-18. That is the comfort the Lord gives to the sorrowing. And any other under such circumstances is false comfort. It is not only his comfort to us, but it is *his command* that we comfort one another *with these words.*

Once more: In 2 Thess. 1:6-10 Paul speaks to those "who are troubled," and his comfort is that "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven . . . when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe . . . in that day." This is the comfort of God: The Lord is coming. "I will come again." "The Lord himself shall descend from Heaven." "The Lord shall be revealed from Heaven." "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God."

A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 4 (1888)

April 5, 1888

"The Faith of Jesus" *The Present Truth* 4, 7 , pp. 99, 100.

IN the matter of the duty of keeping the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus, it is not to be understood that the two can for a moment be separated. The commandments cannot be kept acceptably to God except by faith in Jesus Christ; and faith in Christ amounts to nothing - is dead - unless it is manifested, made perfect, in good works, and these good works consist in the keeping of the commandments of God. Christ kept the commandments of God: "I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love." John 15:10. By his obedience it is that many must be made righteous. "For as by one man's [Adam's] disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one [Christ] shall many be made righteous." Rom. 5:19. But these are made righteous only by faith in Him, thus having "the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:22, 23.

All have sinned; and "sin is the transgression of the law." As all have thus transgressed the law, none can attain to righteousness by the law. There is righteousness in the law of God; in fact, the word says, "All thy commandments *are* righteousness;" but there is no righteousness there *for the transgressor.* When any one has transgressed the law, then if righteousness ever comes to one who has transgressed the law, it must come from some source besides the law. And as all in all the world, have transgressed the law, to whomsoever, therefore, in all the world, righteousness shall come, it must be from another source than from the law, and that source is Christ Jesus the Lord. This is the great argument of Rom. 3:19-31: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped,

and *all the world may become guilty before God*. Therefore *by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified* in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God *without the law is manifested*, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; *even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ* unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."

Then the question comes in, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Notice, he has already said that although this righteousness of God is without the law, and by faith of Christ, yet it is "*witnessed by the law* and the prophets." It is a righteousness that accords with the law; it is a righteousness to which the law can bear witness; it is a righteousness with which the law in its perfect righteousness can find no fault. And that is the righteousness of Christ he wrought out for us by his perfect obedience to the commandments of God, and of which we become partakers by faith in him; for "by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous." Thus we become the children of God by faith in Christ; by faith in him the righteousness of the law is met in us, and we do not make void, but we establish the law of God, by faith in Christ.

This is further shown in Rom. 8:3-10: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." What was it that the law could not do? 1. The law was ordained to life (Rom. 7:10) but it could not give life, because all had sinned - transgressed the law - and the wages of sin is death. 2. The law was ordained to justification (Rom. 2:13), but it will justify only the *doers of the law*, but of all the children of Adam there have been no doers of the law; all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. 3. The law was ordained to righteousness (Rom. 10:5), but it can count as righteous only the obedient, and all the world is guilty of disobedience before God. Therefore because of man's failure, because of his wrong doings, the law could not minister to him life, it could not justify him, it could not accept him as righteous. So far as man was concerned, the purpose of the law was entirely frustrated.

But mark, what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the sinful flesh, God sent His Son to do, in the likeness of sinful flesh. What the law could not do, Christ does. The law could not give life, because by transgression all had incurred its penalty of death; the law could not give justification, because by failure to do it all had brought themselves under its condemnation; the law could not give righteousness, because all had sinned. But in-

100

stead of this death, Christ gives life; instead of this condemnation, Christ gives justification; instead of this sin, Christ gives righteousness. And for what? that henceforth the law might be despised by us? Nay, verily! But "that the righteousness of the law *might be fulfilled in us*, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, *but to fulfill*," said the holy Son of God. And so "Christ is

the end [purpose] of the law *for righteousness* to everyone that believeth." Rom. 10:4. For of God, Christ Jesus "is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." 1 Cor. 1:30, 31.

Again, says the Scriptures, "The law is spiritual," and "the carnal mind [the natural mind, the minding of the flesh] is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh can not please God." Rom. 7:14; 8:7, 8. How then shall we please God? How shall we become subject to the law of God? The Saviour says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," and we have just read in Romans that it is "sinful flesh," this is why they that are in the flesh can not please God. But the Saviour says, further, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Therefore it is certain that except we are born of the Spirit, we can not please God, we cannot be subject to the law of God, which is spiritual, and demands spiritual service. This, too, is precisely what the Saviour says: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

We know that some will say that the kingdom of God here referred to is the kingdom of glory, and that the new birth, the birth of the Spirit, is not until the resurrection, and that then we enter the kingdom of God. But such a view is altogether wrong. Except a man be born of the Spirit, he must still remain in the flesh. But the Scripture says, "They that are in the flesh can not please God." And the man who does not please God will never see the kingdom of God, whether it be the kingdom of grace or of glory. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." The kingdom of God, whether of grace or of glory, is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Rom. 14:17. Except a man be born again, he can not see nor enter into the righteousness of God; he can not see nor enter into the peace of God, which passes all understanding; and except he be born of the Spirit of God, *how can he* see, or enter into, that "joy in the Holy Ghost"? Except a man be born again - born of the Spirit - before he dies, he will never see the resurrection unto life. This is shown in Rom. 8:11. "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you. It is certain, therefore, that except the Spirit of Christ dwells in us, we can not be raised from the dead to life. But except His Spirit dwells in us, we are yet in the flesh. And if we are in the flesh, we can not please God. And if we do not please God, we can never see the kingdom of God, either here or hereafter.

Again: it is by birth that we are children of the first Adam; and if we shall ever be children of the last Adam, it must be by a new birth. The first Adam was natural, and we are his children by natural birth; the last Adam is spiritual, and if we become His children, it must be by spiritual birth. The first Adam was of the earth, earthy, and we are his children by an earthly birth; the second Adam is the Lord from Heaven, from above, and if we are to be his children it must be by a heavenly birth, a birth from above. For "as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy." The earthy is "natural" of the flesh, but "the natural man receiveth not

the things of the Spirit of God;" "because they are spiritually discerned," and "they that are in the flesh can not please God." Such is the birthright, and all the birthright, that we receive from the first Adam. But "as is the heavenly such are they also that are heavenly." The heavenly is spiritual; he is "a life-giving Spirit;" and the spiritual man receives the things of the Spirit of God, because they are spiritually discerned; he can please God because he is not in the flesh, but in the Spirit; for the Spirit of God dwells in him; he is, and can be, subject to the law of God, because the carnal mind is destroyed, and he has the mind of Christ, the heavenly. Such is the birthright of the second Adam, the one from above. And all the privileges, the blessings, and the joys of this birthright are ours when we are born from above. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born from above." "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born from above, he can not see the kingdom of God." With the argument of this paragraph, please study 1 Cor. 15:45-48; John 3:3-8; 1 Cor. 3:11-16; Rom. 8:5-10.

Thus in briefest outline we have drawn a sketch of the faith of Jesus which must be kept, and by means of which alone the commandments of God can be kept. He who keeps this will live the life of the just, as it is written, "The just shall live by faith." Then can he say with the great apostle, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and *the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God*, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Gal. 2:20. And when his course is finished, he can say with both the great apostle and the beloved disciples, "I have fought a good fight [it is the fight of faith, 1 Tim. 6:12], . . . I have kept the faith." "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." 2 Tim. 4:7; 1 John 5:4.

We thank God for the message which calls upon all men to "keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 7 (1891)

February 26, 1891

"Is It Peace and Safety?" *The Present Truth* 7, 5 , pp. 75, 76.

IN spite of the rapid increase of crime and violence on every hand; in spite of the most gigantic preparations for war that the world has ever seen; in spite of the increasing worldliness of the church, the pulpit and the religious press continue to talk of peace and safety, of a millennium in which there shall be no war, and in which the world will be converted. In the midst of violence and crime, it seems a strange proceeding to talk of peace and safety. In the presence of the greatest possible preparations for war, it seems rather incongruous to announce the speedy approach of a time when there shall be no war. In the face of the increasing worldliness of the church, and the loss of her power of godliness, the prospect does not appear very flattering for the conversion of the world to Christ.

Yet under these very circumstances, in these very times, these very things are preached.

But is such preaching, the preaching of the truth? Is it so that through the practice of violence and crime there is to be developed an era of peace and safety for those who commit these things as well as for those who do not? Is it true that by these immense preparations for war, by this constant readiness for war, and this increasing jealousy and warlike spirit amongst nations, there is to be brought about a time when all nations shall voluntarily lay down their arms and make no more preparation for war, and when there shall nevermore be either jealousy or warlike spirit? Is it a fact that through a world-loving church seeking for worldly power and worldly favor, there shall flow such a flood of Divine grace that it shall irresistibly overwhelm the world? Such results from such causes or by such means, are moral impossibilities. Then why is it that from one end of Christendom to the other the pulpits ring with it? Is it because the Scriptures say that this shall be? Let us see.

There are certain scriptures quoted to prove that these things are so. Let us read them.

Psa. 2:7, 8. "I will declare the decree; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession." There, does not that say that the world shall be converted? Well does it? Plainly it does not. It says that the heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth shall be given to the Son of God. But it does not say that this shall be by conversion nor for conversion. Before the conversion of the heathen or the uttermost parts of the earth can be found in that scripture it has to be put into it by the one who wants to find it there. And that is not the best way to interpret Scripture. It is not the best way to read into Scripture what we want there, rather than to read the Scripture to find what really is there. But it may be asked, Is not conversion the necessary conclusion from the text? It is not, because the next verse shows the contrary: "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." That is certainly anything else then their conversion. This is shown further by the remaining verses: "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little."

This shows that the time is coming when the Son will be angry, and His wrath will be kindled; and that now men must make their peace with Him, that they be not broken and dashed in pieces when His wrath shall be kindled, for that is to be done with the heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth when they are given to Him. This is confirmed by another scripture in which this wrath is spoken of. Rev. 6:16 speaks of "the wrath of the Lamb." And when that wrath is revealed, "the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and *from the wrath* of the Lamb; for the great day of His wrath is

come; and who shall be able to stand?" It is certain therefore that the second psalm does not teach the conversion of the world; nor will it allow any such teaching to be read into it.

Another scripture quoted in proof of the conversion of the world is Rev. 11:15: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever." But this text is much the same as the other. It does not say that these kingdoms become His by conversion nor for conversion. It is evident that this text bears the same meaning as that in the second psalm. Read the two together: "I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession." "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ." These two texts certainly speak of the same time and the same event, and we have seen that these heathen are given Him to be dashed in pieces. And that this is the same with "the kingdoms of the world," is evident from the context. The whole verse reads, "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever."

"The seventh angel" here spoken of is the seventh of the seven trumpet angels of the eighth to the eleventh chapters of this book. And each of the last three trumpets is accompanied by woe, for Rev. 8:13 says, "Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound!" There were three trumpets yet to sound and there were to be three woes because of the three trumpets. This is further shown by Rev. 11:14: "The second woe is past; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly." Then follows the sounding of the seventh trumpet and the announcement that the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ. Now as the seventh trumpet is accompanied by the third woe, and as it is under the seventh trumpet that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, it is certain therefore that it is in the midst of a time of woe that the kingdoms of this world do become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

This is further shown by verse 18: "And the nations were angry (precisely the attitude of the nations at this moment), and *Thy wrath is come*, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto Thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear Thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which corrupt (margin) the earth." The time of reward of the saints, etc., is at the coming of the Lord, for He says, "Behold, I come quickly; and My reward is with Me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12. Then it is that His wrath is kindled, and

the angry nations are given Him, and in the midst of a time of woe they are dashed in pieces and destroyed because they corrupt the earth.

This is confirmed by the prophecy in Dan. 2:31-45. There was a great image seen, with head of gold, breast and arms of silver, sides of brass, legs of iron, and feet of iron and clay. Then a stone was seen to smite the image upon his feet, "and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver,

and the gold, broken to pieces together and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them." And in explanation of this the Word says: "In the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall *break in pieces and consume* all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever."

It is evident that in none of these texts is the conversion of the world, nor a millennium of peace, spoken of at all nor even suggested. Instead of the nations being at peace, they are "angry;" instead of there being safety on the earth there is "woe;" instead of the conversion of the world there is to be destruction that shall fall grievously upon the head of the wicked. And yet in the face of these plain declarations of the Word of God, and of the events that mark their fulfilment, men will preach directly the opposite. But even this is shown by the Word of God as that which will be at this time. In the last verse of 1 Thessalonians 4, the coming of the Lord is spoken of. Then in the first verses of the fifth chapter it is said: "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, Peace and safety; *then sudden destruction cometh upon them*, as travail upon a woman with child; *and they shall not escape.*"

This shows that at the time when destruction is impending there will be men saying, "Peace and safety," and *then* sudden destruction comes upon them. Therefore if there is any one thing that men should disbelieve, it is the preaching of peace and safety, the preaching of a millennium of peace and the conversion of the world. The very preaching of it is evidence of its falsity, because the word of God says that *then* "destruction cometh."

A. T. J.

April 9, 1891

"The Religious Oath" *The Present Truth* 7, 8 , p. 124.

A SHORT time ago, in noticing the Nine Demands for Liberalism, we made some remarks upon the religious oath; and now comes the *Christian Statesman* and confirms all that we then said on that question. It says: -

The efficacy of the oath which is simply an appeal to God, as witness and Judge, depends on the fear of God in the hearts of men.

This is true. What is the worth, therefore, of such an oath taken by men who have no fear of God in their hearts? To oblige a man who has no fear of God in his heart, to take an oath, the sole efficacy of which depends on the fear of God in his heart, in order that he may be a competent witness, is to destroy all the value of his testimony. Because when such a man takes such an oath, he publicly professes that he has the fear of God in his heart, when he and all who are acquainted with him know full well that it is not so. He therefore publicly

professes a lie as a pledge to society that he is going to tell the truth! And any State which compels men to take such an oath in order to be competent witnesses, adopts the surest means of undermining both public and private integrity, and of destroying the value of judicial testimony.

The *Statesman* knows of course that there is not as much of the fear of God in the hearts of men in the United States as there should be to lend the religious oath its necessary efficacy; and therefore it proposes in the regular National Reform way, to put the fear of God in the hearts of all of the people in Pennsylvania by strictly enforcing the Pennsylvanian statute, which declares that

If any person shall willfully, premeditatedly and despitefully blaspheme, or speak loosely or profanely of Almighty God, Christ Jesus, the Holy Spirit, or the Scriptures of truth, such person shall be liable to a fine of one hundred dollars, and an imprisonment of three months.

The *Statesman* therefore declares that "a crusade against profanity would be an incalculable blessing;" and calls upon the "religious newspapers" to summon "Christian citizens to undertake it." Now we are not in favour of either blasphemy or profanity; but at the same time we are not in favour of any effort to put the fear of God into the hearts of men by penalties upon their bodies and goods. The fact of the matter is, that State laws on the subject of blasphemy are themselves blasphemous.

A. T. JONES.

June 18, 1891

"Human Nature and Its Restraints" *The Present Truth* 7, 13 , pp. 203, 204.

LET anyone compare the two pictures drawn by Paul, the one in Rom. 1:28-31, of the iniquity of ancient heathenism, the other in 2 Tim. 3:1-8, of the iniquity of the last days, even among those who have "a form of godliness," and he will see that they are exactly alike. Human nature, unrestrained, is the same in all ages. Whether in the days of Christ, or two thousand years before, or two thousand years after; whether manifested in the habitants of Canaan, or in the inhabitants of the United States, it is always the same. It is for this very reason that the Bible fits men, wherever on the earth it may find them. It is a book not for one tribe only, nor for one class, nor for one nation, but for the human race. *And it is the only book in the world that is.* The reason for that is, that the book was given by One who knows human nature in its very essence.

God made man upright. But he turned from the bright course which God set before him; he sinned, and so sold himself to do evil; and not the sublime powers which the Lord bestowed upon him, to be exerted in the way of righteousness, are prostituted to evil; his "course is evil," and his "force is not right." If ever, then, man shall be raised from his fallen state, if ever his lapsed powers shall be restored, it is indispensable that the tendency of every faculty be restrained,

turned into the right course, and trained to follow it. The Bible meets this necessity; it meets it in every part, and satisfies it to the full. Therefore, this of itself is proof that *the Creator of man is the Author of the Bible*.

Human nature being the same everywhere, the only thing that makes one person to differ from another *is the degree of restraint* each one recognizes in his own case. If, in a person, all the restraints of the law of God are recognized, he will be a man fitted for the society and fellowship of the angels. If, on the contrary, none of these are recognized, he will be a man fit only for the society and fellowship of demons. Upon many persons, and in many ways, these restraints exert themselves unconsciously, as in the case of the infidel, who denies the authority or the existence of God, and despises his word. Yet the principles of that word are so imbedded in the society of which he is a member that he yields obedience to them, while he thinks he is defying them; but transplant him to the state of society which he advocates, where none of these principles are recognized, and none exerted, and he will run as readily in the way of iniquity as the veriest heathen that ever dwelt in the land of Canaan. And that other class of persons who call themselves "Christians", or even "Christian ministers," who, in their opposition to the obligations of the ten commandments, can hardly frame sentences that will sufficiently express the bitterness of their contempt for the law of God, only let the time come when such seed shall have borne its fruit, when society in following such teaching shall have reached that condition which would be defined in the very opposite of the ten commandments, and they will go as greedily in that evil way as did Balaam of old.

Again, many will restrain themselves from *doing* evil through fear of punishment; but take away the prospect of punishment, or satisfy them that there will be none, and they will go to any length that circumstances may allow. Henry VIII., although he regarded not God, as long as he feared the Pope did not dare to divorce his wife, but when he had broken through that restraint, he *cut off the heads of three wives*, and only a witty speech saved the head of the fourth.

There is another course by which men reach the same state of cruelty. That is, not by denying the existence of God, but by making themselves the depositaries of what they choose to define as his will, and then holding themselves as the sole expositors and executors of that will. As in every single instance it is only *their own will* which is thus exalted to the supremacy, and therefore is of only human authority, the only way in which it can be enforced is by human enactment; and then instead of being simply executors, they make themselves *executioners* in carrying into effect their arbitrary will. Making their own will supreme, and themselves the sole interpreters of that will, even though they claim it to be the will of God, they just as veritably put themselves beyond restraint as do the men who deny God outright. Both classes reach the same point, and both commit the same enormous crimes, the one illustrated in the fearful orgies of the Reign of Terror, the other illustrated in the terrible torments of the Inquisition.

The Scriptures confirm all that this

investigation suggests. In the beginning of this article we cited Rom. 1:28-31 as the description of the ancient heathendom, and 2 Tim. 3:1-8 as the description of the last days of modern Christendom, and we find them exactly alike. It is by resistance to the truth of God that men loosen its restraints upon them, and deliver themselves up to the sway of Satan. In the last days it is only those who "received not the *love of the truth* that they might be saved," in whom Satan works "with all power and signs and lying wonders." It is only those "who believe not the truth" but have "pleasure in unrighteousness," who become so deluded that they "believe a lie."

From the beginning of the world God has left no nation without witness. Acts 14:16, 17. By a *then* "present truth" He has witnessed to different ages. In obedience to that truth, and in the love of it, lay the salvation of the people in each respective age. In the last days God sends a message which continues sounding to the end of the world, and is therefore His last message to the world. It is the Third Angel's Message, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-16. The commandments of God are truth. Psa. 119:151. The faith of Jesus is the faith of Him who is the truth. John 14:6. Both together embrace the whole Word of God, which is truth (John 17:17), and restrain men. "*Thou shalt not*" is the key-note of the commandments of God; "and if any man will come after Me, *let him deny himself*," exclaims Jesus. Therefore the Third Angel's Message, in holding forth the "commandments of god and the faith of Jesus" presents the summary of all those restraints which are demanded in checking and transforming the tendencies of human nature, and in leading them by the "right course," to goodness and to God. And when the word shall deliberately reject the Third Angel's Message, it thereby places itself beyond those restraints, and is then ready to be led captive by Satan *at his will*; and then it is that he works with all power in them that perish, "*because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved.*" By the Third Angel's Message, the harvest of the earth will be ripened for good or for ill; for glory or for shame; to be gathered into the garner of God, or to be bound in bundles to be burned.

A. T. J.

July 16, 1891

"Reputation" *The Present Truth* 7, 15 , p. 228.

IT is character alone that is acceptable to God. No brilliancy of reputation can dazzle Him. He demands truth in the inward parts. "God looketh on the heart." And here people make a great mistake as often as in anything else. Thousands when called upon to obey the truth of God, will put first their reputation, and what they think is their influence, and will make their allegiance to God - their character - yield to these. Christ "made Himself of no reputation;" so likewise did he who was the figure of Christ, he "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches

than all the treasures of Egypt." So it will ever be. The disciple is not greater than his Lord.

The people of God have ever been subject to reproach; the truth of God has always been unpopular, and men often have the opportunity to follow Christ most closely by, like Him, making themselves of "no reputation." Often it becomes necessary for us to forfeit reputation before men, that we may perfect character before God.

A. T. J.

August 13, 1891

"The Reward of the Saints" *The Present Truth* 7, 17 , pp. 266, 267.

THE last question which we shall notice in this connection is that one which was put by Peter to the Lord Jesus: "Behold, we have forsake all, and followed Thee; what shall we have therefore?" To this question the Lord gave two answers. The first one was to the twelve direct, and concerned them alone: "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The other answer is to all people: "And everyone that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for My name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold," "now in this time, . . . and in the world to come eternal life." Matt. 19:27-29; Mark 10:30.

Eternal life is that which they shall have who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. "For 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. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." 1 John 5:11, 12.

With eternal life to those who believe on the Son of God, there is also given eternal glory. "The God of all grace, who hath called us unto His eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered awhile, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you." 1 Pet. 5:10. "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." Rom. 8:18. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." 2 Cor. 4:17.

They shall stand in the presence of the throne of God and of His glory. "I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." Rev. 7:9, 10. "Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever." Jude 24, 25.

Of some other of the glories of the reward which shall be to those who have left all and followed Christ, we will let another tell, in tones that charm as though attuned to the symphonies of the other world: -

"'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away.' The fire that consumes the wicked purifies the earth. Every trace of the curse is swept away. No eternally burning hell will keep before the ransomed the fearful consequences of sin. One reminder alone remains: our Redeemer will ever bear the marks of His crucifixion. Upon His wounded head, His hands and feet, are the only traces of the cruel work that sin has wrought.

"'O Tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion.' The kingdom forfeited by sin, Christ has regained, and the redeemed are to possess it with Him. 'The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein for ever.' A fear of making the saints' inheritance seem too material has led many to spiritualize away the very truths which lead us to look upon the new earth as our home. Christ assured His disciples that He went to prepare mansions for them. Those who accept the teachings of God's Word will not be wholly ignorant concerning the heavenly abode. And yet the apostle Paul declares: 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.' Human language is inadequate to describe the reward of the righteous. It will be known only to those who behold it. No finite mind can comprehend the glory of the paradise of God.

"In the Bible the inheritance of the saved is called a country. There the great Shepherd leads His flock to fountains of living waters. The tree of life yields its fruit every month, and the leaves of the tree are for the service of the nations. There are ever flowing streams, clear as crystal, and beside them waving trees cast their shadows upon the paths prepared for the ransomed of the Lord.

267

There the wide-spreading plains swell into hills of beauty, and the mountains of God rear their lofty summits. On those peaceful plains, beside those living streams, God's people, so long pilgrims and wanderers, shall find a home."

"There is the New Jerusalem, 'having the glory of God,' her light 'like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal.' Saith the Lord: 'I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in My people.' 'The tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away.'

"In the city of God 'there shall be no night.' None will need or desire repose. There will be no weariness in doing the will of God and offering praise to His name. We shall ever feel the freshness of the morning, and shall ever be far from its close. 'And they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light.' The light of the sun will be superseded by a radiance which is not painfully dazzling, yet which immeasurably surpasses the brightness of our noontide. The glory of God and the Lamb floods the holy city with unflinching light. The redeemed walk in the sunless glory of perpetual day.

"I saw no temple therein; For the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.' The people of God are privileged to hold open communion with the Father and the Son. Now we 'see through a glass, darkly.' We behold the image of God reflected, as in a mirror, in the works of nature and in His dealings with men; but then we shall see Him face to face, without a dimming veil between. We shall stand in His presence, and gaze upon the glory of His countenance.

"There, immortal minds will study with never-failing delight the wonders of creative power, the mysteries of redeeming love. There is no cruel, deceiving foe to tempt to forgetfulness of God. Every faculty will be developed, every capacity increased. The acquirement of knowledge will not weary the mind or exhaust the energies. There the grandest enterprises may be carried forward, the loftiest aspirations reached, the highest ambitions realized; and still there will arise new heights to surmount, new wonders to admire, new truths to comprehend, fresh objects to call forth the powers of mind and soul and body.

"And as the years of eternity roll, they will bring richer and more glorious revelations of God and of Christ. As knowledge is progressive, so will love, reverence, and happiness increase. The more men learn of God, the greater will be their admiration of His character. As Jesus opens before them the riches of redemption, and the amazing achievements in the great controversy with Satan, the hearts of the ransomed beat with a stronger devotion, and they sweep the harps of gold with a firmer hand; and ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands of voices unite to swell the mighty chorus of praise.

"And every creature which is in Heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea. and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." A. T. J

September 10, 1891

"The Church the House of God" *The Present Truth* 7, 19 , pp. 298, 299.

IN one of the views which the Scripture gives of the Church of Christ it is called "the house of God." Said Paul to Timothy: "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." 1 Tim. 3:14, 15. And again, in the letter to the Hebrews, we read: "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a son over His own house; *whose house are we*, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." Heb. 3:5, 6. Peter also adopts the same figure, and, speaking of the Lord, says, "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house." 1 Peter 5:4, 5.

Christ is the "living Stone," and they who believe on Him become "lively" stones because they live by Him who is life; for it is written: "Behold, I lay in Sion

a chief corner-stone, elect, precious; and he that believeth on Him shall not be confounded." These persons therefore who by believing on the living Stone become lively, or living, stones, are built up a spiritual house, and this house is the church of the living God. Paul further speaks of it as God's *building*. Speaking of himself and Apollos as ministers by whom the brethren had believed on Christ, he says: "For we are labourers together with God: ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building." 1 Cor. 3:9. That is to say, By their labours in preaching the gospel of Christ, these brethren had been brought to believe on Christ, the living Stone, and, by believing on Him, had become imbued with life from Him, and had thus become in the figure living stones. These then built up that spiritual house, became God's building. Now Paul carries the thought further: "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 3:10, 11.

Christ is the foundation and chief corner-stone, the very foundation of the foundation, and in the letter to the Ephesians, Paul carries the thought yet further and completes this conception of the church as the house or building of God. Of Christ he says: "Through Him we both [Jews and Gentiles] have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye [Gentiles] are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. 2:18-22.

Here, then, is the Lord's view of the church as the house or building of God: Christ, and the apostles and prophets are the foundation, and the membership at large is the superstructure. But Christ Himself is the chief corner-stone, the foundation of the whole structure, the foundation of the foundation itself. Because it is only in Christ that either the apostles or prophets were ever what they were, or that any member is what he is. Christ is the living Stone, to whom the apostles and prophets and all others must come that they might be made lively stones, fit for the building of God. In Jesus Christ, and upon Jesus Christ, the church of Christ, the church of the living God, is built. And the purpose of this building is "for an habitation [a dwelling place] of God through the Spirit." "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you," and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." Rom. 8:9. And said Jesus, "If a man love Me, He will keep My words; and My Father will love him, and We will come unto him, and make Our abode with him." John 14:23. Thus it is, and of these "God hath said, I will dwell in them; and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." 2 Cor. 6:16. As He saith also in another place, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. 3:16. "For ye are the temple of the living God." When these in whom the Spirit of God dwells are "fitly framed together," and built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, and Jesus Christ, they grow unto an

holy temple, in the Lord, and are "an habitation of God through the Spirit." And that is the house of God, the church of the living God.

Peter said, as before quoted, "To whom coming as unto a living stone, ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house." Now it is a characteristic of a living stone that it can be polished to such a height that it will reflect the image of the one looking upon it. Thus Christ is the living stone, to whom we come, and upon whom we look, and to whom we come, and upon whom we look, and as we look we see ourselves. And there "we all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, *are changed into the same image* from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." 2 Cor. 3:18. And thus, being changed into the same image, we also become lively stones, reflecting in turn the image of Christ as He looks upon us; for then God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, shines into our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. 4:6. Then the church is indeed the light of the world, a city set on a hill which cannot be hid. It is written of the city of God, the New Jerusalem, that it has twelve foundations "garnished with all manner of precious stones." The first foundation is jasper, clear as crystal; the second, a sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald; the fifth, a sardonyx; the sixth, a sardius; the seventh, a chrysolite; the eighth, a beryl; the ninth, a topaz; the tenth, a chryso-

299

prusus; the eleventh, a jacinth; the twelfth, an amethyst; and are surmounted by a wall great and high, "and the building of the wall of it was of jasper; and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass." And the glory of God does lighten the city, and the Lamb is the light thereof; and her light is like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal. Rev. 21:10-23. Eye has never seen except in holy vision such a scene of glory and beauty as is here pictured of the city of the living God, and the home of the redeemed.

Now the New Jerusalem is not the church. It is *not* the house, the building, the habitation, the church, of God, referred to in the texts which we have quoted in this article. But from this description of the glorious city of God, we may gather from this image of the church as a house, a building, and an habitation of God, an idea of what the Lord desires that the glorious church of God shall be. Christ is a living stone, the chief corner-stone, most precious. He is the first, the chief foundation of the church. Upon Him as part of the foundation also, rest the apostles and prophets, made from Him lively stones. Then upon this foundation are built all the saints, as gold, silver, and precious stones. 1 Cor. 3:12. Then the light of the knowledge of the glory of God as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ, shining through and reflected from all these, makes the church indeed the light of the world, giving to men the knowledge of the glory of God as He has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ. Oh, that each one who professes to be a member of the church of Christ were really so! Oh, that everyone who is professedly joined to the church, were really joined to Christ! that each one were indeed a lively stone reflecting the precious image of the dear Redeemer, and thus conveying to them that are in darkness the light of the knowledge of the glory of God as it is manifested in Jesus Christ our Lord. Then indeed would the world believe that

God did send Jesus Christ.
A. T. J.

October 22, 1891

"Written for Our Learning" *The Present Truth* 7, 22 , p. 346.

THE apostle says that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning." We may draw a very useful lesson from the case of the Rechabites, who were commendably tenacious of the commandments of their fathers.

There is always a disposition in man to do as his ancestors do, without ever inquiring whether it is right or wrong. If among professed Christians there was the readiness to obey strictly what the Word of God commands that there is to be content with barely doing what our fathers did, or what is enjoined by tradition and the precepts of men, it would be only a little while till the earth would be full of the glory of God. God commands that we shall be baptized, but the majority of professed Christians are willing to do almost anything in the world but to render faithful obedience to the Word. The Lord commands that men shall do no work on the seventh day, but the great majority of professed Christians are willing to do anything at all but to obey the plain commandment of God in this matter. In honour of a wholly man-made institution, they are willing to do all that would be required by the Lord in honour of His own heaven-born institution. This choice has been made, and is being made by thousands as the days go by. If there were about this man-made institution the merit of the precept of Jonadab, there might be some shadow of excuse, but about this there is not one redeeming quality; it is wholly iniquitous, erected in defiance of the commandment of God. And the children of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, will arise in the judgment with this generation and condemn it because they obeyed the commandment of their father, and these will not obey the plain commandment of God.

The Lord has given His commandments, precept upon precept, and line upon line; He now sends a message to all nations, saying with a loud voice: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation. . . . Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. xiv. 9-12.

How many of the people of our day are going to be condemned by the faithful Rechabites, as were the people of God? And upon how many in our day will come all the evil that the Lord has pronounced, "because I have spoken unto them, but they have not heard; and I have called unto them, but they have not answered"? "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith."

A. T. J.

The Present Truth, Vol. 8 (1892)

January 28, 1892

"Not a Christian Nation" *The Present Truth* 8, 2 , p. 28.

IT would be difficult to use language in a looser way than by calling this "a Christian Nation." In all the Nation there is not a single town, nor a village even, in which the people are all Christians. A single family in which all are Christians is seldom found; and individual Christians are not abundant. We do not say these things to find fault; we are simply stating the facts in the case, as every person knows who looks at things as they are. Let any person anywhere in the land honestly ask himself the question, and honestly answer it, How many of my immediate neighbors and acquaintances actually show in the works of a godly life that they are real, consistent Christians? In the face of facts as they are, the answer only can be, Very few. How many are really separate from the world, and conformed to the will of Christ?

Take even the churches themselves, and everybody knows, and the churches themselves confess, that many of their members will not bear the test of the precepts of Christ. Many, of them love the opera or the circus more than they love the prayer-meetings; and the excursion more than the services of the church; and the newspaper more than the sermon; and pleasure more than God; and the world more than Christ. Then, while it is thus with the church, where is the sense of calling the *Nation*, Christian? and while the Church is so nearly half full of worldlings, what is the use of talking about this being a Christian Nation? The trouble is that they put upon the term "Christian" a construction so loose that there is scarcely any discernible distinction between many of those who bear it and those who don't, and then spread the term over the whole mass, and thus they have a "Christian" Nation. But so long as the term "Christian" means what the word of God means - so long as it means strict conformity to the precepts of Christ - just so long it will be that this is not, and cannot be, a Christian Nation, except by each individual's becoming a Christian by an abiding, working faith in Christ. A. T. J.

February 11, 1892

"The Spirit of Christ as Manifested in His Work for the Salvation of Man" *The Present Truth* 8, 3 , pp. 42-44.

JESUS is the example in all true living. Jesus is the example in all true service to God. With the *mind* we are to serve the law of God. Therefore saith the scripture, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." Phil. ii. 5. So certainly as we will *let* this mind be in us, so certainly it *will* be in us; and so certainly as it is in us, so certainly it will do in us what it did in Christ; and so certainly that which appeared in Him will appear in us.

What, then, did this mind do in Him? - "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Phil. ii. 6. The idea conveyed in the word "robbery" may be made plainer by noting the different translations. The Emphatic Diaglott remarks that the original, - *Harpagmon*, - "being a word of very rare occurrence, a great variety of translations have been given," cites the following: -

Clarke, "Did not think it a thing to be earnestly desired." *Cyprian*, "Did not earnestly affect." *Wakefield*, "Did not regard as an object of solicitous desire." *Sharpe*, "Thought no a thing to be seized." *Kneeland*, "Did not eagerly grasp." *Dickinson*, "Did not violently strive after." *Turnbull*, "Did not meditate a usurpation."

From this it is easy to see that the idea conveyed by the word "robbery" is not a mistaken one; because the point stated is that though He was in the form of God, though He was the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person, and though He was indeed equal with God, He did not think that to be equal with God was a thing to be seized upon, and eagerly held fast, as a robber

43

would grasp and hold that upon which he has seized.

Them Emphatic Diaglott adopts Turnbull's translation, "He did not mediate a usurpation to be like God," which, where government is involved, is nearer the idea of the original, as a robber of government is a usurper.

The thought, then, which is expressed in the verses is this: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not a thing to be seized upon, to be violently striven for, and eagerly retained with solicitous desire, not a usurpation to be meditated, to be equal with God." But He was already equal with God. He was already the one whose "goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity." He was already the one who created all things "that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers." He was indeed already God, equal with God. What, then, caused His mind to run in this channel, and to *think* it not a thing to be seized upon, striven for, and eagerly retained, to be equal with God, - in other words, to be that which, by eternal and inalienable right He truly was? Something caused it; and when we discover that, we have the key to the whole situation.

From the nature of the case, it is evident that on the part of somebody there was a strife, a dispute, as to who ought to be equal with God. It is plain that on the part of some one there was manifested a mind, a disposition, earnestly to desire, to seize upon, and to meditate, a usurpation of such a position, - a position of equality with God. Who was that one? In whom did such a mind manifest itself? Not in Christ Jesus, for the mind that was in him thought no such thing. In whom was it, then? Ah! in that anointed cherub that covered, and who sinned; for the scripture says: "Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee. By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast

sinned; therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God: and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire. *Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty*, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness." Eze. xxviii. 14-17.

Being "perfect in beauty," he began to look upon himself, to honour himself, and to glorify himself because of this perfect beauty, instead of glorifying Him that gave it. He began to attribute to himself the honour and the merit, and to think that there was not shown to him the preference that was his due, and that the place which he held was not such as fitly became one so glorious. Then he said in his heart: "I will exalt my throne *above* the stars of God. I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation in the sides of the north; . . . *I will be like the Most High.*" Isa. xiv. 13, 14.

Here is the one in whom was the mind that thought that to be equal with God was a thing to be seized upon, a thing to be eagerly grasped and retained, as a robber his prey. Here is the one in whom was the mind that *meditated a usurpation* to be equal with God. And love of self, exaltation of self, was the beginning of it all. His own self would exalt itself to the throne of the Most High, and would make all subject to himself, instead of to God.

For this, he was cast as profane out of the mountain of God. Then he came to this world, and instilled into its inhabitants this venom of self.

"And the serpent said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?

"And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.

"And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, *ye shall be as God* [Hebrew and Revised Version], knowing good and evil.

"And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired *to make one wise*, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." Gen. iii. 1-6.

Thus Satan instilled the exaltation of self into man - even his own ambition to be equal with God. Thus it was the selfish desire to be equal with God that induced sin in man on the earth. And thus into mankind was instilled the mind of Satan, - that same mind which thought that to be equal with God was a thing to be seized upon, and eagerly retained, - that same mind which meditated a usurpation to be equal with God, - that same mind which puts self in the place of God.

Then it was that the mind that was in Christ Jesus was manifested. He whose goings forth have been of old, from the days of eternity; He who had created all the worlds, and all things in all of them; He who was the brightness of His Father's glory, and the express image of His person; He who was of right equal with God, - He, the high and lofty One, thought it not a thing to be seized upon, to be greedily grasped and zealously retained, to be equal with God; but emptied Himself (Phil. ii. 5, 6, Rev. Ver.), and gave Himself for lost mankind. Therefore the

word went forth immediately to Satan: "*I will put enmity* between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." And in this word to Satan there was a promise to man of deliverance from the bondage of Satan, which is the bondage of self, into the glorious liberty of sons of God indeed.

The deception of man led him to put self in the place of God, and the mind and word of Satan in the place of the mind and word of God. This led to the perversion of man's ideas concerning God, and the receiving of Satan's ideas and suggestions as the true ideas concerning God. It led to the setting of God in a totally false light in the estimation of man. It led mankind to look upon God as a hard master, a despotic governor, and a stern, impassive, unmerciful judge. Over and over, the Lord set forth His Word to the contrary. To Moses he declared himself to be "merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." In His law He set forth His character as "LOVE." Yet, for all this, mankind still followed perverted ideas of God.

Then, when the fulness of time was come, the Father would reveal Himself to mankind as He really is, and His bearing toward the world of sinners. And in order that this might be done in its fulness and perfection, Jesus emptied Himself, and "took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Phil. ii. 6-8. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." John i. 14.

So entirely did He empty Himself of all self that He could say with perfect truth, "I came down from heaven, *not to do Mine own will*, but the will of Him that sent me." John 6:38. "I can *of Mine own self do nothing*: As I hear, I judge, and My judgment is just because I seek not Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me." John v. 30. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, *the Son can do nothing of Himself*, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever He doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." Verse 19. "The Father that dwelleth in me, *He doeth the works*." John xiv. 10. "My doctrine *is not Mine*, but His that sent Me." John vii. 16. "The words that I speak unto you, *I speak not of Myself*," "but the Father which sent Me, He gave a commandment, what I should

44

say and what I should speak." John xiv. 10; xii. 49. He came not doing His own will, nor speaking His own words, nor doing his own works. It was the Father's will which was done in Him; it was the Father's words that were spoken by Him; and it was the Father's works that were done in Him. That is to say, He emptied Himself that the Father *might* appear in Him. And when He emptied Himself, the Father *did* appear in Him. And so, "in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." He was "God manifest in the flesh," "God with us."

But He did all this that men might know the Father as He really is. Therefore, He says none know "the Father but the Son, and He to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." This is Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world.

What the Father was to the Son and in the Son in this world, that is just what He *wishes* to be to every person in this world. And just as certainly as any man will empty Himself of self, as Christ did, so certainly will the Father be to him, and in him, what He was to the Son, and in the Son.

The word of Christ to every man is this, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself." Luke ix. 23.

All sin is of self, and self is of Satan. All righteousness is of Christ, and Christ is of God.

Therefore let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, "who emptied Himself" that the Father might appear to men, and that men might be saved. *Let* it be in you. As surely as you will *let* this mind be in you, so surely *will* it be in you. And so surely as in Him it led Him to empty Himself, so surely it will lead you to empty *yourself* of all self. And so surely as you are emptied of self, so surely will you be "filled with all the fulness of God." Eph. iii. 19.

A. T. J.

March 24, 1892

"Civil Government and God's Law" *The Present Truth* 8, 6 , pp. 90, 91.

THE ten commandments are for the universe, the supreme standard of morals. They are the law of God, the supreme moral Governor. Every duty enjoined in the Bible - that is to say, every duty of man - finds its spring in some one of the ten commandments. To violate that law, even in thought, is sin. For, said Christ: "Ye have heard that it was said by them in old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." And again: "Ye have heard that it was said by them in old time, Thou shalt not kill, and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Matt. v. 27, 28, 21, 22. And "whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." 1 John iii. 15.

This is sufficient to show that the ten commandments deal with the thoughts, with the heart, with the conscience. By this law is the knowledge of sin (Rom. iii. 20); in fact, the inspired definition of sin is, "Sin is the transgression of the

91

law." 1 John iii. 4. And, as already shown, the law may be transgressed by thinking harshly or impurely of another; it is immoral to do so.

But it is the government of God alone which has to do with the thoughts and intents of the heart, and with the eternal interests of men. Governments of men have to do only with the outward acts and the temporal affairs of men, and this without reference to any question of God or religion. The law of the government of God is moral: the laws of the governments of men are only civil.

The moral law is thus defined: "The will of God, as the supreme moral ruler, concerning the character and conduct of all responsible beings; the rule of action

as obligatory on the conscience or moral nature." "The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue, written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai."

This definition is evidently according to Scripture. The Scriptures show that the ten commandments are the law of God; that they express the will of God; that they pertain to the conscience, and take cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart; and that obedience to these commandments is the duty that man owes to God.

Says the scripture, "Fear God, and keep His commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." Eccl. xii. 13, 14.

This quotation, with the ones above given from the sermon on the Mount, are sufficient to show that obedience to moral law, from the heart and in the very thought, - that this only *is morality*; which is therefore correctly defined as "The relation of conformity or non-conformity to the true moral standard or rule. . . . The conformity of an act to the Divine law." The moral law being the law of God, morality being conformity to that law, and that law pertaining to the thoughts and intents of the heart, it follows that in the very nature of the case, the enforcement of that law, or the requirement of conformity thereto, lies beyond the jurisdiction and even the reach of, any human government.

Under the law of God, to hate is murder; to covet is idolatry; to think impurely of a woman is adultery. These things are all equally immoral, equally violations of the moral law; but no civil government seeks to punish on account of them. A man may hate his neighbour all his life; he may covet everything on earth; he may think impurely of every woman he sees - he may keep this up all his days; but so long as these things are confined to his thought, the civil power cannot touch him. It would be difficult to conceive of a more immoral person than such a man would be; yet the State cannot punish him. It does not attempt to punish him. This is simply because that with such things - with morality or immorality - the State can have nothing to do.

But let us carry this further. Only let a man's hatred lead him, even by a sign, to attempt an injury to his neighbour, and the State will punish him; only let his covetousness lead him to lay his hand on what is not his own, in an attempt to steal, and the State will punish him; only let his impure thought lead him to attempt violence to any woman, and the State will punish him. Yet, let it be borne in mind that even then the State does not punish him for his immorality, but for his incivility. The immorality lies in the heart, and can be measured by God only. The incivility is in the outward action, and may be measured by men. It is not with questions of moral right or wrong, but with civil rights and wrongs that the State has to do.

The correctness of this distinction is further shown in the term by which government by men - State or national government - is designated. It is called *civil* government, and the term "civil" is thus defined: "Pertaining to a city or State, or to a citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens, or to the State."

Thus it is plain that governments of men have to do only with men's relation to their fellow-citizens, and not at all with their relations to God, which is again but to

affirm that governments of men never can of right have anything to do with religion.

A. T. J.

"Method in Their Madness" *The Present Truth* 8, 6 , p. 92.

"IF the Russian policy of persecution towards the Jews is deemed madness," remarks the *Observer*, "there is apparently some method in the madness. According to the Vienna correspondent of the London *Standard*, M. Pobedonostzeff was asked by M. Poliakov, a well known Russian Jewish banker in St. Petersburg, whether it was true that the recent expulsion of Russian Jews was due to his initiative. Minister Pobedonostzeff replied that it was, and then went on to say: 'I addressed a memorandum to the Czar, and that was the origin of the orders you refer to. In that memorandum it was pointed out how useful it would be to Russia if a considerable number, at least some thousands, of Jewish families could be converted to the Orthodox faith, and thereby assimilated to or absorbed in the Russian race. The best way to this end, it was urged would be to enforce the old decrees against the Jews, because the classes most wanted, like landed proprietors, manufacturers, first-class merchants, doctors, lawyers, and so forth, would rather be converted than to be driven out of their homes, and forced to reside within the Jewish pale. We Russians want new blood in our race, and none better could be found than that of the Jews, whose thrift, industry, soberness, domestic tastes, thirst for learning, and self-culture, whose instinct for trade, money making and money saving are just the qualities which we require, and which would come into our race by the infusion of Jewish blood. We can not amalgamate with the lower classes of Jews. But I can not observe any bad qualities in the better class of Jews, like you, M. Poliakov, and we hope to retain them by conversion, if we only leave them expulsion as an alternative. All this was in my memorandum, and in an audience I had of the Czar, his Majesty directly expressed the hope that tens of thousands of the better class of Jews would embrace the Orthodox faith, and thereby become Russians.' The scheme is certainly a bold one and the statesman who would thus boldly announce it is almost an anomaly. The views of M. Poliakov on the subject would be interesting."

A. T. J.

July 14, 1892

"The One Example" *The Present Truth* 8, 14 , pp. 218, 219.

JESUS Christ is the one only example for men to follow. To every man He commands absolutely, "Follow Me." Take *My* yoke upon you and *learn of Me*." "I am the door," "he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." "By *Me* if any man enter in, he shall be saved." The Lord Jesus is the one only person whom this world ever

saw who met perfectly, in the fullest measure, every requirement of the perfect law of God. He was made flesh, and He in the flesh and form and nature of man, stood in every place and met every temptation that any man can ever meet, and in every place and in everything He met all the demands of the perfect law of God. He did it from infancy to the prime of manhood, and never failed. "He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin." Therefore, as He is the only person whom this world ever saw who ever met to the full all the perfect requirements of the law of God, it follows that He is the only person whom the world ever saw, or ever shall see, who can be an example for men, or whose example is worthy to be followed by men.

Therefore, when preachers and leaders of theological thought anywhere present before men any other example, even though it be the example of the apostles, and seek to induce men to follow any other example, even though it be proposed as apostolic example, such conduct is sin against God, and treason against our Lord Jesus Christ. And that there are men, in this day, Protestants too, who are doing that very thing only shows how far from Christ the religious teachers of the day have gone. It is time that they and all men should be told, that the law of God is the one perfect rule of human duty; that the Lord Jesus Christ is the one perfect example that has been worked out, in this world, under that rule; and all men who will correctly solve the problem of human destiny must solve it by the terms of that rule as exemplified

219

in, and according to, that example. Whoever attempts to solve the problem by any other rule, or according to any other example, will utterly fail to a correct solution: and whoever teaches men to attempt to solve it by any other rule, or according to any other example, even though it be by "the example of the apostles," both acts and teaches treason against the Lord Jesus Christ.

What, then, is the example of Christ in regard to keeping the first day of the week? There is no example about it at all. He never kept it. But where there is no example of Christ there *can* be no example of the apostles. Therefore there is not, and cannot be, any such thing as the example of the apostles for keeping the first day of the week.

When, then, is the example of Christ in regard to keeping the seventh day? He kept the first seventh day the world ever saw, when He had finished His great work of creation. When He came into the world, everybody knows that He kept it as long as He lived in the world. And "he that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also so to walk even as He walked." Therefore, those who walk as He walked will have to keep the seventh day. His steps led Him to the place of worship on the seventh day for thus "His custom was" (Luke iv. 16), and He taught the people how to keep the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord (Matt. xii. 1-12). And He has left "us an example that ye should follow His steps." And all who follow His steps will be led by those steps to keep the seventh day, and to turn away their feet from the Sabbath, for such is His example.

Paul said "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." Now was Paul a follower of Christ in the matter of the seventh day? Let us see: "And He [Christ] came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, *as his custom was*, he

went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and *stood up for to read.*" Luke iv. 16. And of Paul it is said, by the same writer, "They came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews, and Paul, *as his manner [custom] was,* went in unto them, and three Sabbath days *reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.*" Acts xvii. 1, 2. Paul *did* follow Christ in his "custom" of keeping the Sabbath day - the seventh day - therefore, if any man will obey the word of God by Paul, and will be a follower of Paul as he followed Christ, it will have to be his "custom to go to the house of God, and to worship God, on the seventh day.

For the keeping of the seventh day we have the commandment of God and the example of the living God (Ex. xx. 8-11; Gen. ii. 3), and of the Lord Jesus Christ, both in Heaven and on earth, both as Creator and Redeemer. And there is neither command nor example for the keeping of any other day. Will you obey the commandment of God, and follow the divine example in divine things? or will you, instead, obey a human command and follow human examples in human things, and expect the divine reward for it? Answer now as you expect to answer in the Judgment.

A. T. J.

August 11, 1892

"Members One of Another" *The Present Truth* 8, 16 , pp. 248-250.

WE have noticed those scriptures which set forth the church as the body of Christ, and the members of the church as members of the body of Christ, and therefore members one of another, as they by "joints and bonds" are "knit together in love." As the members of the church are members of the body of Christ, and also members one

249

of another, how can it be but that there shall be unity in the church. If I am a member of the body of Christ and you are a member of the body of Christ, then if we have any respect for Christ how can it be that we shall have any disrespect for one another? If we love Christ how can we have anything but love for one another? But more than this, we are also members one of another, and as "no man ever yet hated his own flesh," how then can it ever be that we should not love one another.

This is the very test of our love for Christ: "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" 1 John 4:20. No man can appreciate the love of Christ while he is cross and spiteful and cruel to his brother, for whom Christ died. Church-members cannot expect to honour Christ while they dishonour one another. In dishonouring one another they do dishonour Christ, because "we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." But when each one sees in his brother one for whom the Saviour died, and one who is a member of the body of Christ, then each one will treat his brother tenderly, lovingly, as the Saviour is tender and loving. When each one sees in his brother a soul so precious as that Christ died for him, he is not going to treat him

slightly, nor needlessly cause him pain. To cause a brother pain cannot be without causing Christ pain, for we are members of His body, and He is the Head of the body, and it is the head always which is really conscious of any pain in the body. The Scripture would have us realize the closeness, the intricacy, of the relationship between Christ and the church, and between the members one with another in the church.

Paul sets this forth as follows: -

"For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary; and those members of the body, which we think to be less honourable, upon these we bestow more abundant honour; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness. For our comely parts have no need; but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which lacked; that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." 1 Cor. 12:12-27.

In this it is shown that in the church - the body - of Christ, the members make up the body, as in the human body the eyes, the hands, the feet, etc., form the body. And as in the human body the different members are joined one to another, each in its proper place, to form the perfect body, so also is the body of Christ. And God hath "set the members every one in the body as it hath pleased Him." and as in the human body one dislocated member disconcerts and deforms the whole body, so also is it in the body of Christ. As in the human body each member can properly fulfill its function only by working in the place in which it belongs, so also is it in the body of Christ. For each member to know his place, and keep it, in the church, is just as essential to the efficient working of the church as that each member of the human body shall properly be set in its proper place, in order to the easy, comfortable working of the human body. But "all members have not the same office;" and cannot be hands, all cannot be eyes, all cannot be feet. Let the eye and the hand change places, and the good of both would be destroyed, and each would be an evil to the whole body. Let the hands and the feet change places, and the efficiency of all would be destroyed. But with all the members - eyes, hands, and feet - in their proper places, each can be

efficient in its own place, and all working together can do that which the hand finds to do. The eye sees that which is to be done, the feet carry us within reach, and the hands perform the task, and each is essential to the working of the other. Except they all work together no task can be efficiently executed. "The eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary." To no part of the body can any other part of the body say, "I have no need of you."

Thus it is with the human body, as everybody knows; and thus it is with the body of Christ, the church - as everybody ought to know. Each member of the church, *in his place*, is necessary to every other member of the church. Yea, even "those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary." And those members of the body which we think to be less honorable, upon these we should bestow more abundant honour. Christ has honoured them with a place in the church, shall we despise them? "The members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it." Or as it is said in another place: "Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; and them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body." Heb. 13:3. "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." And, oh, that everyone who is a member of the church would realize how sacred is the relationship into which he has entered! Then indeed would the disciples of Christ be one, and the world would believe that God sent Him.

For the edifying - the building up - of the church, the Lord has placed certain gifts in the church. "When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." "When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." "And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Eph. iv. 8, 11-13. In another place it is written of these gifts, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." 1 Cor. xii. 28. Thus we see that the gift of teaching the word of God is only third in importance of the gifts of the Spirit of God to members of the church. It is second only to the gift of prophecy, and is before miracles, or gifts of healings, or diversities of tongues. Paul expressed the matter thus: "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all; yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." 1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19.

But though all could speak with the tongues of men and of angels, if they have no charity - the love of God - they are but as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. Though all had the gift of prophecy, and the gift of wisdom to the understanding of all mysteries and all knowledge; and though all had faith that could remove mountains, if they have not charity they are nothing. And though

all were so benevolent as that they would bestow all their goods to feed the poor; and though they were all so perfectly assured of what they believe that they would die at the stake as witnesses to it, if they have not charity it will profit nothing. Charity is love. It is the love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost. It is that love which keeps the commandments of God, "for this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments;" and "love is the fulfilling of the law." Therefore, though all have all these wondrous powers, and have not the keeping of the commandments of God, they are nothing. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." But if there be in the church the love of God, keeping the commandments of God, then all these gifts, working together with charity, build up the body of Christ, make increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love, and increase it with the increase of God.

How long shall it be ere the church of the living God comes up to the fullness of its high privilege?

A. T. J.

December 29, 1892

"The Church of Christ" *The Present Truth* 8, 26 , pp. 405, 406.

IN the Scriptures the Christian's relationship to Christ is described under the symbol of the marriage tie: "Ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." Rom. vii. 4. "I have espoused you to one husband." 2 Cor. xi. 2. And the individual Christian is in this represented as having been espoused "as a chaste virgin to Christ."

Such individuals gathered in fellowship form the Church of Christ. And the relationship to Christ of such collection of individuals is also described under the symbol of the marriage tie: "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it. . . . So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church. . . . For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: *but I speak concerning Christ and the church.*" Eph. v. 25-32.

In accordance with this idea the church of Christ is represented in the Scriptures as the purest and fairest of women, leaning upon the arm of her beloved; drawn to Him with the drawings of His love; her only thought being of her beloved; to her the chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely, whose banner over her is love, and who would present her to Himself "a glorious church not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Such is the church to Christ; such is Christ to His church; and such is the relationship between Christ and His church.

To such a church as this Christ committed His gospel to be by her made known to every creature. It is only such a church as this that can make known the Gospel of Christ. That Gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. i. 16. No one can make known that power who does not know that power for himself and in himself. And the church could make known the power of God only by knowing the power in and for himself. And that power being known only by faith, in the nature of things it is only by abiding faithful to her Lord that the church could fulfil the work of the Gospel committed to her trust.

Again: The Gospel is Christ in men the hope of glory. Col. i. 27. This is what the church of Christ is to make known to men. No one can make known Christ in men who for himself does not

406

know Christ in himself. It pleased God "to reveal His Son *in me* that I might preach *Him*." Gal. i. 16. But Christ dwells in men only by faith: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." Eph. iii. 17. It is evident, therefore, that the only way in which the church can make known Christ in men the hope of glory, is to have, and to know Christ revealed in herself. And as this is only known by faith it is evident that it is only by abiding faithful to Christ that she can know Christ in herself or make Him known in men.

Once more: In the Gospel the righteousness of God is revealed; and the righteousness of God only. And it is the righteousness of God only which the church of Christ is to know, and which she is to make known to all the world. This is the ministry of the Gospel which is committed to the church of Christ. This righteousness is known only by faith, and revealed only to faith. "Therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." Rom. i. 17, and iii. 22. As, therefore, this righteousness is known only by faith, and is revealed only to faith, it is plain that it is only by abiding steadfast in faithfulness to Christ that the church can know or make known the righteousness of God which is revealed in the Gospel. And the sum of all these counts, and of many more that might be given, is simply to demonstrate over and over that it is only by abiding wholly in Christ, by trusting in Him entirely, by depending upon Him completely, by perfect faithfulness to Him, that the church can be what she must be in order to do what she is established to do.

Such was the church of Christ in the beginning. Such is always the church of Christ indeed. But such neither is nor has been the professed church of Christ. For there has been an apostasy from Christ and from the true church of Christ. In the apostles' days the warning was given, "Of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts xx. 30. And there shall come "a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. . . . For the mystery of iniquity doth already work." 2 Thess. ii. 3-7.

The Lord exalted His church, and clothed her with the beautiful garments of salvation and righteousness, and the power of godliness, before the eyes of all the nations. He made her exceeding beautiful, and she prospered, and her

renown went forth to all the world for her beauty; for it was perfect through *His* comeliness which *He* had put upon her, but not satisfied with the exaltation which the Lord gave, which could come and remain only through her own humility, the church grew haughty and exalted *herself*. Not content with the beauty of the Lord, which He had put upon her, she prided *herself* upon her own beauty; and instead of trusting in Him for her beauty, she trusted in herself. Not content that God alone should be glorified in her, she glorified *herself* and lived deliciously. Then, trusting in herself, priding herself upon her own beauty, magnifying her own merit, and satisfied with her own sufficiency, - this in itself was to put herself in the place of God. Then it was natural enough that she should seek to draw disciples to herself rather than to the Lord. Not only this, but having exalted herself, and magnified herself, and trusting in herself, it was impossible for her to draw disciples to anybody but herself. Thus came the apostasy. And thus, instead of remaining the church of Christ in truth, manifesting to the world the mystery of God and of godliness, she became, though still professedly the church of Christ, only the manifestation to the world of the mystery of *self* and of selfishness, which is the very mystery of iniquity.

A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 9 (1893)

January 26, 1893

"Consecration" *The Present Truth* 9, 2 , p. 23.

CONSECRATION is simply the constant recognition of the fact that we are the Lord's and not our own. He who learns that this *is* a fact, and lives in the constant living presence and recognition of it as the great fact, - he is consecrated, and this is consecration.

Now is this a hard thing to do in itself and as the Lord has fixed it. People make it hard for themselves, by thinking it to be something that it is not, and *trying* to accomplish it in a way that is not the Lord's way, and even then they miss it. And, in truth, going about it in another than the Lord's way they cannot possibly do anything else than miss it.

Is it a fact, then, that we are the Lord's? - Of course it is; for it is written: "Ye are bought with a price." 1 Cor. vi. 20. And the price is "the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." 1 Peter i. 19. For He "gave *Himself* for us." Titus ii. 14.

This "price" was paid for every soul that is on earth, and for every one who ever was or ever shall be on earth; for "He died for all." Having died for all; having paid the wondrous price for all; having given Himself for all; - having thus bought, and paid the price for *all*, it is certainly a fact that all are his. Therefore it is written: "*Ye are not your own*; for ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, *which are God's*." 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20.

He not only gave Himself for us, but for all there is of us - yes, even for our sins. For again it is written that He "gave Himself for our sins." Gal. i. 4. And He did it "that He might deliver us from this present evil world;" that He might "purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works;" that He might present us "faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy" (Jude 24); - in one word, "that He might bring us to God." 1 Peter iii. 18.

He so loved us that He wants to save us. But He cannot save us in our sins. He will save us *from* our sins. And as our whole self is sin and sin only, in order to get *us*, in order to buy *us*, He had to buy our sins also. So in giving Himself for us, He gave Himself for our sins too. And as we are His, because He bought us with that great price, so also our sins are His, for He bought them with the same great price.

Then will you let Him have the sins which He has bought? or will you hold on to these yourself? Will you let Him have what is His own? Will you let Him do what He will with His own? And what will He do with these sins? O, He will forgive them! 1 John i. 9. He will make them as white as snow. Isa. i. 18. He will put them away. Heb. ix. 26. He will cast them into the depths of the sea. Micah vii. 19. He will remove them from us as far as the east is from the west. Ps. ciii. 12. He will cast them all behind His back. Isa. xxxviii. 17. And when they are all cast behind His back, He and His own throne will stand between us and them, as the pledge that we are free from them; and the rainbow round about the throne will be the sign - the token - of the everlasting covenant that our sins and iniquities will be remembered no more. Heb. viii. 12.

Thus in giving Himself *for* our *sins*, He gave Himself *to us*. In giving Himself *for* us, He gave Himself *to us*. So when we let Him have our sins, we get Him instead. When we let Him have ourselves, we get Himself instead. Will you make the exchange now? Would you rather have Him than your sins? Then let Him have them. Make the blessed exchange to-day. Would you rather have His way than your way? Would you rather have His life than your life? Would you rather have His disposition than your disposition? Would you rather have His character than your character? Would you rather have *Him* than yourself? Would you? "To be sure I would," you say. Then, O! let Him have you now; make the blessed surrender, and exchange now and forevermore.

This is consecration. And thus it is a daily, an hourly, a constant recognition, in gratitude and thankfulness, that we are His own. So each day, "consecrate yourself to God in the morning. Make this your very first work. Let your prayer be, 'Take me, O Lord, as wholly Thine. I lay all my plans at Thy feet. Use me to-day in Thy service. Abide with me, and let all my work be wrought in thee.' This is a daily matter. Each morning consecrate yourself to God for that day. Surrender all your plans to Him, to be carried out or given up as His providence shall indicate." Say, "I am the purchased possession of Jesus Christ, and every hour I must consecrate myself to His service." "Thus day by day you may be giving your life into the hands of God, and thus your life will be moulded more and more after the life of Christ." This is consecration. And it is not a burden, but a living, everlasting joy.

Therefore, "reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. . . . Yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you." "Sin shall not have dominion over you," - is that promise worth anything to you, brethren? It is worth all that God is worth to the one who reckons himself to be dead indeed unto sin, and alive unto God through Jesus Christ; and who yields himself unto God, and his members unto God as instruments for God to use. To this one God has declared, "Sin shall not have dominion over you." Thank the Lord for this blessed promise of freedom from sin and all the power of sin. And this promise he will make a *fact* in the life and experience of every one who reckons thus and yields to God. You furnish the reckoning, He will furnish the fact. You yield to Him, and He will use you. You yield to Him your members, and He will use them only as instruments of righteousness. And so, "sin shall not have dominion over you," for God is stronger than sin. A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 10 (1894)

May 10, 1894

"Boundless Grace Free to All" *The Present Truth* 10, 19 , pp. 294, 295.

"UNTO every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." Eph. iv. 7. The measure of the gift of Christ is "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." This is true whether viewed as the measure of the gift which God made in giving Christ, or as the measure of the gift which Christ Himself gave. For the gift that God gave is His only begotten Son, and in "Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and this being only the measure of the grace that is given to every one of us, it follows that unto every one of us is given grace without measure, simply boundless grace.

Viewed from the measure of the gift in which Christ Himself gives to us, it is the same; because "He gave Himself for us;" He gave Himself for our sins, and in this He gave Himself *to* us. And as in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead

295

bodily, and as He gave Himself, then the measure of the gift of Christ on His own part is also only the measure of the fulness of the Godhead bodily. It therefore follows that from this standpoint also, the measure of grace that is given to every one of us is only the measure of the fulness of the Godhead, that is, simply immeasurable.

Thus in whatever way it is viewed, the plain words of the Lord is that unto every one of us He has given grace to the measure of the fulness of the Godhead bodily: that is, boundless, immeasurable grace - all the grace He has. This is good. But it is just the Lord, it is just like the Lord to do that; for He is good.

And this boundless grace is all given, given freely, to "every one of us." To *us* it is. To you and me, just as we are. And that is good. We need just that much grace to make us what the Lord wants us to be. And He is just so kind as to give it all to us freely, that we may be indeed just what He wants us to be.

The Lord wants every one of us to be saved, and that with the very fulness of salvation. And therefore He has given to every one of us the very fulness of grace, because it is grace that brings the salvation. For it is written, "The grace of God *that bringeth salvation* hath appeared to all men." Titus 2:11. Thus the Lord wants all to be saved, and therefore He gave all of His grace, bringing salvation to all. The marginal reading of this text tells it that way, and it is just as true as the reading in the verse itself. Here it is: "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared." All the grace of God is given freely to every one, bringing salvation to all. Whether all or any one will receive it, that is another question. What we are studying now is the truth and the fact that God *has given* it. Having given it all, He is clear, even though men may reject it.

The Lord wants us to be perfect; and so it is written: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Desiring that we shall be perfect, He has given us, every one, all the grace that He has, bringing the fulness of His salvation, that every man may be presented perfect in Christ Jesus. The very purpose of this gift of His boundless grace is that we may be made *like Jesus*, who is the image of God. Even so it is written: "Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ, . . . *for the perfecting* of the saints; . . . till *we all* come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a *perfect man*, unto the *measure* of the stature of *the fulness* of Christ."

Do you want to be like Jesus? Then receive the grace that He has so fully and so freely given. Receive it in the measure in which *He has given it*, not in the measure in which you think you deserve it. Yield yourself to it, that it may work in you and for you the wondrous purpose for which it is given, and it will do it. It will make you like Jesus. It will accomplish the purpose and the wish of Him who has given it. "Yield yourselves unto God." "I beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain."

A. T. JONES.

June 14, 1894

"How to Oppose the Papacy" *The Present Truth* 10, 24 , p. 375.

THE secret of the great advantage that the Papacy holds is that peculiar "policy" by which she can so fully and constantly "cause craft to prosper" in her hand. She is such a perfect mistress of every kind of deceitful invention that there is no kind of human working that can successfully contend with her. To attempt to oppose her by any kind of crafty method is not only to be so far just like her, but at the last to find yourself so far outdone in craftiness as to be made ashamed that you ever tried it. To attempt that you ever tried it. To attempt opposition to her

now by any political or governmental method, even though it be right, is to find yourself at such an immense disadvantage as to make all such effort practically useless.

What shall be done? Shall we sit still and do nothing? - No, no. We are to be more active, and do more than ever before. How then shall it be done? - There is one way to do it, and only one. *That is* with the word of God, the everlasting Gospel. This method gives to him who employs it every advantage of position and of power over the Papacy and all her workings.

It gives every advantage in *position*, because the Papacy knows nothing of the Gospel, and in contending with him who uses that method only, she is all at sea. It gives every advantage in *power*, because the Gospel itself is the power of God, and in contending with him who depends upon the power of God, and is allied to it only, the Papacy is impotent.

This is the true Christian way, this is the true Protestant way, to oppose the Papacy; and in this way there is no such thing as defeat or failure; for what seems to be failure is victory, and what appears to be defeat is triumph. This has been closely and abundantly proved in history.

This is true of the time of Luther and the rise of Protestantism. So long as Protestants held faithfully to the Gospel alone, and depended only upon its power, the Papacy which then possessed all the power of Europe, was powerless before them. Martin Luther, the chief and leader of the opposition to the Papacy in that day, was attacked with all the power, cunning, and craft, of the Papacy; by the published decree of the emperor in behalf of "holy Church," he was outlawed in all Europe, and everybody was commanded, under penalty of treason, to take him and deliver him up, and receive the reward due to so good a work. Yet for all this the Papacy was unable ever to lay a hand on him or do him harm, and he died at last peaceably and in his bed, an everlasting victor over all the power of the Papacy; and, living and dying, a proof to all the world of what a man can do in opposition to the Papacy, who depends upon the Gospel alone and is allied to the power of God only.

And so long as Protestantism was faithful in its allegiance to the Gospel and the power of God only, so long the tide of the Reformation swept irresistibly onward. But the moment this allegiance was slackened, this tide was checked; and as this allegiance lessened, the tide was reversed. But the Gospel has not ceased. The word of God is not bound. The power of God is not slack toward those who believe. The everlasting Gospel abides, and is to be preached with the attendance of the power of God in such measure as the world has never seen, and which is to accomplish indeed what Luther longed to see - the complete overthrow and engulfing of the Papacy and all her abominations.

A. T. JONES.

June 21, 1894

"Justification by Faith" *The Present Truth* 10, 25 , p. 386.

"WHATSOEVER is not of faith is sin." Rom. xiv. 23.

Faith is of God and not of ourselves (Eph. ii. 8); therefore whatsoever is not of God is sin.

Whatsoever is of God is righteousness: faith is the gift of God: and whatsoever is of faith is therefore righteousness, as certainly as that "whatsoever is *not* of faith is sin."

Jesus Christ is the Author and Finisher of faith (Heb. xi. 2), and the word of God is the channel through which it comes and the means by which it operates. For "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. x. 17. Where there is no word of God there can be no faith.

The word of God is the most substantial and most powerful thing in the universe. It is the means by which all things were produced. It carries in itself creative power. For "by the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth." "For He spake and it was; He commanded and it stood fast." Ps. xxxiii. 6, 9. And when this world was thus made, and darkness covered all the face thereof "God said, Let there be light: And there was light."

Thus the word of God is self-fulfilling, and of itself accomplishes the will of God in every one who receives it as it is in truth the word of God. "When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it *not* as the word of *men*, but as it is in truth *the word of God*, which *effectually worketh* also in you that believe." 1 Thess. ii. 13. Thus to receive the word of God; to yield the heart to it that thus it may work in the life; this is genuine belief, this is true faith. This is the faith by which men can be justified, made righteous indeed. For by it the very will of God, as expressed in His own word, is accomplished in the life by the creative word of Him who has spoken. This is the work of faith. This is the righteousness - the right doing - of God which is by faith. Thus "It is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Thus the character, the righteousness, of God is manifested in the life, delivering from the power of sin, to the saving of the soul in righteousness.

This is justification by faith alone. This is justification by faith, without works. For the faith being the gift of God, coming by the word of God, and itself working in man the works of God, needs none of the work of sinful man to make it good and acceptable to God. The faith itself works in man that which is good, and is sufficient of itself to fill all the life with the goodness of God, and needs not the imperfect effort of sinful man to make it meritorious. This faith gives to man good works, instead of being itself dependent upon man for "good works." It is not expressed by "faith *and* works;" but by "faith *which* works," "for in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but *faith which worketh* by love." Gal. v, 6. "Seest thou how *faith wrought?*" Jas. iii. 22. "Remembering without ceasing, you work *of faith*;" "and the work *of faith* with power." 1 Thess. i. 3; 2 Thess. i. 11. And, "This is the *work of God*, that ye *believe on Him* whom He hath sent." John vi. 29. This is "the faith of God" which Jesus exhorts us to have (Mark xi. 22, margin); which was manifested in him; and which by his grace is a free gift to every soul on earth.

A. T. JONES.

July 12, 1894

"The Real Presence" *The Present Truth* 10, 28 , pp. 433, 434.

BEFORE the Lord Jesus Christ went away from the world, He said to His disciples, "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you."

As He was about to ascend to heaven from the Mount of Olives, He said again to His disciples, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; . . . and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

The presence of Christ with His people is thus an assured fact. Nor is it only with them in an outward and separate sense, but with them in the inward and essential sense of oneness with them. He is *with* them by being *in* them. And so it is written, "I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people." 2 Cor. vi. 16.

But His name is Immanuel, which is "God with us." "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." Therefore the presence of Christ with His people is the presence of God also. It is the presence of both the Father and the Son, for they "are one." And so He has said, "If a man love Me, he will keep My words; and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John xiv. 23.

An abode is a dwelling-place. We will come unto him, and make him our dwelling-place. "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, *with him also* that is of a contrite and humble spirit." Isa. lvii. 15. "My presence shall go with thee." Ex. xxxiii. 14. And as God is real, and Christ is real, so their presence is real. Their presence with the believer in Jesus is a real presence. This is the true real presence.

How, then, is this real presence manifested? Here is the answer to that question: "Strengthened with might *by His Spirit* in the inner man; *that Christ may dwell in your hearts*, . . . that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Eph. iii. 16, 17, 19. "For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. ii. 9. Thus it is by his Spirit that Christ dwells with His people. It is by the presence of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer that the real presence of Christ is manifested to those and in those that are his. For "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." Rom. viii. 9.

This is more fully stated in the Saviour's last talk with His disciples (John xiv. 16-23), before His death. He says, "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you." As He will not leave His children comfortless, He gives them the Comforter. He gives them the Comforter, because He will come to them. Consequently, it is by "the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost," that Christ dwells with His people, and that His real presence

434

is manifested to them and in them. So He says: "I will pray the Father and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; *whom the world can not receive*, because it seeth Him not, neither

knoweth Him; but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. . . . At that day ye *shall know* that I am in My Father, and ye in Me and *I in you*." In the day that the child of God receives the Holy Spirit, he knows that Christ dwells in him; he knows the real presence of Christ with him and in him.

This Spirit of Truth, the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, which brings the presence of Christ, the world can not receive, "because it *seeth* Him not, neither knoweth Him." And the world *sees* Him not because it does not *believe*. Instead of *believing*, that it may *see*, the world wants to *see*, that it may *believe*. And so, because the world sees not the Spirit of God, and therefore can not receive Him and can not know Him. But to those who do believe, and therefore do receive Him, Jesus says, "Ye know Him for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." The promise of the Spirit is received "through faith," and then we know Him. So that it is literally true that by *faith* we *know* God and the things of God.

Such is the true doctrine of the real presence of Christ with those who are His, and of his manifestation to them and in them. In one word this is the Gospel. Without it there is no Gospel of Christ. The Lord's own definition of the Gospel is that it is Christ in believers, the hope of glory. And here it is: "Be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel which ye have heard. . . . Whereof I Paul am made a minister . . . to fulfil the word of God; even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to His saints; to whom God would make know what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles *which is Christ in you*, the hope of glory whom we preach." Col. i. 23-28. Christ in men, the hope of glory; God manifest in the flesh; this, and this alone, is the Gospel of Christ. And therefore Paul tells us that "it pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the heathen." Gal. i. 15, 16. Not revealed *to* him only, but revealed *in* him, and revealed *to* him by being revealed *in* him. He was to preach Christ in men, the hope of glory; but he could not possibly do this unless he knew Christ in himself, the hope of glory. It was not enough to preach about this - he must preach this in very fact. It was not the thing to do to preach *about* Him, but to preach *Him*.

Thus "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body." 2 Cor. iv. 6, 7, 10. "But I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me." Gal. ii. 19, 20.

Such is the Scripture doctrine, the true doctrine, of the real presence of Christ with His people and in His people. It is the presence of Christ Himself in the believer by the creative power and overshadowing of the Spirit of God. This is the mystery of God.

A. T. JONES.

July 19, 1894

"In You or in the Eucharist?" *The Present Truth* 10, 29 , pp. 449, 450.

THE Christian doctrine of the real presence is, "Christ in *you*."

The Catholic theory of the real presence is, "Christ in *the eucharist*."

The Christian doctrine of the real presence is, Christ in the believer by the creative power and overshadowing of the *Spirit of God*. The Catholic theory of the real presence is, Christ in the eucharist by the *word of the priest*.

In the Christian doctrine of the real presence there is an inward change or conversion of the soul the believer in self by the power of the Holy Spirit, by which is made a "new creature." In the Catholic theory of the real presence there is what is called an "inward change or conversion" of the bread and wine, or the wafer of the communion into the very flesh and blood of Jesus Christ by the word and at the will of *the priest*.

Nor is in the of this mirrored captious criticism or prejudiced statement. It is all the street truth. And that all they see that it is so, we herewith give the authority approved. First, as to the real presence of Christ being in the eucharist. Here is the statement: -

Among the various dogmas of the Christian Church there is none which rests on stronger Scriptural authority than the doctrine of the real presence of Jesus Christ and holy eucharist. The fathers of the church, without an exception, re-echo the language of the apostle to the Gentiles, by proclaiming the real presence of our Lord in the eucharist. . . . I have counted the names of sixty-three fathers and eminent ecclesiastical writers flourishing between the first and the sixth century, all of whom proclaim the real presence - some by explaining the mystery, others by thinking God for this inestimable gift, and others by exhorting the faithful to its worthy reception. - *Faith of our Fathers*, by Cardinal Gibbons.

And that it is in the eucharist in-

450

stead of "in you," is shown by the following words: -

Every one knows that example loses much of its efficacy in passing through the medium of history, and that virtues perceived at a distance of eighteen centuries are not sufficiently eloquent to move our hearts! It was then very necessary that the Divine Model of the elect should dwell in the midst of us full of grace and truth, and that He should offer to each one the living picture of the same virtues which charmed the witnesses of His mortal life and attached to Him so powerfully the hearts of His disciples. This need Jesus Christ satisfies *in His eucharistic life*. Could Jesus Christ manifest more strikingly His unspeakable tenderness for sinners, and His ardent zeal for their salvation than He does *in the adorable sacrament* in which He condemns Himself to remain on the earth

so long as there is one soul to save? - *Religion in Society, by Albe Martinet.*

And that it is at the word and will of the priest that this is all done, is showing plainly enough and strongly enough to satisfy anybody, in the following words: -

To obtain from must this abrogation of self, it was not enough that the Son of God obeyed Mary and Joseph for thirty years; made Himself, during His public life, the servant of all; and delivered Himself, without resistance, to His executioners. For eighteen hundred that He has reigned at the right hand of the Father, He never has ceased to give to men the example of the most Gwen universal and humiliating obedience. Every day multitudes of priests, be they fervent, lukewarm, or vicious, - it is the same - summon Him where it pleases them, give Him to whom they will, confine Him under lock and key, and dispose of Him at their will. - *Religion in Society.*

And that by the words or ceremonies of consecration pronounced by the priest there is what is called an "inward change or conversion" of the bread and wine, or the wafer, into the very flesh and blood of Christ, is shown in these words: -

The holy eucharist is the true body and blood of Jesus Christ under the outward appearance of bread and wine. . . . This most blessed sacrament contains *truly, reality, and substantially*, though not perceptibly to our senses, nor with their natural accidents. . . . the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with His soul and divinity, which can never be separated from His body and blood. . . . The Catholic Church teaches that, before consecration, that which on the altar appears to be bread and wine, is simply bread and wine; and that after the consecration of that bread and wine, what appears to be bread and wine is no longer bread and wine, but the body and blood of Jesus Christ. Something remains, namely, the outward qualities or species of bread and wine; and something is changed, namely, the inward, invisible *substance* of that bread and wine, into the body and blood of Christ; this *inward change or conversion* is what is called *transubstantiation*. - *Catholic Belief.*

The Christian truth of the real presence of Christ converts the soul of the believer: the papal dogma pretends to convert the bread and wine. The Christian truth of the real presence of Christ believed, makes man subject to God in everything: the papal dogma makes God subject to man in everything. The preaching of the Christian truth of the real presence of Christ in the believer, is the revelation of the mystery of God: the preaching of the papal dogma of the real presence is the proclamation of the mystery of iniquity. A. T. JONES.

October 18, 1894

"St. Anne' vs. The Saviour" *The Present Truth* 10, 42 , pp. 657, 658.

THE following quotations are from a Roman Catholic work, "Manual of Devotion to Good St. Anne," which is officially endorsed. The quotations are followed by Scripture comments.

TO Catholic readers we say that these quotations are not printed for the purpose of ridiculing Catholics or Catholic doctrines, but in the hope of exalting in their minds the Lord Jesus Christ to the place He occupies by the will and word of God, which place, by the teaching of this book, is given to "St. Anne."

"O GOOD Jesus, be compassionate to the faithful servants of Thy grandmother St. Anne, show them Thy mercy, and for love of her extend to them a helping hand in all their necessities. O Mary, Mother of God, vouchsafe always to protect those who pay homage to thy blessed mother and serve her with a devout heart. Page 362.

"Then one said unto Him, Behold, Thy mother and Thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak to Thee. But He answered and said unto him that told Him, Who is My mother? and who are My brethren? And He stretched forth His hand toward His disciples, and said, Behold My mother and My brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of My Father which is in heaven, the same is My brother, My sister, and My mother." Matt. xii. 47-50.

"O WISE and potent Mother, who hast so much power and merit before God and who reignest in glory with the Queen of Paradise, thy blessed Daughter Mary, never let thy heart forget my needs. I am indeed thy unworthy servant, but I treasure in my soul the thought that my devotedness to serve thee will be the pledge of my salvation." p. 364.

"Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the fruit of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold I have graven thee upon the palms of My hands." Isa. xlix. 15, 16. "Then said Jesus unto him, Get thee hence Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve." Matt. iv. 10. "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ," not through St. Anne.

"O SWEET advocate, present thyself for me before the throne of Divine Majesty that by thy meditation I may obtain pardon of the evil I have done, strength henceforth to overcome my passions, and grace to spend all my days in good works." p. 365.

"No man cometh to the Father, but by Me." John xiv. 6. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. ix. 24. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5.

"HOLY Mother St. Anne, by that great power which God hath given unto thee, show thyself my mother my consoler, and my advocate, reconcile me to God whom I have so deeply offended." p. 370.

"But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son [not by "Mother St. Anne"], much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." Rom. v. 8-10.

"HOLY Mother St. Anne, by that great power which God has given unto thee, . . . console me in my trials." p. 370.

"For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ." 1 Cor. i. 5. "Now our Lord Jesus Christ Himself [not "St. Anne"], and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work." 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17.

"STRENGTHEN me in all my combats; aid me in my day of need." p. 370.

"I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." Phil. iv. 13.

"Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help." Ps. cxlvi. 3.

"AID me in my day of need." p. 370.

"Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace [not to "Mother Anne"], that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Heb. iv. 16.

"DELIVER me from all danger." p. 370.

658

"Call upon Me [not on "St. Anne"] in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify Me" [not "St. Anne"]. Ps. l. 15.

"HELP me at the hour of death and open to me the doors of Paradise. Amen." p. 370.

"Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou [not "St. Anne"] art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me." Ps. xxiii. 4. "Then said Jesus unto them again, Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. All that ever came before Me are thieves and robbers; but the sheep did not hear them. I am the door; by Me if any man enter in, he shall be saved." John x. 7-9.

"HOLY Mother Anne, make peace for me with my Lord and my God whom I have offended." p. 376.

"Let him take hold of My strength, that he may make peace with Me; and he shall make peace with Me." Isa. xxvii. 5. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," [not through "St. Anne."] Rom. v. 1.

"MY heart, alas, my inclinations and my will are attached to vanity, to the world and to sensuality. This great love which God bears towards me, the many benefits He has bestowed upon me, neither touch, nor rouse me from my guilty alth. [God's infinite power and love being too weak (?) the Romanist has recourse to "St. Anne."] Good St. Anne, change these unholy dispositions." pp. 379, 380.

"Despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?"

Rom. ii. 4. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me." John xii. 32.

"MY dear Mother St. Anne, I have unbounded confidence in thy prayers; I place in thy blessed hands my soul, my body, and all my hopes, both in this world and in the world to come." p. 383.

"Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish. Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose hope is in the Lord his God." Ps. xcvi. 3-5. "Should not a people seek unto their God? on behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead?" Isa. viii. 19, R.V. "Mother Anne," if such a person ever lived (the Scripture does not give the name of Mary's mother) is dead, but the Lord Jesus Christ "ever liveth" to make intercession for us. Heb. vii. 25.

"HONOUR," "praise, thanksgiving, glory, and love to my powerful and beloved St. Anne!" "forever." pp. 104, 325, 392.

"And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." Rev. v. 11-13.
A. T. JONES.

November 22, 1894

"The Headship of the Church" 11 *The Present Truth* 10, 47 , pp. 741, 742.

JESUS HIMSELF, OR A PAPAL REGENT

IN the Scriptures the church of Christ is described under the figure of the human body as God made it. The relationship between Christ and his church is shown and illustrated by the relationship that exists between the human body and its head: and the relationship between Christ and the members of his church is illustrated by the relationship between the members of the human body and the head of that body as God has placed it.

"The church is His body." Eph. i. 22. "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." 1 Cor. xii. 27. The members of His church are "members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." Eph. v. 30. Christ is, the head of this body, which is His church. For "He is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead." Col. i. 18. "God raised Him from the dead . . . and gave Him to be head over all things to the church, which is His body." Eph. i. 19-23. And it is Christ *Himself*, too, who is head of this church. Not

Christ by a representative; not Christ by a substitute, a vicar, or a regent; but Christ Himself, in His own proper person. This is certainly true, because in stating this same thought under the figure of a *building*, the word declares that Christ "*Himself*" is the chief corner stone, "the *head-stone* of the corner." And here are the words: "Ye are God's building." 1 Cor. iii. 9; Eph. ii. 21, 22, 10, 20.

Yet the claim of the Papacy is, that a *man* is head of the church of Christ. The claim of the Catholic Church is that the head of *that* Church is the head of the church of Christ. The claim of the Church of Rome is that the Bishop of Rome is head of the church of Christ - in the place of Christ - as the "representative," the "substitute," the "vicar," the "regent," of Christ. Here is the authoritative statement: -

Says the Council of Florence (1430), at which also were present the bishops of the Greek and the Latin Church: "We define that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole church, the father and doctor of all Christians; and we declare that to him, in the person of blessed Peter, was given him by Jesus Christ our Saviour, full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal church."

The Pope is here called the *true vicar* or representative of Christ in this lower kingdom of his church militant; that is, the Pope is the organ of our Saviour, and speaks his sentiments in faith and morals. - *Cardinal Gibbons, in The Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 154, 155.*

It was the Council of Chalcedon 451, that first addressed the bishop of Rome as "the head, of whom we are the members."

Let us look at this claim of the Catholic Church in view of the statements made in the Scriptures on this point. As we have seen, the church of Christ is His body in this world, and He is its head. God is the builder of this body, the church of Christ, as He was the builder of the human body in the beginning; for "God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased Him." Now, take a human body as God made it, with the head in its place as God set it. In the place of that head, which God gave to that body, you put a "representative" head - a substitute head. In the place of the true head, which God set to that body, you put a "regency" head - another head to occupy the place in the absence of the true head - then what have you? Take away the head from a human body, and you have left only a *dead body*. This is the very first and only result of taking away the head. And even though you set another head on this headless body, it is still only a dead body.

Now this is precisely the case of the Church of Rome. It was once the church of Christ; its members were members of the body of Christ; and Christ was its head. It had life from Christ, its living head, the life which is by faith, so that its "faith was spoken of throughout the whole world." Rom. i. 8. But there came "a falling away." 2 Thess. ii. 3. The bishops and councils of the church put away Christ, the true head whom God had set, and put another, a *man*, in His place, as head of that church. The putting away of Christ, its living head, left it only a

lifeless body; and the putting of another head in His place did not, and could not, give life to that

742

lifeless body. So far as spiritual life is concerned - the real life of the church of Christ - the Church of Rome is as destitute of it as is a human body with its own head cut off and another head put on in its place. Thus the Church of Rome is destitute of the life that vivifies the church of Christ, and partakes only of the elements of death. The only hope for it, or for those who are connected with it, is to recognise that it is indeed spiritually dead, and have Christ, the life-giver, raise them from the dead, and connect them with himself as their living head, that thus they may live indeed.

Warning was given against this very course of that church in the first days of the church of Christ, and the same warning is yet given. In the second chapter of Colossians it is written: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in Him, *which is the head* of all principality and power. . . . Let no man beguile you of your reward in a *voluntary* humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and *not holding the head*, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, *why*, as though living in the world, *are ye subject to ordinances after the commandments and doctrines of men?* Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting [punishing, margin] of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh." Verses 7-10, 18-23.

This is the Divine warning against the spirit that made the Papacy, against the Papacy itself, against all its workings, and against its very nature. Men, fleshly-minded men, ambitious men, in the church, not being dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, holding the rudiments of the world and *not holding the head* - these were the men who put away from the people Christ, the true and living head, and put a man, one of their own sort, in His place. And to supply the lack of Him and His life they imposed upon the people a host of forms and ordinances, and commandments and doctrines of men, and voluntary humilities, and will-worshipping, and punishings of the body in penances and pilgrimages, and worshiping of angels, and saints, and dead people called saints. And this is the body of which Leo XIII., pope is the head. This is the Church of Rome with a man as its head, in the place of Christ. This is the Catholic Church. And this is how the bishop of Rome obtained his "regency of God on earth."

A. T. JONES.

November 29, 1894

"The Infallibility of the Pope" *The Present Truth* 10, 48 , pp. 758, 759.

WHERE DOES IT COME FROM? AND HOW DOES HE GET IT

IN order to answer these questions more fairly and fully, let us see what is the exact statement of the claim as officially and "infallibly" pronounced. Here it is: -

Wherefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of the Christian people, we, the sacred council, approving, teach, and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed; that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra* - that is, when discharging the office of pastor, and teacher of all Christians, by reason of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole church - he, by the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed the His church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the said Roman pontiff are of themselves unalterable and not from the consent of the church.

Consequently, Catholics believe that the Pope is infallible when he teaches the faithful *ex cathedra*, that is, "*from the chair*" of St. Peter, in matters of *faith or morals*. - *Catholic Belief*, p. 69.

From this it is seen that there is no claim that infallibility attached to the Pope except when he speaks "*ex cathedra*, that is, from the chair of St. Peter;" and he speaks "*ex cathedra*" only when he speaks (a) "as the father and doctor of all Christians;" (b) "discharging the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians;" (c) and then only as he speaks on a question of faith or morals. That is to say: If he speaks or writes only as a priest, a bishop, or a theologians, he is not claimed to be infallible, nor is that which is so spoken or written claimed to be infallibly true. If he speaks about the weather or the crops, or the loss of his temporal power, or politics generally, or his great "love for Protestants" - in none of this is it claimed that infallibility attaches to him or anything that he says.

From the dogma itself it is perfectly clear that it is not claimed that infallibility attaches to *the man* at all, who happens to be a Pope, but that it attaches to *the Pope* who happens to be a man. For instance, Joachim Pecci happened to become a Pope. When he was just plain Joachim Pecci and nothing else, no hint of a claim of infallibility ever attached to him. And if he had always remained plain Joachim Pecci no hint of any such thing, in the mind of anybody, would have ever attached to him. When he became "Father Pecci," a priest, it was the same way; when he became Bishop Pecci, it was the same way; when he became Archbishop Pecci, it was still the same way; and when he became Cardinal Pecci it was yet the same way - in none of these positions was any thought of infallibility ever connected with him in the mind of anybody. And if he had always remained in any one of these positions, no thought of infallibility ever would have been connected with him.

It is perfectly plain, then, that outside of the office of Pope there is no thought of infallibility connected with the man who happens to become Pope. As priest, or

bishop, or archbishop, or cardinal, no vestige of it attaches to him in the mind of anybody. Yet it was by a vote of 363, against two,

759

bishops, archbishops, and cardinals, that the doctrine was established that infallibility does attach to him when he happens to become Pope. This, too, while not one of the 363 made any kind of claim of infallibility on his own part!

In this, therefore, we are treated to the absurd suggestion that 363 elements of absolute fallibility could infallibly settle the doctrine that infallibility is connected with one of their own absolutely fallible selves when he happens to be made Pope! - No, this is not quite the full statement of the case yet; for when the 363 had voted it, it was not infallibly fixed until the Pope had *ex cathedra* proclaimed it. That is to say, the 363 fallibles voted it infallibly so, then he of whom, till this, it was not *infallibly* so, proclaimed it infallibly so, and thus it became infallibly so. In other words, 363 fallibles voted his infallibility when he speaks *ex cathedra*; but this could not be infallibly certain till he himself had infallibly proclaimed it; and he could not infallibly proclaim it until it was infallibly so! *Like produced totally unlike. Out of nothing SOMETHING CAME!*

A. T. JONES.

December 6, 1894

"Christ or Peter - Which?" *The Present Truth* 10, 49 , pp. 772, 773.

THE dogma of papal infallibility is, that the Pope is "infallible," not by any promise to him himself either as an individual or as an official, but "by the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter."

Therefore, in the study of this subject, it is proper enough to inquire, How do they find this thing promised to Peter? and, Was there in fact ever any such thing promised to Peter, or to the Pope "in blessed Peter," or in anybody else?

The claim being that this thing is promised to him only "in blessed Peter," it is essential to make some sort of a connection between the Pope and Peter. And this essential connection is made when the Pope speaks "*ex cathedra*, that is, 'from the chair' of St. Peter." But if it should turn out that no such thing as infallibility was ever promised to Peter at all, then it would follow that even the chair of St. Peter cannot supply to the Pope the much desired infallibility.

The truth is, that this promise of infallibility to Peter, and consequently, to the Pope, "in blessed Peter," springs from the same law that we have already found to be the source of the "infallibility" of the Pope, namely: the law that like produces totally unlike, and out of nothing something comes. It is in fact created by

TWO ENORMOUS ASSUMPTIONS

first, that the church of Christ "must have a visible head," and *secondly*, that Peter is that head. The first of these assumptions is thus stated by Cardinal Gibbons: -

Unity of government is not less essential to the Church of Christ than unity of doctrine. Our Divine Saviour never speaks of His churches, but of His Church. He does not say: "Upon this rock I will build My churches," but "Upon this rock I will build My Church," from which words we must conclude that it never was His intention to establish or to sanction various conflicting denominations, but one corporate body, with all its members united under one visible head; for as the church is a visible body, it must have a visible head. - *Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 24, 25.

Upon this sheep assumption, that the church of Christ "must have a visible head," - upon this is built the whole Papacy with its claim of infallibility and everything else that it claims to have and to be. But nothing could be more false than the idea that the church of Christ has or "must have a visible head."

Jesus Christ Himself is head of the church; for it is written: "I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ." And, "Ye are the body of Christ and members in particular." And He "is the head of the body, the church."

The Lord Jesus lived in this world a whole lifetime *as man*, subject to all the weaknesses and infirmities of a man; for He said of Himself, "Of Mine own self I can do nothing." And as He said likewise to all men, "Without Me ye can do nothing," and likewise of Himself, "Of Mine own self I can do nothing," it is perfectly plain that in this world He put Himself in the place where man is; yet He was led of the Father all the way, for He said, "The Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works."

Thus He did not assert Himself, and take of *Himself*, His own way, but He trusted the Father, and was led of Him, and was taught of Him, as all of *us* must be who shall be saved by Him. He did not of Himself follow His own way, but only as He was guided by the Father; that is to say, that *the Father was His head* all the time that He was in this world as man; and the Father, as that head, was all this time *invisible*. And this is to show, and does plainly show, that in showing to man the way that he must take, Jesus Christ lived the Christian life in this world

WITHOUT A VISIBLE HEAD

For the Lord Jesus to have asked in this world for a *visible* head to be His guide, would have been to deny the Father. And for any professed believer in Jesus to ask for a *visible* head to be his guide, it to deny Jesus Christ. The Christian is to see Him who is invisible. Heb. xi. 27. The Christian is to look at the things that are not seen. 2 Cor. iv. 18. And the invisible things of God are clearly seen. Rom. i. 20. So that nothing could more plainly expose the essential earthliness and carnality of all the papal conceptions than does this demand that there shall be "a *visible* head" to the church of Christ. Any church that has a visible head is not, and cannot be the church of Christ. And such is the Roman Catholic Church.

Again, the Cardinal says: -

His Church is compared to a human body. In one body there are many members, all inseparably connected with the head. The head

commands and the foot instantly moves, the hand is raised and the lips open. Even so our Lord ordained that His Church, composed of many members, should be all united to one supreme visible head, whom they are bound to obey. - *Id. pp. 26.*

The church of Christ is the body of Christ, it is true. And Christ Himself is the head of this "His body, which is the church." And to take away Christ, the true head of this body, and put another - a man - in His place, is only to take away all life from the church and so leave it only a lifeless thing so far as the Lord or spirituality is concerned. To take away the true head of any body and put another head in the place of the true one, is to destroy the life of that body. Even though the substitute head be really fastened on in some way, all that there can be of the things is but a *dead form*. And such is the Catholic Church, according to every idea of it that is set forth by the Papacy itself.

Again we quote from the same authority: -

773

The Church, in fine, is called in Scripture by the beautiful title of bride or spouse of Christ, and the Christian law admits of only one life. - *Id.*

True enough this is, *in itself*. And that same Christian law admits of only one *husband*. Now, in this scriptural symbol, Christ occupies the place of husband to the wife. And as the Christian law admits of only one husband, it follows as plainly as can be, that for another person to put himself in the place of husband to this wife - the church - is positively to violate the Christian law. And for any wife - any church - claiming to be the bride or spouse of Christ, to allow another person to take the place of Christ, the true husband to her, is positively to

VIOLATE THE CHRISTIAN LAW

and to proclaim herself an adulteress and a harlot. And such is the Catholic Church, according to her own authoritative statement.

To claim that Peter was the first to occupy this illegitimate place toward the "spouse of Christ," or that this "spouse" accepted Peter as the first substitute for her true and living husband - this does not in the least alter the essential immorality of the thing, nor does it relieve it of the just charge that it is a positive violation of the Christian law which admits only of one husband. "For the woman that hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband *so long as he liveth*. . . . So, then, if while her husband liveth she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye *should be married to another, even to Him that is raised from the dead*." Rom. vii. 2-4. Thus, according to the Scripture, the Christian, and in this the Christian church, is married to Christ - "to Him that is raised from the dead" - *as long as He liveth*. Therefore, for any Christian church to be joined to another husband *while Jesus Christ liveth*, is to be called by the Scriptures of truth "*an adulteress*." Now, as the Catholic Church claims to be "the spouse of Christ," and yet claims

"another man" as her visible husband, her "visible head," to "speak to her His sentiments in faith and morals" as this is her own showing, and she pretends to make no other, she is therefore obliged to claim that Jesus Christ *is dead*, or else confess that she is an adulteress. And in either case it is perfectly plain that she is not the bride or spouse of Christ; for if she will claim that He is dead and that therefore she has right to be joined to this other one, then she is not *His* spouse but the spouse of *the other man*; while if she will not allow that Christ is dead, "then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress," and in this she is just as certainly not His spouse. So from her own showing and upon her own claims it is certain that the Catholic Church is not in any sense a Christian church.

It is therefore perfectly clear that in the first of her assumptions, namely, that "the church must have a visible head," the Papacy is all at sea. How, then, is it with

HER OTHER ASSUMPTION

that Peter was appointed that visible head, and so the Pope by succession from him, and therefore "by the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter," "is infallible" "when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, 'from the chair' of St. Peter"? Here are the cardinal's words on that: -

Let us now briefly consider the grounds of the doctrine [of the infallibility of the Pope] itself. The following passages of the Gospel, spoken at different times, were addressed exclusively to Peter: "Thou art Peter; and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "I, the Supreme Architect of the universe," says our Saviour, "will establish a church which is to last till the end of time. I will lay the foundation of this church that the winds and storms of error shall never prevail against it. *Thou, O Peter, shalt be the foundations of this church*. It shall never fall, because thou shalt never be shaken; and thou shalt never be shaken, because thou shalt rest on Me, the rock of truth." The church, of which *Peter is the foundation*, is declared to be impregnable, that is, proof against error. How can you suppose an immovable edifice built on a tottering foundation? for it is not the building that sustains the foundation, but the foundation which supports the building. - *Id.*, pp. 150, 151.

Now on their very face these statements plainly show that the conception which they define is utterly incongruous and fails at every turn, as applied to Peter or any other man or succession of men. And all that is needed to annihilate the whole theory, is but to read two or three passages of scripture which speak directly on this subject. Even admitting that the word Peter means a stone or rock, allowing the scripture to explain its own statements it is seen that this is far from proving that Peter was *the* rock upon which the church of Christ was to be built.

For it is written: "Other foundation can no man lay that *is laid, which is Jesus Christ.*" 1 Cor. iii. 11. And again: "Ye are built upon *the foundation* of the apostles and prophets, *Jesus Christ Himself* being the chief corner stone. *In whom* [in Jesus Christ Himself, not in Peter] *all the building* fitly framed together growth unto an holy temple in the Lord. *In whom also ye are builded together* for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. ii. 20-22. Please note particularly that this scripture does *not* say that Ye are built upon the foundation *which is* the apostles and prophets, but it does say, "Ye are built upon the foundation *of* the apostles and prophets," that is, Ye are built upon the foundation *upon which* the apostles and prophets are built.

Ye are built upon the foundation *of* the apostles and prophets. And

WHO IS THE FOUNDATION

of the apostles and prophets? Answer: "Jesus Christ Himself," and "other foundation can no man lay than that *is laid which is Jesus Christ.*" Therefore, as "the foundation of the apostles and prophets" is "Jesus Christ Himself," and as Christians are "built upon the foundation *of* the apostles and prophets," it is settled by the Scriptures of truth, that whoever is not built upon "Jesus Christ Himself" as the only foundation that is laid, or that can be laid, is not a Christian; and any church that is not built upon "Jesus Christ Himself" as the only foundation that is laid, or that can be laid, is not in any sense a Christian church.

And such, by her own exclusive claim, is the Catholic Church. She does not claim to be "built upon the foundation *of* the apostles and prophets," which is "Jesus Christ Himself," as the only foundation. She claims to be built upon *one of the apostles himself* as the foundation. The church *of Christ* is not built on any such "foundation." The church of Christ is not built on a foundation of dust, nor even on a rock that is made out of dust. It is built upon the eternal, *self-existent* Rock which is "Jesus Christ Himself."

Next week we will examine the inspired testimony of Peter himself upon this question.

A. T. JONES.

December 13, 1894

"Christ or Peter - Which? Did Peter Have Infallibility to Give?" *The Present Truth* 10, 50 , pp. 788-790.

DID PETER HAVE INFALLIBILITY TO GIVE

IN our consideration of Papal "infallibility" last week, we found that Christ and not Peter is the rock upon which the church is built. But let us have the word of the Lord by Peter himself on this point.

Thus it is written by the hand of Peter: "As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby: if so be ye have tasted that *the Lord*

is gracious: *to whom coming as unto a living stone*, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye also as lively stones are *built up a spiritual house*, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore it is also contained in the Scripture, Behold I lay in Sion

A CHIEF CORNER STONE

elect, precious: and he that believeth on Him shall not be confounded. Unto you, therefore, which believe, He is precious; but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner." 1 Peter ii. 2-7.

That the "stone" here referred to is none other than Jesus Christ Himself, and not Peter in any sense, is clear from the words spoken by Peter in another place, thus, speaking of "Jesus Christ of Nazareth," whom the Jews had crucified, he says, "This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner." Acts iv. 10, 11.

In the first of these passages from the words of Peter, he says that this "is contained in the scripture," and then quotes a portion of this "scripture." Let us turn to that scripture to which Peter here refers, and which he says means "Jesus Christ of Nazareth," and see what it does say in full. Here it is: "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion *for a foundation*, a stone, a tried atone, a precious corner stone, *a sure foundation*: he that believeth shall not make haste." Isa. xxviii. 16. Peter him-

789

self says that *this stone* which is laid "for a foundation" is "Jesus Christ of Nazareth," and that "*this stone*" - this "Jesus Christ of Nazareth," - "*is the head.*" And Peter says that it is to this "*living stone*" that men must come in order to be of the building of Christ - in order to be of this "spiritual house," which is the church of the living God.

Now, to every one who cares for the truth only, the testimony of Peter *himself* is better than the testimony of the Catholic Church *about* Peter. And to every such one the inspired testimony of Peter himself as to who is the foundation and head of the church, is far better than is the uninspired and self-interested testimony of the Catholic Church and her Popes *about* Peter. The

INSPIRED TESTIMONY OF PETER

himself is that "Jesus Christ of Nazareth" is "the stone," the "living stone," which is the "sure foundation" and "the head" of the building of God, this "spiritual house," which is the church of Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. This is also the inspired testimony of the Apostle Paul. In other words, this is the testimony of Jesus Christ Himself, that *He and He alone* is the foundation and head of the apostles and prophets and of the whole church of Christ, and that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, *which is Jesus Christ.*"

And this word demonstrates that the claim of the Papacy that Peter is the foundation and head of the church of Christ is as false; fleeting, baseless, and

intangible, as is "the stuff that dreams are made of." It therefore and of necessity follows that the "infallibility of the Pope," as derived from "the divine assistance promised to him in *blessed Peter*," is also as false, fleeting, baseless, and intangible, as is "the stuff that dreams are made of."

Cardinal Gibbons, in "Faith of our Fathers," makes Jesus say to Peter, "Thou, O Peter, shalt be the foundation of this church. It shall never fall, because thou *shalt never be shaken*." In noticing the words of Christ to Peter that He had prayed for him, that when he should be sifted as wheat, his faith should not fail, the Cardinal further says: "Therefore the faith of Peter will always be firm" (page 152); that, consequently, the faith of Peter's "successors" would always be firm, and therefore these "successors" would always be infallible in the faith.

This argument, like all their other ones in favour of the infallibility of the Pope, is utterly groundless, from the divinely recorded fact that

PETER WAS SHAKEN

and that his faith did fail more than once. For it was after these words were spoken by the Lord that Peter denied Him *three times* and declared that he did not know Him. It will not do to say that this was not a point "regarding faith or morals," and that therefore infallibility was not involved. It was entirely a question of faith and morals.

It was a question of *faith*, for the knowing of the Lord Jesus is nothing else than a matter of faith; and to deny Him is nothing else than to deny the faith by which alone He is known.

It was a question of *morals*, too, because to make his denial as emphatic as possible, Peter then and there "began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not this man of whom ye speak." Mark xiv. 71. And it is certain that to curse and to swear involves a question of morals.

Therefore it is certain, by the Divine record, that Peter did fail and did decide wrongly on a question of faith and morals. And this divinely recorded fact annihilates the claim of the infallibility of the Pope, as derived in succession from Peter.

If this fact and the logic of it would be dodged by the plea that this all occurred before the day of Pentecost, and therefore before Peter was endowed with the Holy Ghost; this plea will fail also because of the divinely recorded fact that *after Pentecost* Peter failed again, and this, too, upon the very pivotal point of the faith. Here is the word of the Lord as to that: -

But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, *because* he was to be blamed. For, before that certain came from damascus, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them that were the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that *they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel*, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not

as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We who are deus by nature and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ: even we have believed in Jesus Christ: that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law, for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. Gal. ii. 11-16.

Here is the Divine record that Peter "was to be blamed" in this matter, and this "because he walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel." And the particular point of the truth of the Gospel that was involved in this transaction of Peters, was the all-important question of *how are men to be justified?* Is it by faith? or is it by works? Is it by the faith of Christ? or is it by works of the law? Is it by faith without works - a faith which works? or is it by "faith and works," with all the trust in the works? Is it by Christ alone? or is it by Christ *and something else?* This was the question that was involved in the course of Peter there. It was nothing less than the supreme question of faith and morals. And on this supreme question of faith and morals Peter there decided wrongly.

He decided this great question not according to the truth of the Gospel. This is the truth by the word of God, and it therefore

ANNIHILATES ALL THE CLAIM

of the infallibility of the Pope as derived from "blessed Peter" when he speaks "from the chair of St. Peter" or from anywhere else, "regarding a question of faith or morals" or anything else.

Cardinal Gibbons seems to see the danger to "the infallibility of the Pope" from this fact, and he therefore says of it that -

St. Paul criticised his [Peter's] conduct on a point *not affecting doctrine*, but discipline.

But this will never do, even for him; because this question that was then up between Paul and those Jews who professed the faith, and who constantly followed up Paul and opposed the Gospel, and by whom Peter, and even Barnabas, were carried away from the truth of the Gospel - that question we say that was then up between Paul and those Jews was the very question that was up between the Reformers and the Papacy *in the Reformation*. And the Council of Trent, which was called especially to consider the questions raised by the Reformation, treated this question altogether as a question *of doctrine*, and not of discipline at all. So, for the Cardinal to say that Paul criticised Peter's conduct "on a point not affecting doctrine," while it was the very point that the Council of Trent treated as altogether affecting doctrine - this will not do even for him: this fact destroys his argument and annihilates even this plea by which he would save "infallibility" to Peter and to the Pope "in blessed Peter."

So, then, the conclusion of the whole matter is simply this: As the claim of

"the infallibility of the Pope" is solely that it is "promised to him in blessed Peter," it follows plainly enough that if it was not in Peter, then even, according to their

own dogma, the Pope does not have it, and no Bishop of Rome ever did have it. And by the Divine record it is certain that Peter at least *twice* decided wrongly "regarding faith and morals."

Therefore by the Divine record it is made perfectly certain that the infallibility of the Pope or any other man or set of men, derived from "the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter," or in anybody else, when he speaks "*ex cathedra*," or any other way, on a question "regarding faith or morals," or anything else, is utterly without any shadow of foundation in any right conception imaginable.

Every argument adduced in its favour is sheer fallacy; and analysis of every claim upon which it is based only develops the *finale* that, out of nothing something comes. Yet, as the thought that out of nothing something comes, involves either creation or absurdity, and as this claim of infallibility is seriously asserted by and in behalf of the Papacy, this is but the development of the assertion of creative power as the prerogative of the Papacy. It is the

USURPATION OF THE PAPACY

of the essential prerogative of the Creator. It was therefore perfectly fitting to the subject and to the occasion, that, when the decree of the infallibility of the Pope was passed in the Vatican Council, Pius IX. should pervert to this blasphemous service the dying words of our Creator and Redeemer, and rapturously exclaim, "It is finished."

But as any claim on the part of a man in any place, of the prerogative of creation, is but absurdity and nothingness; so this claim of the Papacy, which, by every analysis, develops only the finale that out of nothing something comes, is only supreme absurdity and absolute nothingness. It is the most unconscionable piece of imposture that was ever proposed to be imposed upon mankind. It is the greatest humbug in the most gigantic system of humbuggery that ever there was in the world. It is the culmination of the blasphemous claim of this "the mystery of iniquity," beyond which it is impossible even for it to go.

A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 11 (1895)

March 7, 1895

"A Dead Formalism" *The Present Truth* 11, 10 , p. 154.

IT is eternally true that the only way in which we can ever possibly be separated from this world or from the people of this world, is by the presence of God going ever with us. "So shall we be separated from all the people that are upon the face of the earth."

Just here is the point where a dead formalism enters and takes the place of living faith. People want to be the Lord's; they want to serve the Lord; they want

to go to heaven; and knowing that this requires separation from the world, they "try to give up the world." But instead of finding the living presence of the Lord by having faith, which of itself would accomplish all that is required and all that the heart can rightly desire, they undertake to separate themselves from the world and from the things that are in the world. This they hope to do by professing religion, joining the church, practising the forms of religion, and "doing their best" to keep the commandments and obey the Scriptures. Not having the living presence of Christ in the heart to accomplish of itself the will of God and to work the works of God, they hope to supply the lack by practising of themselves the forms of religion. But all this is only the form of godliness without the power, and can never bring peace to the mind nor rest to the heart.

The profession of religion without the living presence and power of Christ in the heart and manifested in the life, is only a dead formalism. It matters not though it be profession of Christianity itself, and a practice of all the forms of service and of worship that pertain to Christianity; if Christ Himself is not a living presence and power in the heart and life, giving life to all the forms of service and of worship in which we engage, then it is all simply an outward service of mere forms and is therefore only a dead formalism.

The forms even of Christianity can never give life to the observer of them. No; life is found *only in Christ* Himself, by a living faith. And having by living faith found Him who alone is life, He then is life to us and to all the forms too. Then all the service, and all the forms of service of Christ are always a delight. But to practise the forms of God's service with the hope of *getting life*, instead of because we have the life of God, is a wearisome and vain procedure and a profitless business.

A. T. JONES.

March 21, 1895

"Calling Things by Their Names" *The Present Truth* 11, 12 , pp. 182, 183.

THE *American Sentinel*, a vigorous Protestant journal published in New York, has been charged by the *Monitor*, a Catholic journal, with dealing in "steady and unlimited abuse of the Pope of Rome and the loudly dressed lady who sat on seven hills," whereupon the *Sentinel* replies, in part, as follows: -

As for what the *Monitor* calls "the loudly dressed *lady* who sat on seven hills," we have never spoken of her as a "*lady*." That term does not properly belong to her. It is not the term that the Lord uses in referring to her. The Scripture says that she said *of herself*, "I shall be a lady," and that she would be *called* "The lady of kingdoms;" but what the Scripture itself calls her is a term that is absolutely incompatible with any suggestion of a lady. We shall not *quote* the scriptures which describe her, lest the *Monitor* and other Catholic papers should not only charge us with abuse, but worse. We shall therefore cite chapter and verse, and the *Monitor* and all others can read the words for themselves as the Lord has

spoken them; and then let them make their charges as they choose. Here they are: Rev. xvii. 1-6, 15, 16; xviii. 2, 3; xix. 2.

And that the *Monitor* may the better be prepared to understand the application of these scriptures, we also cite the two standard and popular Roman Catholic authorities - "The Faith of Our Fathers," p. 131; and

183

"Catholic Belief," p. 323 - both of which say that the Babylon referred to by Peter (1 Peter v. 13) and the early Christians, is *Rome*. And when the Lord says that she is a harlot herself, and "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," it is not abuse when we say or anybody else says that that is what she is.

When the plain statements of the word of God seem to any person to be abusive, then the only proper thing for such person to do is so to change his attitude that that word will not seem so, but can be accepted as the exact truth. To the scribes and Pharisees it no doubt seemed to be very great abuse when Jesus told them that they were hypocrites, whited sepulchres, serpents, and a generation of vipers. It was the truth, though, and instead of persecuting and crucifying him, it would have been far better for them to have acknowledged that it was all true, and changed their course from that of disobedience to that of faith.

It is altogether likely that the devil would rather still be called Lucifer - Lightbearer - than to be called Satan - the adversary - and Diabolus - the slanderer. It may be that he thinks the Lord is engaging in "steady and unlimited abuse," when he insists in continually referring to him by these titles. But be that as it may, it is certain that these titles define precisely what he is; and the Lord, in constantly using these terms, is not in any sense abusing him - he is simply telling the truth.

It is just so as between us and the papacy. We have no doubt that the Catholic Church would much rather that we, like most other people, would always refer to her as "the true church," "a Christian church," "a branch of the Christian church." "the Holy Catholic Church," etc., instead of speaking of her, as the Lord does, as "the man of sin," "the mystery of iniquity," "the son of perdition," "the great harlot," "Babylon, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," "the beast." But all these latter things are just what the Lord calls her, and *he* is right; in all this he simply tells the truth. The Lord is not abusing her when he constantly speaks thus of her - he is simply telling what she is in truth; and neither are we abusing her when we use the terms, and only the terms, which he uses in describing her.

We do not intend to abuse the papacy nor anybody else. But we *do* intend to tell the truth. We do intend to proclaim the truth of God as it is in the word of God, the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. We do intend to proclaim this truth precisely as it is, whether it be concerning the Papacy - the beast - or whether it be concerning apostate Protestantism - the image of the beast. If this *truth* - the truth of God - should seem to any one to be abusive, let him change his attitude toward the truth, and then it will cease to appear to be abuse. The change must be in him, for the truth of God *cannot* change nor be changed.

March 28, 1895

"Catholicism vs. Christianity. Every Man His Own Saviour" *The Present Truth* 11, 15 , pp. 198, 199.

"HOW shall a man be just with God?" This has been the great inquiry of men ever since the days of the man of Uz, and long before. In fact this has been the great inquiry of all men in all ages; it is the great inquiry still; and is yet to be a far more absorbing topic than it is now.

At each of the three great religious epochs of the world's history - the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage; the Apostolic Age; and the Era of the Reformation - this has been the one great question at issue; and in our day it is again to be the great question at issue in the great controversy which is to be the culmination of all questions and of all earthly ages.

How then are men made righteous - justified, saved from sin - according to the way of the Papacy? - It is by penance. Proof? Here it is: "*Penance*, by which the sins that we commit after baptism are forgiven." "The sacrament of penance, in which the forgiveness of sins is granted to the penitent." - *Catholic Belief*, pp. 80, 366. One of these says that penance is the means by which the sins that we commit "*after baptism*" are forgiven. It is, therefore, important to know when, according to that system, baptism is to be administered; and by this to know how many sins can be committed *before* baptism. Here is the authoritative statement on that point: -

From what has been said, you may well judge how reprehensible is the conduct of Catholic parents who neglect to have their children baptized at *the earliest possible moment*, thereby risking their own souls, as well as the souls of their innocent offspring. - *Faith of Our Fathers*, p. 313.

Well then, as baptism is to be administered to the child at the earliest possible moment, it were literally impossible for such person ever to commit any sins except after his baptism. And as penance is the means of obtaining the forgiveness of sins committed after baptism, it follows as plainly as that two and two make four, that, according to the Papacy, penance is the way of forgiveness of all sin, is the way of justification, of salvation. There is no escaping this conclusion from these premises. And indeed the Papacy has no desire to escape this conclusion, for this is her specific doctrine.

Penance being the means of justification, the way of salvation from sin, what then is penance? Here is the authoritative answer: -

In the case of those who have fallen into mortal sin after baptism, when the guilt of such sin and the everlasting punishment due to it are forgiven, there still very often remains a *debt of temporal punishment*, to be paid by the sinner. This *debt* remains, not from any imperfection in the power of absolution in the sacrament of penance, nor from any want of efficacy in the atonement of Jesus Christ; but because by God's will, chastisement

for past sins helps us to compensate for the imperfection in our repentance, and serves as a correction. - *Catholic Belief*, p. 191.

Now when the guilt of the sin, and the everlasting punishment due to it, are both forgiven and so have passed from the sinner, and yet he is not saved until a debt of temporal punishment has been paid by himself then upon what does his salvation turn? and who is his saviour? - Plainly his salvation turns altogether upon the punishment; and as this debt of punishment is to be paid by the sinner himself, it just as certainly follows that the sinner is his own saviour. And thus penance, punishment, is the papal way of salvation.

Nor is this all - but the Lord Himself is made responsible for it, so that it is literally set forth as the Divine way of salvation and the divine means of justification. For it is plainly said that this debt of punishment, to be paid by the guiltless sinner, remains "because *by God's will* chastisement for past sins helps us to compensate [to pay] for the imperfection in our repentance, and serves as a correction." As the Lord forgives both the guilt and the everlasting punishment of the sin, and yet by his own will has fixed it that the sinner must still pay a debt of punishment in order to be justified and saved, then it is certain that according to the papal system, God has made punishment, which is penance, the means of justification and the way of salvation.

And indeed this is also further stated by this same authority, as follows: -

From this we see that . . . He has not dispensed us from doing with the help of His grace what we can to punish ourselves for the offences and outrages we have offered to God. Good sense tells us that this is both right and just. - *Ib.*, p. 192.

Everybody who will think on the subject can easily enough see that instead of its being good sense, it is an utter lack of every element of sound sense that tells a man that it is in any sense either right or just that he should punish himself to save himself from

199

himself. Yet as punishment is the only way of salvation known to the Papacy, and as self is its own saviour, even this thing of a man - punishing himself to save himself from himself is logical enough. And so essentially is punishment - penance - the papal way of salvation that even the dying thief, whom the Lord Jesus Himself pardoned on the cross, is made to do penance. Here are the words: -

The pardon granted to the penitent thief in the saving words: "Amen, I say to thee, this day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise" (St. Luke 23:43), can not be taken as proof that we are dispensed by God from doing works of penance. *That* was a wonderful and special grace granted under extraordinary circumstances, namely, when the blood of redemption was actually being shed upon the cross; moreover, the dying thief, besides bearing testimony to the divinity of Jesus Christ, confessed his guilt, and, *in the spirit of penance*, suffered the torment of his crucifixion, and the cruel breaking of his limbs, as penalties justly due to his sins. - *Ib.*, p. 193.

All this doctrine that men must punish themselves to save themselves springs from the utterly false, even heathenish, idea that God is harsh, stern, forbidding, and exacting, instead of gentle, loving, winning, and merciful. It looks upon Him as so ill-tempered and stern that He has to be "moved" by men's doings so well that they get Him into a good humour, and by punishment making themselves such pitiable objects that He can finally be persuaded by the Pope, or somebody else, to yield and "save" them. And here is that thought authoritatively expressed:

We stand in continual need of actual graces to perform good acts, both before and after being justified. . . . The good acts, however, done by the help of grace *before justification*, are not, *strictly* speaking, meritorious, but serve to *smooth the way* to justification, *to move God*. - *Ib.*, pp. 76, 77.

Thus by her own showing, the god of the Papacy is of such a disposition and character that it is necessary for *men*, wicked men, to do "good acts" in order to move him; and then, after they have thus moved him, it is still essential that they shall pay "a debt of temporal punishment," in order to induce him to allow them the justification which they have so hardly earned. To such a god as that it is no wonder that the Inquisition is a pleasing tribute.

This is self-salvation as set forth by the Papacy. Next week we will consider a few scriptures setting forth God's way of saving men.

A. T. JONES.

April 4, 1895

"Catholicism vs. Christianity. The Free Salvation of God" *The Present Truth* 11, 14 , pp. 213, 214.

THE FREE SALVATION OF GOD

THE article on the Catholic doctrine of penance, which makes every man his own saviour, closed two weeks ago with the statement:

Thus by her own showing, the god of the Papacy is of such a disposition and character that it is necessary for *men*, wicked men, to do "good acts" in order to move him; and then, after they have thus moved him, it is still essential that they shall pay "a debt of temporal punishment" in order to induce him to allow them the justification which they have so hardly earned.

But such is not the God of the Bible. Such is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Such is not his way of justifying men. Such is not His way of salvation. Here is His own announcement of His name, which is simply the proclamation of His character and His disposition toward all mankind: "I will make all My goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee. . . . And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed: The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." This is the true God.

"Merciful" - full of the disposition to treat people better than they deserve. Mercy is not to treat people as they deserve. Mercy is not to treat people better than they deserve, in an outward way. It is not to wait till one is "moved" by good deeds and punishments to grant what has been thus already caused. No, no. It is the *disposition*, the very heart's core of the being, to treat all persons better than they deserve. This is the Lord, the true God. "He doth not afflict from the heart, nor grieve the children of men." Lam. iii. 33, margin. "He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is His mercy toward them that fear Him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him. For He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust." Ps. ciii. 10-14. His mercy is great above the greatness of the heavens. Ps. cviii. 4.

"Gracious" - extending favour. And that without measure; for it is written: "Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." Eph. iv. 7. And the measure of the gift of Christ is but the measure of "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." And this is the measure of the full and free favour that God has extended to every soul on this earth, just where he is, and just as he is. And this boundless grace to every one, brings salvation to every one in the same measure as is given the grace, which is the measure of the gift of Christ. For again it is written: "The grace of God *which bringeth salvation*, hath appeared to all men." Titus ii. 11. As the grace, the favour, of God is full and free to every one; and as this grace brings salvation; so the salvation of God is a full and free gift to every one. Though it is freely given, He will compel no one to take it. As it is freely given, it must be freely received. And the receiving of the free gift of God is the exercise of the faith which He has also freely given to every man. "For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, *it is the gift of God.*" Eph. ii. 8. "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed." Rom. iv. 16.

This is God's way of justification; by grace, through faith; and of faith, that it might be by grace. "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare *His righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past, through *the forbearance* of God." Rom. iii. 24, 25. Justification is the free gift of God through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, who is altogether the free gift of God. For "as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon *all men to justification* of life." Rom. v. 18. And the receiving of this gift of justification, this gift of righteousness, as the free gift of God which it is, this is the exercise of the faith which God has given. And this is justification, this is righteousness, *by faith*: "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference." Rom. iii. 22. The faith being the gift of God, the righteousness which it brings and which it wrought by it is the righteousness of God. And this is righteousness, justification, *by faith alone*, of which by her own boast the Catholic Church knows nothing; and in so boasting advertises her utter lack of Christianity.

True, men are to repent, and they will repent when they find God as He is in truth, as He is revealed in Jesus Christ. For "it is the goodness of God" that leads men to repentance; and repentance itself is the gift of God. Rom. ii. 4; Acts v. 31. True repentance being the gift of God, is perfect in itself, and needs no punishing of ourselves to compensate for the imperfection in it. But when the repentance is of ourselves, it has no merit that can bring to us any good, and all the punishment of ourselves that could ever be inflicted by ourselves or in ten thousand purgatories never could compensate for the imperfection of it. For it is simply impossible for any man to save himself by punishment or in any other way.

The salvation, the justification, offered to mankind by Christianity, is altogether of God by faith. The salvation, the justification, offered to mankind by the Papacy, is altogether of self by penance. The salvation offered by Christianity saves to the uttermost all who will receive it. The salvation offered by the Papacy brings

214

to utter destruction all who follow after it. And yet the professed Protestantism of to-day recognises "Christianity" in the Papacy! Than this, nothing could possibly show more plainly how completely apostate such Protestantism is, not only from true Protestantism, but also from true Christianity.

A. T. JONES.

April 11, 1895

"Catholicism vs. Christianity" *The Present Truth* 11, 15 , pp. 226, 227.

LAST week we considered the free salvation of God by the faith that is the free gift of God, the faith that works by love.

THE CATHOLIC DENIAL OF FAITH

Now of this faith it is the boast of the Catholic Church that she knows nothing. This is the very doctrine of faith, and of justification by faith, which produced the Reformation and made original, genuine Protestantism. And of this faith, and of the Reformation which was produced by it, the Catholic Church speaks thus: -

As in revolutions the leaders try to gain the people over by the bait of promised independence, so at the time of the so-called Reformation - which was a revolution against church authority and order in religion - it seems that it was the aim of the Reformers to decoy the people under the pretext of making them independent of the priests, in whose hands our Saviour has placed the administering the seven sacraments of pardon and of grace.

They began, therefore, by discarding five of these sacraments. . . . They then reduced, as it appears, to a matter of form, the two sacraments they professed to retain, namely, Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. To make up for this rejection, and enable each individual to prescribe for himself, and procure by

himself the pardon of sins and Divine grace, independently of the priests and of the sacraments, they invented an *exclusive means, never known in the church of God, and still rejected* by all the eastern churches and *by the Roman Catholics throughout the world. . . .* They have framed a new dogma of *Justification by Faith Alone, or by Faith only.*

Luther invented, as we have said, the doctrine, and was the first to affix such a meaning to the word *faith. . . .* And from that period only there existed man who saw in the word "faith," occurring so frequently in Holy Scripture, that which has never been seen by the fathers, doctors, saints, and by the whole Church of God. - *Catholic Belief, pp. 365, 366, 374.*

THE FAITH OF THE CREED

THESE extracts are enough to show, and they declare plainly enough, that the Catholic Church does indeed know nothing of the faith which is of God, and which, because it is of God, bears in itself sufficient power and merit to justify and save the sinner who will allow it to work in him the righteousness of God. What meaning then does she affix to the word "faith"? Here it is: -

These texts, all of which refer to saving faith, prove beyond a doubt that not trust in Christ for personal salvation, but the *faith of the Creed, . . .* is the faith availing for justification. - *Ib., p. 370.*

But who made the creed? - Men, and men only. Constantine was the chief agent in the making of the original Catholic creed, the Nicene Creed. Men being the sole authors of the creed, and "faith" being "the faith of the creed," it follows at once that that faith is solely of themselves, of their own manufacture, and not the gift of God at all, and is therefore not true faith at all. For the true faith, the faith that really saves, is "not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." And as men only made the Catholic creed, and as Catholic faith is only "the faith of the creed," it is as certain as anything can be that the Catholic faith is a base counterfeit that she would pass off upon all the world, and by force too, to supplant the true faith.

It is not enough, however, to say that it is a mere human invention; it comes from lower down than that. And she herself has given us the means of tracing it to its original. Here it is: -

By *faith* is not meant a trust in Christ for personal salvation, but evidently a firm belief that Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ, the Son of God, that what is related of him in the Gospel is true, and that what he taught it true. - *Ib., p. 369.*

EXAMPLES OF THIS FAITH

Now there are recorded in the Scriptures several examples of this same identical "faith" here defined. And now, as we read these examples, and have the plain word of God as to what they were who held this "faith," we can have no

difficulty in knowing the real nature and origin of the Catholic faith, "the faith of the creed."

Here is one: "And in the synagogue there was a man, which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art Thou come to destroy us? I know Thee who Thou art; the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him." Luke iv. 33-35.

Here is another: "And unclean spirits, when they saw Him, fell down before Him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. And He straitly charged them that they should not make Him known." Mark iii. 11, 12.

And here is another: "And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way. And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with Thee, Jesus, Thou Son of God? Art Thou come hither to torment us before the time?" Matt. viii. 28, 29.

And yet another: "Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth. And there were seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests, which did so. And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" Acts xix. 13-15.

In these examples there is every element of the "faith" above defined and set forth as the "saving faith" of the Catholic Church. Every one of these devils showed "evidently a firm belief," and actually proclaimed it, "that Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ, the Son of God"! And that legion of them that found a home with the hogs and set the whole two thousand of them crazy, showed also "evidently a firm belief that what is related of him in the Gospel is true." For from the beginning of the Gospel in this world it had been related of Him that He should bruise the devil's head; and it was indeed related of Him that He should destroy the devil. And that this legion of devils had "evidently a firm belief" that this is true is clearly shown by their terrified inquiry, "Art thou come hither to torment us *before the time*?" They thoroughly believed that this time of torment was coming, as it had been related; and what they feared now was that it was to befall them "before the time."

Not only do these examples supply every element of that which is authoritatively defined and set forth as Catholic "saving faith," showing it to be but the faith of the devils, but the Scripture plainly states that that is just the kind of faith that it is. Here are the words: "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; *the devils also believe*, and tremble." James ii. 19. There is the plain word of the Lord, that this "faith" that is proudly set forth as the Catholic faith is simply the faith that the devils have. And *it does not save them*. It has no power to change their lives. They are devils still. And, moreover, Jesus forbade them to preach this "faith."

TRUSTING A DEAD FAITH

THIS is precisely "the faith of the creed." It is of themselves and not of God. And being only of themselves, it is impotent to bring to them any virtue to change the life; it is powerless to work in them any good. Being incapable of working, it is a faith that is dead. And those who hold it, realising that it is lifeless and so unable to do anything for *them*, are obliged to give it the appearance of life by doing great things for *it* in the multiplication of dead works. For, works that are not of faith, that are not wrought by the faith itself, are dead works. They are worse than valueless, for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Any faith that is not able to itself to produce, to work, but works of God in him who professes it, is a dead faith. It is "the faith of the creed." It is the "faith" of the devils. It is the "faith" of the Papacy. And when such "faith" is passed off for Christianity, it is the mystery of iniquity, wherever it is found. And therefore it is that the Scripture, immediately after describing this "faith" of the devils, exclaims: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" And then cites Abraham and calls to all, "Seest thou how *faith wrought* with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?" Jas. ii. 20, 22. Thus the works by which faith was made perfect, were wrought by the faith itself. When the faith is living, the works of faith appear just as certainly as when the tree is living the fruit appears in its season.

The only thing that will be accepted in the Judgment is *works*. The only works that will be accept in the Judgment are works of *righteousness*. And the only righteousness that will be accepted or countenanced in any way whatever in the Judgment is the righteousness of *God*. And this righteousness is a free gift to men, and is wrought in man by faith alone - "even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference."

It is true that "the Church" says that "this faith," "the faith of the creed," this faith of the devils, "leads to trusting in Christ, and to all other virtues." But it is a notable fact that it has not done this for the devils. And it is just as notable and just as apparent that "this faith" has not, in all these hundreds of years, led the Catholic Church to trusting in Christ nor to any other virtues.

A. T. JONES.

April 18, 1895

"Catholicism vs. Christianity" *The Present Truth* 11, 16 , pp. 243, 244.

ROME gives an illustration to show the difference between the faith of Christ and "the faith of the creed," and here it is: -

To show the unfairness of taking the word "*faith*," occurring in the Holy Scripture, in this new Protestant sense of trust in Christ for pardon, to the exclusion of any other dispositions or means, and not in the Catholic sense of belief in revealed truths, . . . allow me to use the following illustration: Suppose a man afflicted with a grave

disease sends for a physician of repute. The physician comes and prescribes, and to inspire the patient with more confidence, tells him, "Only believe in me and you will be cured." Can we suppose that the poor sufferer, on the departure of the physician, would say: "I shall take no medicine, for the physician said: 'Only believe and you will be cured'?" This way of reasoning and acting seems impossible to be adopted in regard to the cure of the body, but respecting the cure of the soul it is an unhappy matter of fact that thousands of persons fall into this sad mistake. - *Catholic Belief*, pp. 374, 375.

Now there is not the least doubt that this statement perfectly illustrates the difference between the faith of Christ and Catholic faith, for it proceeds altogether upon the view that there is no more power or virtue in the word *of God* than there is in the word of *a man*; that the word of Christ, the heavenly Physician, has no more power to cure than has the word of an earthly physician. And that is indeed just the difference between true faith, the faith of God, and Catholic faith, "the faith of the creed."

THE FAITH A POWER TO WORK

TRUE faith finds in the word of God, the word of the heavenly Physician, the living - creative - power of God to accomplish all that that word says. When the centurion asked Jesus to cure his sick servant, Jesus said, "I will come and heal him." But the centurion said, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." And Jesus himself decided this to be "faith," and even "so great faith" as he had not found in Israel, and then said to the centurion, "Go thy way; and as *thou hast believed*, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour." Matt. viii. 5-13.

A nobleman also came to Jesus beseeching him: "Sir, come down ere my child die. Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy son liveth. And the man *believed the word* that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way." And when the man neared his home "his servants met him, and told him, saying, Thy son liveth. Then inquired he of them the hour when he began to amend. And they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him. So the father knew that it was at *the same hour in which Jesus said* unto him, *Thy son liveth*; and himself believed, and his whole house." John iv. 46-53.

This is faith, genuine faith. It finds in the word of God itself all sufficiency to accomplish all that the word expresses. And over and over again, in fact in all the cases recorded in the New Testament, it was believing the word spoken and thus receiving the power of that word to accomplish of itself the thing that was spoken - it was this faith that healed the sick, restored the palsied, made the impotent to talk, and *forgave the sinner*. This is believing God. This is faith.

But when the word of God is held to be as powerless as the word of a man; when the word of Jesus Christ is held to be as empty of healing virtue as is the word of a mere human physician; when the word of the living God is thus reduced to the level of the word of men, and to all intents and purposes is

received as the word of men, and the words of men themselves, formulated into a creed, are really put in the place of the word of God; then such belief, such faith, is only of themselves and is as powerless and as empty of saving virtue as are the men themselves. It is the same story over again, of the effort of men to save themselves by themselves from themselves. And this "faith" that is altogether from men themselves, that stands only in the words and wisdom of men, this "faith of the creed" that is identical with the "faith" of the devils - this, by her own showing, by her own boast, and by her own illustration, is the faith of the Catholic Church. Very good. We accept her showing in the case. Undoubtedly it is the truth. The illustration is perfectly satisfactory.

SELF TO WORK IT OUT

THERE is another statement that she makes which so clearly reveals again the essential nature of the "faith" which is held, and the salvation that is offered, by the Catholic Church, that it is worth quoting. Here it is: -

We seem to hear Jesus, our heavenly Physician, say: I died for all, and thereby prepared in My blood a remedy for all. If you would have the merits of My passion and death applied to you, to free your souls from sin, you must . . . believe that I am what I declare Myself to be, and believe what I teach. *Do also what I have told you to do*, and *then* you shall have the merits of My passion and death applied to you and you shall be justified.

This is in very substance, and even in terms, the old covenant. It is identical with the covenant "from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage." Gal. iv. 24. Here are the terms of the old covenant, the covenant from Sinai. "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, *if* ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, *then* ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me above all people: for all the earth is Mine; and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." "And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Ex. xix. 4-6, 8.

Their agreement to obey his voice indeed, was an agreement to keep the

244

ten commandments indeed. For when His voice was heard from Sinai the Ten Commandments alone were spoken. And of these it is written: "Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. xii. 13.

So that in substance this covenant from Sinai, just as certainly as this Catholic statement, says, I have done this great thing for you. Now, if you would have the benefit of it, believe what I teach, *do also what I have told you to do*, and *then* you shall have it and you shall be justified. And the people all said they would do it, and this, too, *with the hope of being justified*. These two statements are identical in substance and in doctrine. The thought of both is that man must *do* righteousness in order to *be* righteous, instead of first *being* righteous in order to *do* righteousness.

MEANING OF THE OLD COVENANT

IT will not do though to say that as the Lord made the statement from Sinai, therefore this statement from Rome is truth. The Lord had a purpose in this covenant from Sinai even though it did then "gender to bondage." That covenant from Sinai corresponds to Hagar in the family of Abraham. The children of that covenant, the people who entered into it, correspond to Ishmael, the child of Hagar. As Hagar was a bondswoman, so the child that was born of her was a bondchild. And thus she gendered to bondage. As Hagar represents the covenant from Sinai, and her child was a bondchild, so the covenant from Sinai gendered to bondage and the children of that covenant were bondchildren.

Moreover, Ishamael was "born after the flesh." And as Ishmael represents the children of the covenant, so they were "after the flesh" and knew only the birth of the flesh. Knowing only the birth of the flesh, and minding only the things of the flesh, they thought themselves capable of fulfilling all the righteousness of God. The Lord knew full well that they could not do it; but they did not know it, and they would not believe that they could not do it. In order to convince them that they could not do it, and enable them to see it so plainly that they themselves would confess their inability to do it, the Lord gave them a full and fair opportunity to try.

Within forty days they had fully demonstrated their utter inability to do what the Lord had told them, and what they had freely promised to do. They were in deeper bondage than ever. They were *then* willing to have the Lord deliver them from the bondage of sin to the liberty of righteousness by his own power, through His own word, in His own promise, even as He had delivered their father Abraham. In a word, they were then willing to attain to righteousness, to be justified, *by faith*, instead of trying to obtain it by works. They were willing to be children of promise, instead of children of the flesh.

Having found by this experience that "the minding of the flesh is enmity against God, and it not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," they were willing to be born again and of the Spirit of God, rather than to trust longer to the ways of the birth of the flesh. Having found that by this old and temporary covenant they were *lost*, they were willing to be saved by the new and everlasting covenant, which is this: -

"I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know Me from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."

In this covenant there is no "if." It depends not upon what we shall do, but upon what God will go "unto all and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference. For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

A WICKED PERVERSION

SUCH was the covenant from Sinai, such was its nature, and such its purpose. And that the recording of it, with the nature and experience of those who caused it to be made and who entered into it, was necessary for future ages, is demonstrated by this repetition of it in the Catholic system of "faith." That covenant was faulty, as it rested upon the promise of the people to obey God's law without faith in Jesus Christ; but this repetition of it is infinitely faulty and altogether bad, as compared with the original example. For there, although it was their own sinfulness and self-righteousness that led to the making of it, yet through the sad experience of it God would draw them away from themselves to the knowledge of Christ. While here and in this, the Papacy takes the very revelation of the Gospel of Christ itself and perverts it into the old covenant, and through this perversion draws men away from Christ to the exaltation of self. It puts the old covenant in the place of the new. It puts works in the place of faith. It puts bondage in the place of freedom. It puts ceremonies in the place of Christ. And it puts man in the place of God.

This is the Papacy, and this her doctrine of "faith." And as God said of Hagar and Ishmael in the family of Abraham, and of the covenant from Sinai and its children in the family of Israel, so He says of this same wicked thing as it would be in the family of Christianity: "Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." Gal. iv. 30.

There never was a truer description of the Papacy than that it is "a method of forgetting God, which shall pass as a method of remembering Him."
A. T. JONES.

April 25, 1895

"Reputation" *The Present Truth* 11, 17 , p. 264.

IT is character alone that is acceptable to God. No brilliancy of reputation can dazzle Him. He demands truth in the inward parts. "God looketh on the heart." And here people make a great mistake as often as in anything else. Thousands when called upon to obey the truth of God, will put first their reputation, and what they think is their influence, and will make their allegiance to God - their character - yield to these. Christ "made Himself of no reputation;" so likewise did he who was the figure of Christ, he "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt." So it will ever be. The disciple is not greater than his Lord. The people of God have ever been subject to reproach; the truth of God has always been unpopular, and men often have the opportunity to follow Christ most closely by, like Him, making themselves of "no reputation." Often it becomes necessary for us to forfeit reputation before men, that we may perfect character before God.

A. T. JONES.

May 2, 1895

"The Immaculate Conception" *The Present Truth* 11, 18 , p. 276.

THERE is a large number of Protestants as well as other non-Catholics who entertain the mistaken view that the doctrine of the immaculate conception refers to the conception of Jesus by the Virgin Mary. The truth is that it refers not to the conception of Christ by Mary, but to the conception of Mary herself by her mother. The official and "infallible" doctrine of the immaculate conception as solemnly defined as an article of faith by Pope Pius IX., speaking *ex cathedra*, on the 8th of December, 1854, is as follows: -

By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, we declare, pronounce, and define, that the doctrine which holds that the most blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, by a special grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved free from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and, therefore, is to be firmly and steadfastly believed by all the faithful.

Wherefore if any shall presume, which may God avert, to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us, let them know, and moreover understand, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have made shipwreck as regards the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the church. - *Catholic Belief*, p. 214.

WHAT THE DOGMA MEANS

IN these days of the general acceptance of Catholicism as Christianity, and the compromises with the Catholic Church, and apologies for her, it is well that we should study such things as this, that we may know for ourselves what is their real effect upon the doctrine of Christ, and what their consequences in those who accept the dogma. The first consequence of it is to make the Virgin Mary, if not actually divine, then the nearest to it of any creature in the universe, and this, too, in her human nature. In proof of this we have the following statements of Catholic fathers and saints: -

The ancient writer of "De Nativitate Christi," found in St. Cyprian's works, says: Because (Mary) being "very different from the rest of mankind's human nature, but not sin, communicated itself to her."

Theodoret, a father who lived in the fifth century, says that Mary "surpassed by far the cherubim and seraphim in purity."

In the Greek liturgy of St. Chrysostom, a father of the fourth century . . . the following words are directed to be chanted by the choir during the canon of the mass: "It is truly meet that we should

praise thee, O mother of God, . . . thou art the mother of our God, to be venerated in preference to the cherubim; thou art beyond comparison more glorious than the seraphim.'

"Theodore, patriarch of Jerusalem, said in the second council of Nice, that Mary 'is truly the mother of God, and virgin before and after child-birth; and she was created in a condition more sublime and glorious than that of all natures, whether intellectual or corporeal.'" - *Id. pp. 216, 217.*

This then puts the nature of Mary infinitely beyond any real likeness or relationship to mankind.

Having this clearly in mind, let us follow to the next step. And here it is in the words of Cardinal Gibbons: -

We affirm that the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Word of God, who, in his Divine nature is, from all eternity, begotten of the Father, consubstantial with him, was in the fulness of time again begotten, by being born of the Virgin, thus being to himself from her maternal womb, a human nature of *the same substance with hers.*

As far as the sublime mystery of the incarnation can be reflected in the natural order, the Blessed Virgin, under the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, by communicating to the Second Person of the unalterable Trinity, as mothers do, a true human nature *of the same substance with her own*, is thereby verily and truly his mother. - *Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 198, 199.*

Now put these two things together. First, we have the nature of Mary defined as being but only "very different from the rest of mankind," but "more sublime and glorious than *all natures*;" thus putting her infinitely beyond any real likeness or relationship to mankind as we really are.

Next, we have Jesus described as taking from her a human nature of the *same substance* as hers.

ROBS THE WORLD OF A SAVIOUR

IT therefore follows, as certainly as that two and two make four, that in his human nature the Lord Jesus is "very different" from mankind, is further from us than are the cherubim and the seraphim, and is infinitely beyond any real likeness or relationship to us as we really are in this world. And in this it follows also that the dogma of the immaculate conception puts Jesus Christ infinitely beyond the reach of mankind as far beyond our reach indeed as though he had never offered himself at all. Thus completely does the doctrine of the immaculate conception rob the world of Jesus Christ, the Saviour, to just the extent that the doctrine is received.

We know the answer that "the Church" makes to this - that Mary and Joseph especially, and all the other saints, intercede with him for those who would have His help, and that through these He is enabled to reach mankind though He Himself is so far beyond us. But this is as great a fraud as is all the rest of the

scheme. For the Virgin Mary and Joseph and all the rest of the saints *are dead*, and cannot intercede for anybody. For the word of God says plainly that "the dead know not anything." Eccl. ix. 5. And "in death there is no remembrance of Thee." Ps. vi. 5. And Jesus said to His disciples all, "Whither I go ye can not come." John xiii. 33.

Thus with Mary and Joseph and the other saints *all dead*, and consequently unable to intercede for anybody, the fact is doubly demonstrated that the dogma of the immaculate conception puts Jesus Christ infinitely beyond the reach of mankind, and robs the world of the Saviour to the extent that that dogma is received.

The truth is, that the Lord Jesus, in His human nature, was made *lower* than the angels, and took our nature of flesh and blood just as it is, with all its infirmities. The Scriptures are as plain as anything can be on this point, and are worthy to be set down here against this papal invention. Having found that the Papacy puts Christ as *far away* from men as possible, we will next consider how *near* to men He really is.

A. T. JONES.

May 9, 1895

"The Immaculate Conception" *The Present Truth* 11, 19 , pp. 291, 292.

IN our study of this Catholic dogma last week we saw how completely it puts Jesus Christ away from men, by giving Mary a nature infinitely beyond any likeness or relationship to mankind, and teaching that from her Jesus Christ received the same nature, totally unlike mankind. This is absolutely the opposite of truth.

MADE LOWER THAN ANGELS

IN the first chapter of Hebrews, Jesus, the Son of God, is presented in his divine nature as equal with God and as God indeed, the Creator and Upholder of all things as "so much better than the angels," that He has "a more excellent name than they," and as so much higher than the angels that "all the angels of God worship Him." In the second chapter of the same book, He is presented in His human nature as "lower than the angels," even as man himself. Thus it is written: -

"One in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou *madest him a little lower than the angels*; thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. *But we see Jesus*, who was made a little *lower than the angels*."

Thus, instead of His human nature being "beyond comparison" higher than angels, cherubim, and seraphim, it was made as much lower than they as man himself was made lower.

Nor is it only as man was lower than the angels *before he sinned*. It was *not* as man was lower than the angels in his *sinless* nature, that Jesus was made lower than the angels in His human nature; but as man was lower than the angels in his *sinful* nature, as he is since he by sin became subject to suffering and death. For so it is written: "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for *the suffering of death*. . . . *that He* by the grace of God *should taste death for every man*. For it became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect *through sufferings*."

PARTOOK OF OUR NATURE

THUS, as man in his sinless human nature was made a little lower than the angels, and then by sin stepped still lower to suffering and death; even so Jesus, that He might bring him back to the glory of God, in His love followed him down even here, partakes of his nature as it is, suffers with him, and even dies *with* him as well as *for* him in his *sinful human nature*. For "He was numbered with the transgressors" - He died as a malefactor between two malefactors. This is love. This is Jesus our *Saviour*, for he comes to us where we are, that He may reach us and lift us up from ourselves unto God.

Yet this blessed saving truth is even more plainly stated, thus: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also Himself likewise took part of the same." He, in His human nature, took the same flesh and blood that we have. All the words that could be used to make this plain and positive are here put together in a single sentence. See: The children are partakers of flesh and blood. Because of this *He* took part of the same. But that is not all: He *also* took part of the same flesh and blood as the children have. Nor is this all: He also *Himself* took part of the same flesh and blood as we. Nor yet is this all: He also Himself *likewise* took part of the same flesh and blood as man.

Thus the Spirit of inspiration so much desires that this truth shall be made plain and emphatic that He is not content to use any fewer than all the words that could be used in the telling of it. And therefore it is declared that just as, and just as certainly as, the children of men are partakers of flesh and blood, *He also, Himself, likewise*, took part of the same flesh and blood as we have in the bondage of sin and the fear of death. For He took this same flesh and blood that we have, in order "that through death He might . . . deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

BLOOD-RELATIONSHIP

THEREFORE, instead of its being true that Jesus in His human nature is so far away from men, as they really are, that he has no real likeness nor relationship to us, it is true that He is in very deed our kin in flesh and blood

relation - even our brother in blood-relationship. For it is written: "Both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause He is *not ashamed to call them brethren*, saying, I will declare they name unto My brethren."

This great truth of the blood-relationship between our Redeemer and ourselves is clearly taught also in the Gospel in Leviticus. There was the law of redemption of men and their inheritance. When any one of the children of Israel had lost his inheritance, or himself had been brought into bondage, there was redemption provided. If he were able of himself to redeem himself or his inheritance, he could do it. But if he were not able of himself to redeem, then the right of redemption fell to his nearest of kin in blood-relationship. It fell not merely to *one* who was *near* of kin among his brethren, but to *the* one who was *nearest* of kin who was able. Lev. xxv. 24-28, 47-49; Ruth ii. 20; iii. 12, 13; iv. 1-12.

Thus there has been taught through these ages the very truth which we have found taught here in the second chapter of Hebrews: the truth that man has lost his inheritance and is himself also in bondage. And as he himself can not redeem himself nor his inheritance, the right of redemption falls to the nearest of kin who is able.

292

And Jesus Christ is the only one in all the universe who is able. He must also be, not only *near* of kin, but the *nearest* of kin; and the nearest of kin by blood-relationship. And therefore He took our very flesh and blood, and so became our nearest of kin. And so also, instead of being farther away from us than are the angels and cherubim and seraphim, He is the very nearest to us of all persons in the universe.

He is so near to us that He is actually one with us. For so it is written: "Both He which sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are *all of one*." And He and we being one, He being one with mankind, it is impossible to have a mediator between Him and men, because He and mankind are one and "a mediator is not a mediator of one." Gal. iii. 20. And as certainly as Jesus Christ is one with mankind and "a mediator is not a mediator of one," so certainly this truth at once annihilates the "intercessions" of all the Catholic saints in the calendar even though they were all alive and in heaven instead of being all dead.

HE FEELS OUR INFIRMITIES

BUT the Scripture does not stop even yet with the statement of this all-important truth. It says further: "For verily He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted." "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Heb. iv. 15. Being made in His human nature, in all things like us we are, He could be, and was, tempted in all points like as we are.

As in His human nature He is one with us, and as "Himself took our infirmities" (Matt. viii. 17), so He could be "touched with the *feeling* of our infirmities." He felt just as we feel and knows all about it, and so can help and save to the uttermost all who will receive Him. As in His flesh, and as in Himself in the flesh, He was as weak as we are, and of Himself could "do nothing" (John v. 31), when He "bore our griefs and carried our sorrows" (Isa. liii. 4), and was tempted as we are, feeling as we feel, by His divine faith He conquered all by the power of God which that faith brought to Him and which in our flesh He has brought to us.

IMMANUEL: GOD WITH US

AND thus "what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the *likeness* of *sinful* flesh." did. The law could not bring us to God nor could it find in the flesh the righteousness which it must have, because the flesh had fallen away from God and could not reach him again. But though the sinful flesh could not reach God, yet God in his eternal power and infinite mercy could reach sinful flesh. And so "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us . . . full of grace and truth." "God was manifest in the flesh," even "sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. viii. 3, 4.

Oh! His name is called Immanuel, which is "God with us"! Not God with *Him* only, but God with *us*. God was with *Him* in eternity, and could have been with Him even though He had not given Himself for us. But man through sin became without God, and God wanted to be again with us. Therefore Jesus became us, that God with Him might be God with *us*. And that is His name because that is what He is.

Therefore and finally, as certainly as in His human nature, Jesus Christ is one with us, and as certainly as God with Him is God with us, so certainly the nature of the Virgin Mary was just like that of all the rest of us, and so certainly the dogma of the immaculate conception is an absolute falsehood.

Oh, then, receive Him. No ladder is required to reach Him, for He Himself is the Ladder which reaches from the earth where we are, to the highest heaven. No bridge is needed. There is no abyss between us and Him, for He is of ourselves *as we are* on the earth. And "with His Divine arm He grasps the throne of God, and with His long human arm He gathers the sinful, suffering human race to His great heart of love," that we may be one with God.

Confess to Him your sins; He will never take advantage of you. Tell him your griefs; He has felt the same and can relieve you. Pour out to Him your sorrows; "He hath carried our sorrows," He was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" He will comfort you with the comfort of God.

A. T. JONES.

May 30, 1895

"Seeing the Invisible" *The Present Truth* 11, 22 , pp. 341, 342.

THE Christian is to see, and does see, the invisible. He is to "look at the things that are not seen" (2 Cor. iv. 19), and he is to see - *he can see* - the things that he looks at.

"The things that are not seen are eternal;" and the things that are eternal are the things of God; for He is "the King, *eternal*, immortal, *invisible*, the only wise God," and "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are *clearly seen*" (Rom. 1:20), though not with the natural eyes - the eyes of this world.

There are things even of the natural order, which are invisible to the natural eyes unaided. There are innumerable worlds that cannot be seen at all - that are invisible - without the telescope; there are the countless forms of life in this world of ours that are invisible without the microscope. And all men are eager, and delighted, to use either the telescope or the microscope whenever it is possible, in order that they may see these things that are otherwise invisible. And the invisible things even of the natural order awake more interest, and engage more profound study than do the visible things.

Why should not then the invisible things of the spiritual order awake interest and arouse study as well as the invisible things of the natural order? It may be answered that they do. Yes, that is true; but the interest shown, and the study carried on, in this line, is so largely done in a defective way, that, practically, the effort amounts to very little, and brings no benefit to the greater part of mankind.

THE FATAL DEFECT

THE one grand defect, and, indeed, a fatal one, in the efforts of the greatest part of mankind to see the invisible things of the spiritual order, the invisible things of God, has always been that it is attempted to be done *in the natural way* and with *the natural faculties*. Because of this the gods of the heathen have always been but the reflection of the natural character of the worshipers, and even then must needs be represented before the devotee in some shape visible to the natural eye, whether it be in the form of the heavenly bodies, or of sticks or stones, or of graven or molten images, or of pictures. So that all false worship - all idolatry - is but the result of effort to grasp the spiritual in the natural way, to comprehend spiritual things with the natural faculties.

But it is eternally true that "spiritual things are *spiritually* discerned." 1 Cor. ii. 9-14. The truly spiritual things - the things of God - it is impossible truly to discern in any other than the truly spiritual way. For "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." John iv. 24. It is only by the Spirit of God that the things of God can be discerned. For, "as it is written: Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things that God hath prepared for them that love Him. But *God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit*; for the Spirit searcheth all things; yea, the deep things of God." 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10.

Thus it is evident that God has put within the reach of man the means by which he can see "the invisible things of him." And the Spirit of God and the revelation which He by that Spirit has given, are the means by which men may know the things of God and may see the invisible things of Him. For, again it is written: "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God *knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God*. Now we have received, *not the spirit of the world*, but the Spirit which is of God; *that we might know the things* that are freely given to us of God." 1 Cor. ii. 11, 12.

Although it be eternally true that

342

spiritual things are only spiritually discerned; and although it be evident that it is by the Spirit of God alone that the things of God are known; yet it is also true that even this good Spirit men desire to see - they desire that it shall be *visible* - before they will receive it, even as it is written: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, *whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not*, neither knoweth Him." John xiv. 16, 17. Thus the sole means by which the things of God can be made known to the world - even this the world insists shall be discerned and known in the worldly way. But this will never do. This the Lord could never, by any means, allow in any degree.

GOD'S WAY MUST STAND

GOD can never accommodate himself nor his ways to the ways of this world. This world is wrong, and all its ways are wrong ways. And for the Lord to accommodate himself in anything to the ways of this world, would be only to confirm the world in its wrong ways. If the world could see God, or the things of God, *with worldly eyes*, and could know God or the things of God with worldly knowledge, this would at once reduce God to the level of this world, and all the things of God to the level of the things of this world. And this would be only to confirm, by the sanction of God, this world forever in its own ways as they are, making the ways of this world the ways of God, and making iniquity and transgression and sin eternal.

But God wants to turn this world from its own ways unto Himself, that it may know Him as he is. He wants to lift this world up to Himself and to His ways, instead of allowing the world to bring Him down to its own level and to confirm it in its own wickedness. And in order that this may be accomplished, He must, in the very nature of things, require that the world shall see with other than worldly eyes, and know with other than worldly knowledge. The world must forsake all worldly elements and all worldly methods, and accept and use exclusively the means which God has supplied, or else it can never see God as He is in truth.

And whosoever will do this will see Him as He is, and everywhere, and to all eternity. He who would refuse the use of the telescope and the microscope, the means by which alone he can see the invisible things of the natural order, might strain his eyes till the faculty of sight should be lost, in an effort to see those things, *and all in vain*; for without these instruments he simply *cannot* see the

things which he would see. Even so the things of God can no man see, who refuses to use the means which God has supplied for this purpose. Without the instruments which God has supplied, man may strain all his powers to the breaking point in the effort to see God as he is in truth *and all in vain*; without these he simply *cannot* see him. And this, not because God has arbitrarily fixed it so that he *shall not* see Him if He does not do so, and so, and simply and only because that if he will not use the instruments by which alone the invisible things of God may be seen, literally he *cannot* see them. "Except a man be born again [born *from above*, margin] he *cannot* see the kingdom of God." John iii. 3.

What, then, are the instruments by which men may see the invisible things of God? We shall answer this next week. A. T. JONES.

June 6, 1895

**"Seeing the Invisible. How Ritualism Denies Faith" *The Present Truth*
11, 23 , pp. 355, 356.**

HOW RITUALISM DENIES FAITH

LAST week we studied scriptures showing that if men are to see the things of God they must use the instruments which God has provided for seeing the invisible.

We have read that "the Comforter," "the Spirit of Truth," "which is the Holy Ghost," the world cannot receive "because it *seeth Him not*, neither knoweth Him." And further, on this it is written that "we receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith*." Gal. 3:14. That is to say, therefore, not only that the world cannot receive the Spirit of God because it *seeth Him not*, but that the world *sees Him not* because it does not believe. Instead of *believing*, in order that it may *see*, the world wants to see in order that it may *believe*. But to those who believe and therefore do receive Him, Jesus says, "Ye *know Him*, for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you;" and, "Ye *see Me*;" and "I will manifest Myself to him." So that it is literally true that *by faith* we know God and the things of God, and *see* the invisible things of God.

BY FAITH WE SEE

IT was "by faith" that Moses endured "as seeing Him who is invisible." Heb. xi. 27. It is written that "the pure in heart shall see God;" and He purifies the heart "by faith" (Acts xv. 9); and therefore it is by faith that men see Him who is "the invisible God." Col. i. 15. And in order that all men may see "the invisible things of Him," and "Him who is invisible," "God hath dealt to *every man the measure of faith*." Rom. xii. 3. Faith is "the gift of God." Eph. ii. 8.

It is not the gift of God in the sense that the natural faculties, as reason, might, hearing, etc., are the gifts of God, so that it should be of ourselves. It is the gift of God in the sense that it is from above and beyond ourselves, a

supernatural faculty bestowed since sin entered, and acting only at the free choice of the individual himself. "For by grace are ye saved, *through faith*, and *that not of yourselves*; it is the gift of God." "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. x. 17); and the word of God is able to make things to be seen which before did not appear, and which indeed were not; so that faith, acting through the word of God, sees in very truth, and sees clearly, the invisible things of God.

HOW TRUE FAITH ACTS

TRUE faith, the faith that is the gift of God, the faith of which Christ is the Author, the faith of which the Word of God is the channel - this faith hears the Word of God and depends upon the Divine power of that word itself to accomplish the thing which that word says. For when the centurion came to Jesus asking that his servant should be healed, he said to the Lord, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." Thus he expected the word of the Lord itself to accomplish that which it said when the Lord should but speak the word. And this the Lord pronounced not only "faith" but "great faith:" even such as He had not found in Israel. And this, too, in the face of the fact that the Scripture, upon the knowledge of which Israel was greatly priding itself, had long before plainly stated this very thing, in these words: "As the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; *so shall my word be* that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but *it shall accomplish that which I please*." Isa. lv. 10, 11.

356

To expect the word of God to do the thing which that word says, and to depend wholly upon that word itself to do it, this the Lord Jesus pronounces faith. This is true faith. This is the faith by which men can see the invisible thing of God as certainly and as easily as by the telescope and the microscope they can see the invisible things of the natural order. This is the faith *which works* by love purifies the heart, so that he who is thus "pure in heart shall see God," *invisible though He be*. For this is the faith by which he who exercises it sees the invisible. This is the faith which, working through the word of God, accomplishes the new birth (1 Peter i. 23) by which a man is enabled to see the kingdom of God, which "except a man be born again *he cannot see*" at all.

This is why it is that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Faith is of God, and whatsoever it works is the work of God; while whatsoever is not of faith is not of God, but is of the world. And all that is in the world is not of the Father, but is of the world. 1 John ii. 16. Whatsoever is not of faith is of the world, is of the nature of the world, and is of the way of the world, and perverts the way of God to the ways of the world, and demands that God shall accommodate himself to the world and accept a worship that is altogether of the nature and spirit of this world.

CATHOLICISM DEMANDS THE VISIBLE

NO STRONGER proof, therefore, could possibly be given, of the absolute falsity, the sheer worldliness, and the utter naturalness, of any system of religion, than that it must needs avail itself of *visible* representations of the object of its worship. And of all the systems of religion that are in the world, there is no one which insists more upon the *visible* and upon seeing the visible than does the Roman Catholic system. It is essential to that system that it shall have "*a visible head.*" It must needs have a *visible* kingdom. It must have a *visible* sacrifice. Professing to worship the Crucified One, the Catholic Church must have *visible* "crucifix" by which to do it. Professing to glory in the cross of Christ, she must have a multitude of *visible* crosses of her own by which to do it. There must be a *visible* interpreter of the Scriptures. And for all the worshippers according to that system, there must be *visible* representations of the object worshiped, in the shape of images and pictures. Throughout the whole system the one chief essential is the seeing of the *visible*.

In an encyclical of Leo XIII., "On the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin," describing the purpose of the rosary, that is, of the beads which are used by Catholics in their prayers, he says: "The rosary is arranged not for the consideration of dogmas of faith and questions of doctrine, but rather for putting forth facts to be perceived *by the eyes* and treasured up in the memory." Even though it be recognised that the invisible exists and is to be worshipped, yet it can be comprehended and worshipped only through, and by the aid of, *the visible*. This is the characteristic of all heathenism and of all idolatry. And this is only to say that by this characteristic the Catholic system of religion is demonstrated to be essentially heathenish and idolatrous.

WHAT RITUALISM SIGNIFIES

WE know full well of the plea that is made in defence of the use of images, pictures, etc., in the worship of the Roman Catholic Church; that is, that "the honour which is given them is referred to the originals which they represent, so that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads or kneel, we adore Christ and venerate His saints, whose likeness they represent;" and "the bowing before an image outside of us is no more to be reprehended than the worshipping before and internal image in our own minds; for the external image does but serve the purpose of expressing visibly that which is internal." - *Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 285, 287. But if they only saw Him whom they profess to worship, they would not need any image of Him, either external or internal, nor any representation of Him either visible or otherwise. They could then be true worshippers, worshipping Him who is invisible, in spirit and in truth.

This plea that is made in justification of the use of images and of the visible, is in itself the greatest condemnation of the use of images and of the whole system of Roman Catholicism; for it is a confession of inability to see the invisible, and therefore a confession that the whole system is destitute of true faith and a stranger to the new birth, and altogether without God.

The Catholic system being confessedly unable to see the invisible, is clearly not of faith. And as whatsoever is not of faith is sin, it is perfectly clear that the

whole Catholic system is a system of sin. And the professed Protestantism that panders to it, that compromises with it, that courts it, and that is "wheeling into line with it," is simply like unto it. The one is "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," "the mystery of iniquity," "the beast;" and the other is "the image" of it.
A. T. JONES.

June 20, 1895

"The Papacy and Civilisation" *The Present Truth* 11, 25 , p. 390.

INFLUENCE IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

IT is claimed and urged on behalf of the Papacy that she is the best promoter of a proper and "Christian" civilisation.

As the basis and sufficient proof that the Papacy is the source and stay of a "Christian" civilisation, there is presented by both Catholics and "Protestants," and not less by "Protestants" than by Catholics, the stupendous "fact" that she civilised the barbarians of the fifth century and the middle ages, who annihilated the Roman Empire. This theory the late Dr. Philip Schaff constantly affirmed, though it clearly contradicted and undisputed and indisputable facts of the history which he himself had written. The truth is that there never was a clearer

HISTORICAL FRAUD

put forth than this claim that the Papacy civilised the barbarians who destroyed the Roman Empire, and occupied Western Europe in the middle ages.

It must not be forgotten that the Papacy had possession of the Roman Empire itself, with all the power of the empire at her command, for nearly a hundred years before the barbarians ever entered the Western Empire with any intention to stay, and more than a hundred years before she had any chance to "civilise" them. It must be remembered, too, that her alliance with the empire, and her securing possession of it, were for the express purpose of assuring to it the benefits of a "Christian civilisation" and consequent "salvation." Surely here was ample time to test her powers in this direction, before she was ever called upon to "civilise" the barbarians.

What, then, was the result? It was this: When, by the union of Church and State, church membership became a qualification for political as well as every other kind of preferment, hypocrisy became more prevalent than ever before. This was bad enough in itself, yet the hypocrisy was voluntary; but when through the agency of her Sunday laws and by the ministration of Theodosius the church received control of the civil power to compel all without distinction, who were not Catholics, to act as though they were,

HYPOCRISY WAS MADE COMPULSORY

and every person who was not voluntarily a church member was compelled either to be a hypocrite or a rebel. In addition to this, those who were of the church indeed, through the endless succession of controversies and church council, were forever establishing, changing, and re-establishing the faith; and as all were required to change or revise their faith according as the councils decreed, all moral and spiritual integrity was destroyed. Hypocrisy became a habit, dissimulation and fraud a necessity of life; and the very moral fiber of men and of society was vitiated.

All the corruptions that had characterised the earlier Rome was thus reproduced and perpetuated *under a form of godliness* in this so-called Christian Rome, the Rome of the fifth century. Bower says of this time: -

The primitive rigour of discipline and manners was utterly neglected and forgotten by the ecclesiastics of Rome. The most exorbitant luxury, with all the vices attending it, was introduced among them, and the most scandalous and unchristian arts of acquiring wealth universally practised. They seem to have rivaled in riotous living the greatest epicures of Pagan Rome when luxury was there at the highest pitch. For Jerome, who was an eyewitness of what he writ, reproaches the Roman clergy with the same excesses which the poet Juvenal so severely censured in the Roman nobility under the reign of Domitian.

The only possible result of such a course was constantly to increase unto more ungodliness, to undermine every principle of the foundation of society, and really to

HASTEN THE DESTURCTION

of the empire. The pagan delusions, the pagan superstitions, and the pagan vices that had been adopted and brought into the Catholic Church by her apostasy and clothed with a form of godliness, wrought such infinite corruption that the society of which it was the greater part could no longer exist. It must inevitably fall by the weight of its own corruption, if from nothing else.

Dr. Schaff says in his "History of the Christian Church:" -

The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theatre going, intemperance, lewdness; in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman Empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude, but simple and morally vigorous, barbarians.

And onward those barbarians came, swiftly and in multitudes. They came, a host, wild and savage, it is true; but whose social habits were so far above those of the people which they destroyed, that, savage as they were caused fairly to blush at the shameful corruptions which they found in this so-called Christian society of Rome.

A writer who lived at the time of the barbarian invasions, and who wrote as a Christian, Salvian, gives the following evidence as to the condition of things: -

"The church, which ought everywhere to propitiate God, what does she but provoke Him to anger? How many may one meet, even in the church, who are not still drunkards, or debauchees, or adulterers, or fornicators, or robbers, or murderers, or the like, or all these at once, without end? It is even a sort of holiness among Christian people to be less vicious." From the public worship of God, and almost during it, they pass to deeds of shame. Scarce a rich man but would commit murder and fornication. We have lost the whole power of Christianity, and offend God the more, that we sin as Christians. We are worse than the barbarians and heathen. If the Saxon is wild, the Frank faithless, the Goth inhuman, the Alanian drunken, the Hun licentious, they are, by reason of their ignorance, far less punishable than we, who, knowing the commandments of God, commit all these crimes.

And Dr. Schaff remarks of this very period, and the consequences of this effort of the Papacy at the civilisation of the Roman Empire: "Nothing but the Divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian but essentially heathen world, could open the way for the moral regeneration of society." This is precisely how the Papacy gave "Christian civilisation" and "salvation" to the Roman Empire, when she held full and undisputed possession of it for more than a hundred years. And her work of civilising the barbarians (which we shall consider another week) was after precisely the same order. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, when she assures us that the Catholic Church "is in this world the one thing that never changes."

A. T. JONES.

June 27, 1895

"The Papacy and Civilisation" *The Present Truth* 11, 26 , pp. 405, 406.

LAST week, in considering the claims of the Papacy to having been the great civilising force in early times, we showed its utter failure to do anything for the Roman Empire. It had so corrupted society that when the empire was overturned by the barbarians the victors were shocked at the corruptions which they found. The influence of the Papacy on the barbarians was after the same order.

THE FIRST "CONVERTS"

THE Burgundians were the first of the barbarian nations to be "converted" to the Catholic Church; and through them she "converted" the Franks. An account of this matter will illustrate the powers and efficiency of the Papacy in the work of civilising the barbarians.

The Burgundians were settled in that part of Gaul which now forms Western Switzerland and that part of France which is now the province and district of Burgundy. As early as A.D. 430, the Huns, making inroads into Gaul, severely

afflicted the Burgundians, who, finding impotent the power of their own god, determined to try the Catholic god. They therefore sent representatives to a neighbouring city in Gaul, requesting the Catholic bishop to receive them. The bishop had them fast for a week, during which time he catechised them, and then baptized them. Soon afterward the Burgundians found the Huns without a leader, and, suddenly falling upon them at the disadvantage, confirmed their conversion by the slaughter of ten thousand of the enemy. Thereupon the whole nation embraced the Catholic religion "with fiery zeal." Afterward, however, when about the fall of the empire, the Visigoths asserted their dominion over all Spain, and the greater part of Gaul, and over the Burgundians too, they deserted the Catholic Church, and adopted the Arian faith.

HOW THE FRANKS WERE WON

YET Clotilda, a niece of the Burgundian king, was educated in the profession of the Catholic faith. She married Clovis, the pagan king of the pagan Franks, and strongly persuaded him to become a Catholic. All her pleadings were in vain, however, till A.D. 496, when, in a great battle with the Alemanni, the Franks were getting the worst of the conflict, in the midst of the battle Clovis vowed that if the victory could be theirs, he would become a Catholic. The tide of battle turned; the victory was won, and Clovis was a Catholic. Clotilda hurried away a messenger with the glad news to the Bishop of Rheims, who came to baptize the new convert.

But after the battle was over, and the dangerous crisis was past, Clovis was not certain whether he wanted to be a Catholic. He must consult his warriors. He did so, and they signified their readiness to adopt the same religion as their king. He then declared that he was convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion, and the "new Constantine" was baptized Christmas Day, A.D. 496. The Pope sent Clovis a letter congratulating him on his conversion. The Bishop of Vienne also sent a letter to the new convert, in which he prophesied that the faith of Clovis would be a surety of the victory of the Catholic religion; and he, with every other Catholic in Christendom, was ready to his utmost to see that the prophecy was fulfilled.

WAR BY THE BISHOP'S BLESSINGS

THE Catholics in all the neighbouring countries longed and prayed and conspired that Clovis might deliver them from the rule of Arian monarchs; and in the nature of the case, war soon followed. Burgundy was the first country invaded. Before the war

406

actually began, however, by the advice of the bishop of Rheims, a synod of the orthodox bishops met at Lyons; then with the Bishop of Vienne at their head, they visited the king of the Burgundians, and proposed that he call the Arian bishops together, and allow a conference to be held, as they were prepared to prove that the Arians were in error. To their proposal the king replied, "If yours be the true

doctrine, why do you not prevent the king of the Franks from waging an unjust war against me, and from caballing with my enemies against me? There is no true Christian faith where there is rapacious covetousness for the possessions of others, and thirst for blood. Let him show forth his faith by his good works."

The Bishop of Vienne dodged this pointed question, and replied, "We are ignorant of the motives and intentions of the king of the Franks; but we are taught by the Scripture that the kingdoms which abandon the Divine law are frequently subverted: and that enemies will arise on every side against those who have made God their enemy. Return with thy people to the law of God, and He will give peace and security to thy dominions." War followed, and the Burgundian dominions were made subject to the rule of Clovis, A.D. 500.

The Visigoths possessed all the southwestern portion of Gaul. They, too, were Arians; and the mutual conspiracy of the Catholics in the Gothic dominions, and the crusade of the Franks from the side of Clovis, soon brought on another holy war. At the assembly of princes and warriors at Paris, A.D. 508, Clovis complained, "It grieves me to see that the Arians still possess the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God; and, having vanquished the heretics, we will possess and divide their fertile province." Clotilda added her pious exhortation to the effect "that doubtless the Lord would more readily lend His aid if some gift were made;" and in response, Clovis seized his battle-ax and threw it as far as he could, and as it went whirling through the air, he exclaimed, "There, on that spot where my Francesca shall fall, will I erect a church in honor of the holy apostles."

THE CHURCH ENCOURAGED SAVAGERY

WAR was declared; and as Clovis marched on his way, he passed through Tours, and turned aside to consult the shrine of St. Martin of Tours, for an omen. "His messengers were instructed to remark the words of the psalm which should happen to be chanted at the precise moment when they entered the church." And the oracular clergy took care that the words which he should "happen" to hear at that moment - uttered not in Latin, but in language which Clovis understood - should be the following from Psalm xviii: "Thou hast girded me, O Lord, with strength unto the battle; thou hast subdued unto me those who rose up against me. Thou hast given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me." The oracle was satisfactory, and in the event was completely successful. "The Visigothic kingdom was wasted and subdued by the remorseless sword of the Franks."

Nor was the religious zeal of Clovis confined to the overthrow of the Arians. There were two bodies of the Franks, the Salians and the Ripuarians. Clovis was king of the Salians, Sigebert of the Ripuarians. Clovis determined to be king of all; he therefore prompted the son of Sigebert to assassinate his father, with the promise that the son should peaceably succeed Sigebert on the throne; but as soon as the murder was committed, Clovis commanded the murderer to be murdered, and then in a full parliament of the whole people of the Franks, he solemnly vowed that he had had nothing to do with the murder of either the father or

the son; and upon this, as there was no heir, Clovis was raised upon a shield, and proclaimed king of the Ripuarian Franks; - all of which, Gregory, Bishop of Tours, commended as the will of God, saying of Clovis that "God thus daily prostrated his enemies under his hands, and enlarged his kingdom, because he walked before Him with an upright heart, and did that which was well pleasing in his sight."

CATHOLICISM THE CORRUPTER OF THE BARBARIANS

THUS was the bloody course of Clovis glorified by the Catholic writers, as the triumph of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity over Arianism. When such actions as these were so lauded by the clergy as the pious acts of orthodox Catholics, it is certain that the clergy themselves were no better than were the bloody objects of their praise. Under the influence of such ecclesiastics, the condition of the barbarians after their so-called conversion, could not possibly be better, even if it were not worse than before. To be converted to the principles and precepts of such clergy was only the more deeply to be damned.

Into the "converted" barbarians, the Catholic system instilled all of its superstition, and its bigoted hatred of heretics and unbelievers. It thus destroyed what of generosity still remained in their minds while it only intensified their native ferocity; and the shameful licentiousness of the papal system likewise corrupted the purity, and the native respect for women and marriage which had always been a noble characteristic of the German nations.

In proof of this it is necessary only to touch upon the condition of Catholic France under Clovis and his successors.

Dean Milman says in his "History of Latin Christianity:" -

It is difficult to conceive a more dark and odious state of society than that of France under her Merovingian kings, the descendants of Clovis, as described by Gregory of Tours. . . . Throughout, assassinations, parricides, and fratricides intermingle with adulteries and rapes.

The cruelty might seem the mere inevitable result of this violent and unnatural fusion; but the extent to which this cruelty spreads throughout the whole society almost surpasses belief. That king Chlotaire should burn alive his rebellious son with his wife and daughter, is fearful enough; but we are astounded, even in these times, that a bishop of Tours should burn a man alive to obtain the deeds of an estate which he coveted. Fredegonde sends two murderers to assassinate Childebert, and these assassins are clerks. She causes the Archbishop of Rouen to be murdered while he is chanting the service in the church; and in this crime a bishop and an archdeacon are her accomplices.

This did the Papacy for the barbarians which she "converted;" and such as she could not thus *corrupt* she destroyed. And this is how she "civilised" the barbarians. The truth is the barbarians were compelled, wearily, to drag themselves toward civilisation, weighed down and retarded by this terrible

incubus. They were thus compelled to grope their way, and drag both themselves *and her* toward civilisation and Christianity instead of being helped by her in any sense. What she did with those whom she did within her own proper sphere in the way of civilisation, we shall consider further.

A. T. JONES.

July 18, 1895

"The Papacy and Civilisation. Rome and the Ostrogoths" *The Present Truth* 11, 29 , pp. 453, 454.

ROME AND THE OSTROGOTHS

A FEW weeks ago we examined on its merits, and in the light of indisputable historical facts, the claim that the Papacy is the source and stay of civilisation.

We found that in the great and leading opportunity which she first sought and found, for the establishment of a permanent "Christian civilisation," she proved herself a most deplorable failure - that, instead of purifying and enlightening anything, she corrupted and darkened everything.

We found that the claim that is made by her, and in her behalf by some "Protestants," that she civilised the barbarians who destroyed the Western Empire, is false: that instead of converting them she corrupted them; and instead of aiding them in any way, she retarded them in every way. And we promised to show now what she did for those whom she could not corrupt; and what she did within her own proper sphere in the way of helping or blessing mankind.

And assuredly the time when she had the most untrammelled opportunities to do what she could or would do for nations - that is the time which presents the fairest point from which to view her. In studying these things we are but studying the lessons which faithful history has taught - alas, however, too much in vain.

We may take as an example the history of the Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy, under Theodoric, who was, to the Catholic, and heretic.

PEACE AND SECURITY UNDER THE "HERETIC"

THEODORIC ruled Italy thirty-three years, A. D. 493-526, during which time Italy enjoyed such peace and quietness and absolute security as had never been known there before, and has never been known there since until 1870. The people of his own nation numbered two hundred thousand men, which, with the proportionate number of women and children, formed a population of nearly one million. His troops, formerly so wild and given to plunder, were restored to such discipline that in a battle in Dacia, in which they were completely victorious "the rich spoils of the enemy lay untouched at their feet," because their leader had given no signal of pillage. When such discipline prevailed in the excitement of a victory and in an enemy's country, it is easy to understand the peaceful order that

prevailed in their own new-gotten lands which the Herulians had held before them.

During the ages of violence and revolution which had passed, large tracts of land in Italy had become utterly desolate and uncultivated; almost the whole of the rest was under imperfect culture; but now "agriculture revived under the shadow of peace, and the number of husbandmen multiplied by the redemption of captives;" and Italy, which had so long been fed from other countries, now actually began to export grain. Civil order was so thoroughly maintained that "the city gates were never shut either by day or by night, and the common saying that a purse of gold might be safely left in the fields, was expressive of the conscious security of the inhabitants." - *Gibbon and Milman*. Merchants and other lovers of the blessings of peace thronged from all parts.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

BUT not alone did civil peace reign. Above all, there was perfect freedom in the exercise of religion. In fact, the measure of civil liberty and peace always depends upon that of religious liberty. Theodoric and his people were Arians, yet at the close of a fifty-years' rule of Italy, the Ostrogoths could safely challenge their enemies to present a single authentic case in which they had ever persecuted the Catholics. Even the mother of Theodoric and some of his favorite Goths had embraced the Catholic faith with perfect freedom from any molestation whatever.

The separation between Church and State, between civil and religious powers, was clear and distinct. Church property was protected in common with other property, while at the same time it was taxed in common with all other property. The clergy were protected in common with all other people, and they were likewise, in common with all other people, cited before the civil courts to answer for all civil offenses. In all ecclesiastical matters they were left entirely to themselves. Even the papal elections Theodoric left entirely to themselves, and though often solicited by both parties to interfere, he refused to have anything at all to do with them, except to keep the peace, which in fact was of itself no small task. He declined even to confirm the papal elections, an office which had been exercised by Odoacer.

GOLDEN PRINCIPLES OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT

NOR was this merely a matter of toleration; it was in genuine recognition of the rights of conscience. In a letter to the emperor Justin, A.D. 524, Theodoric announced the genuine principle of the rights of conscience, and the relationship that should exist between religion and the State, in the following words, worthy to be graven in letters of gold: -

To pretend to a dominion over the conscience, is to usurp the prerogative of God. By the nature of things, the power of sovereigns is confined to political government. They have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace. The

most dangerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief.

Similar pleas had before been made by the parties oppressed, but never before had the principle been announced by *the party in power*. The enunciation and defence of a principle by the party who holds the power to violate it, is the surest pledge that the principle is held in genuine sincerity.

The description of the state of peace and quietness in Italy above given, applies to Italy, *but not to Rome*; to the dominions of Theodoric and the Ostrogoths, but not to the city of the pope and the Catholics. How affairs

454

went amongst the subjects of the Pope, and how the Catholic Church finally compassed the destruction of the Ostrogothic power we will consider next week.

A. T. JONES.

July 25, 1895

**"The Papacy and Civilisation. A Shameful Record" *The Present Truth*
11, 30 , pp. 469, 470.**

A SHAMEFUL RECORD

IN our study of the influence of the Papacy - whether for or against civilisation - we saw last week how, under the Arian Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, Italy enjoyed civil liberty and peace. Theodoric enunciated the true principle that civil government has no right or province in the domain of religion. But this peace and these principles were limited to the dominions of the Ostrogoths; in Rome itself, the city of the Pope, it was far different, as will appear.

"ELECTING" A POPE

IN A. D. 499, there was a papal election. As there were, as usual, rival candidates - Symmachus and Laurentius - there was a civil war. "The two factions encountered with the fiercest hostility; the clergy, the Senate, and the populace were divided;" the streets of the city "ran with blood, as in the days of republican strife."

The contestants were so evenly matched, and the violent strife continued so long, that the leading men of both parties persuaded the candidates to go to Theodoric at Ravenna, and submit to his judgment their claims. Theodoric's love of justice and of the rights of the people, readily and simply enough decided that the candidate who had the most votes should be counted elected; and if the votes were evenly divided, then the candidate who had been first ordained. Symmachus secured the office.

Laurentius, though defeated at this time, did not discontinue his efforts to obtain the office. For four years he watched for opportunities, and carried on an intrigue to displace Symmachus, and in 503 brought a series of heavy charges

against him. "The accusation was brought before the judgment-seat of Theodoric, supported by certain Roman females of rank, who had been suborned, it was said, by the enemies of Symmachus. Symmachus was summoned to Ravenna and confined at Rimini," but escaped and returned to Rome. Meanwhile, Laurentius had entered the city, and when Symmachus returned, "the sanguinary tumults between the two parties broke out with greater fury;" priests were slain, monasteries set on fire, and nuns treated with the utmost indignity.

IN CATHOLIC ROME

THE Senate petitioned Theodoric to send a visitor to judge the cause of Symmachus in the crimes laid against him. The king finding that the matter was only a church quarrel, appointed one of their own number, the bishop of Alimo, who so clearly favored Laurentius that his partisanship only made the contention worse. Again Theodoric was petitioned to interfere, but he declined to assume any jurisdiction, and told them to settle it among themselves; but as there was so much disturbance of the peace, and it was so long continued, Theodoric commanded them to reach some sort of settlement that would stop their fighting, and restore public order. A council was therefore called. As Symmachus was on his way to the council, "he was attacked by the adverse party; showers of stones fell around him; many presbyters and others of his followers were severely wounded; the pontiff himself only escaped under the protection of the Gothic guard," and took refuge in the church of St. Peter. The danger to which he was then exposed he made an excuse for not appearing at the council.

The most of the council were favorable to Symmachus and to the pretensions of the bishop of Rome at this time, and therefore were glad of any excuse that would relieve them from judging him. However, they went through the form of summoning him three times; all of which he declined.

The majority of the council declared Symmachus "absolved in the sight of men, whether guilty or innocent in the sight of God," for the reason that "no assembly of bishops has power to judge the pope; he is accountable for his actions to God alone." They then commanded all, under penalty of excommunication, to accept this judgment, and submit to the authority of Symmachus, and acknowledge him "for lawful bishop of the holy city of Rome."

THE BARBARISM OF THE CHURCH

FROM The foregoing facts as to both sides, the condition of civilisation among the "barbarians" and that among the Catholics in the city of Rome, there can be no difficulty in deciding where civilisation, and civil order, and peace, and good of every kind, really dwelt. All the blessings of civilisation and enlightened principles were found with the "barbarians;" while the violence, the strife, and the determination to be chief, that belong to barbarians, were all found in the Catholic Church, led on by her chief leaders, and in the city of her sole possession and government. The "barbarians" gave to Italy all the blessings of enlightened

civilisation. The Catholic Church gave to Rome such violence, strife, and bloodshed as could hardly be outdone by barbarians. Nor was this scene in Rome merely a spasmodic affair - this had been the customary procedure in the election of a Pope for more than a hundred years.

And this barbarism of the Church in Rome was only the same sort as that which prevailed in the Church through-

470

our the empire where there were no "heretic" barbarians to keep order. In the eastern part of the empire the Church had everything her own way, with no "barbarian" heretics to check her barbarism anywhere, and the results were correspondingly barbaric. By the council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, the faith of the world was finally "settled," and all were forbidden, under severe penalties, "to dispute concerning the faith." But in such barbarism as pervaded all the Catholic Church, neither "the faith," nor laws, nor penalties were of any avail.

In Jerusalem a certain Theodosius was at the head of the army of monks, who made him bishop, and in acts of violence, pillage, and murder, he fairly outdid the perfectly lawless bandits of the country. "The very scenes of the Saviour's mercies," says Milman, "ran with blood, shed in His name by His ferocious self-called disciples."

In Alexandria "the bishop was not only murdered in his own baptistery, but his body was treated with shameless indignities, and other enormities were perpetuated which might have appalled a cannibal." And the monkish horde then elected as bishop one of their own number, Timothy the Weasel, a disciple of Dioscorus.

SETTLING A FINE POINT IN THEOLOGY

SOON there was added to all this another point which increased the fearful warfare. In the Catholic churches it was customary to sing what was called the *Trisagion*, or Thrice-Holy. It was, originally, the "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts" of Isaiah vi. 3; but at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, it had been changed, and was used by the council thus: "Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us." At Antioch, in 477, a third monk, Peter the Fuller, "led a procession, chiefly of monastics, through the streets," loudly singing the Thrice-Holy, with the addition, "who was crucified for us." It was orthodox to sing it as the Council of Chalcedon had used it, with the understanding that the three "Holies" referred respectively to the three persons of the Trinity. It was heresy to sing it with the later addition.

In A. D. 511, two hordes of monks on the two sides of the question met in Constantinople. "The two black-cowled armies watched each other for several months, working in secret on their respective partisans. At length they came to a rupture. . . . The Monophysite monks in the Church of the Archangel within the palace, broke out after the 'Thrice-Holy' with the burden added at Antioch by Peter the Fuller, 'who wast crucified for us.' The orthodox monks, backed by the rabble of Constantinople, endeavored to expel them from the church; they were not content with hurling curses against each other, sticks and stones began their

work. There was a wild, fierce fray; the divine presence of the emperor lost its awe; he could not maintain the peace. The Bishop Macedonius either took the lead, or was compelled to lead the tumult. Men, women, and children poured out from all quarters; the monks with their archimandrites at the head of the raging multitude, echoed back their religious war cry."

These are but samples of the repeated - it might almost be said the continuous - occurrences in the cities of the East. "Throughout Asiatic Christendom it was the same wild struggle. Bishops deposed quietly; or where resistance was made, the two factions fighting in the streets, in the churches: cities, even the holiest places, ran with blood. . . . The hymn of the angels in heaven was the battle cry on earth, the signal of human bloodshed."

In A. D. 512, one of these *Trisagion* riots broke out in Constantinople, because the emperor proposed to use the added clause. "Many palaces of the nobles were set on fire, the officers of the crown insulted, pillage, conflagration, violence, raged through the city." In the house of the favorite minister of the emperor there was found a monk from the country. He was accused of having suggested the use of the addition. His head was cut off and raised high on a pole, and the whole orthodox populace marched through the streets singing the orthodox *Trisagion*, and shouting, "Behold the enemy of the Trinity."

ROME THE SAME TO-DAY

THIS is enough, but it is not in vain to show the difference between barbarism and Christian civilisation in the Roman Empire when the Catholic Church had everything in her own hands and was allowed to show fully what she could do. And what did she do with the Ostrogoths? Why, finding she could not corrupt them with her own barbaric religion, she secured from Justinian the armies of the Eastern Empire and swept them not only out of Italy, but out of existence. The Ostrogoths were one of the three nations that were "plucked up by the roots" to give full place to the Papacy. Dan. vii. 8, 20, 24, 25. And now she announces to governments and peoples of the West that what she has done for other nations in the past she will now do for them. And there is not the least doubt that she will do all in her barbaric power to fulfil this avowed purpose. She will corrupt to the core all whom she can; and such as she cannot corrupt she will do her utmost to destroy. But, thank the Lord, she cannot destroy them, for God has promised to all these "the victory over the beast and over his image and over his mark and over the number of his name" - a complete and triumphant victory over her and all her barbarism - and these shall stand on the sea of glass before the throne of God. Rev. xv. 2, 3.

Who will favour Rome? Who will admit her claims? Who will sanction her pretensions? Who will yield to this mystery of lawlessness? this synonym of worse than barbarism? Who will share the perdition that must come, with the coming of this "saviour, with the coming of this "saviour from the Vatican"? Who? It is time to decide.

A. T. JONES.

August 1, 1895

"Who Is Lord of Conscience?" *The Present Truth* 11, 31 , p. 486.

IN reporting the recent trials of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, under the Sunday statute, the New York *American Sentinel* says: -

"A noticeable event of the trials was a speech by ex-Congressman Snodgrass in which he declared his belief that the statute was unconstitutional, the opinion of the Supreme Court, notwithstanding. He expressed great sympathy for the Adventists, but advised them strongly that they ought to submit under the circumstances, and obey the law until it could be repealed, as he was very confident it would be by the next legislature. He said that he would remind the Adventists of that scriptural injunction which says, 'Be subject unto the higher powers,' for 'the power that be are ordained of God.'

"The ex-congressman seems to have forgotten, or never to have understood that God has ordained no human power to rule over conscience. Nor did it occur to him that to adopt his view of the scripture in question would be to make conscience entirely a creature of civil law, and would justify the condemnation and execution of every martyr from Stephen to the present time. For, with but few exceptions, all these have died as violators of the civil law. Had nobody ever disobeyed laws that were in conflict with conscience, the Reformation could never have taken place. Luther would never have left the Catholic Church; Wesley would never have preached contrary to the Established Church; and John Bunyan would never have insisted on preaching the gospel contrary to the orders of the civil magistrate.

"The early Baptists and Quakers of New England and the Baptists of Virginia suffered fines, imprisonments, whippings, banishment and death for violation of the civil law. And the degree of religious liberty which we enjoy to-day is due to the fact that they dared to disobey unjust laws; and that they continued to disobey such laws until the things that they suffered brought their fellow-men to recognize the fact that there was such a thing as the rights of conscience. It is a matter of surprise that intelligent men are found to-day who will endeavor to maintain the position that it is a Christian duty to surrender conscience to civil laws."

August 15, 1895

"Eternal Depth of God's Word" *The Present Truth* 11, 33 , p. 517.

GOD'S purpose in making known to us His will is an "eternal purpose." Eph. iii. 11. And the Scripture is the expression of God's thoughts on that purpose, carrying out and setting forth and making known that purpose. How deep them are His thoughts? - Just as deep as is His purpose. How far-reaching is that purpose? - Of eternal depth. In how many expressions in the Scriptures is the thought of eternal depth? In how many passages? - *Every one*. Has it required all the Scriptures that are written, for the Lord to express to us what He wants to tell us of His eternal purpose? - It has. Then how deep is the thought in each passage of Scripture and the words that are used to tell it? - Eternal.

Then just as soon as any man catches one of these thoughts and thinks, "I know it now, and have got it in that passage; I have the truth; I have all there is of that thought," he has shut up his own mind from the wisdom of the knowledge of God. He has put himself and his own mind in the place of God and His thoughts. The man that does that cannot learn any more. Do you not see that at that instant he shuts himself out for ever from learning? And the man who does that, of course can learn nothing beyond himself, and of course will never have the knowledge of God.

The expressions of thought conveyed in the statement of the Scriptures are as eternal depths. Then what limit can we set to ourselves in the study of these? - No limit at all. Then does not that present the splendid picture, and the grand prospect that the eternal, the whole, mind of God is wide open before us for us to study upon?

And until all the depths and eternities are past we shall never get to the place where we shall have the right to think we know that thing and are done learning from its eternal depths. I am glad to know that we have such a subject to study upon, and such a length of time (eternity) in which to study it.

A. T. JONES.

August 29, 1895

"Living Faith" *The Present Truth* 11, 35 , pp. 547, 548.

THE term "living faith" is strictly proper; because faith indeed is a living thing. The just live by faith, and no man can live by what has no life in it.

Again, faith is the gift of God (Eph. ii. 8) and He is a living God; Jesus is its Author (Heb. xii. 2.), and in Him is life - He is the life. In the nature of things, that which comes from such a source must be of itself imbued with life.

Again, faith comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. x. 17); that word is "the faith word" (Titus i. 9), that is, the word *full of faith*; and that word is "the word of life" (Phil. ii. 16). Therefore as the Word of God brings faith, and is full of faith; and as that Word is the word of life, it is evident that faith is life.

THE LIFE OF FAITH

WHAT life is it, then, which faith brings to men? Coming as it does from God, through Jesus Christ who is the "Author of life," the only life with which it is imbued and which it could possibly bring to men is *the life of God*. The life of God is what men need and what we must have. And it is the life that God wants us to have; for it is written: "Walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being *alienated from the life of God*." Eph. iv. 17, 18.

Jesus came that men might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. John x. 10. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." 1 John v. 11, 12. And Christ is received by faith, and He dwells in the heart by faith. Eph. iii. 17. Therefore as the life of God only, eternal life, is in Jesus Christ, and as Christ dwells in the heart *by faith*, it is as plain as anything can be that faith brings the life of God to him who exercises it.

It is the life of Jesus Himself that is to be made manifest in our bodies, "for we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." 2 Cor. iv. 11. And the life of Jesus is manifested in us, by Christ himself living in us; for "Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh I live *by the faith* of the Son of God." Gal. ii. 20. This is living faith.

THE BLESSING OF THE REAL PRESENCE

AGAIN He says, "I will dwell in them and walk in them;" "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you;" and "because I live, ye shall live also." John xiv. 18, 19. It is by the Holy Spirit that He dwells in us; for He desires you "to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man, *that Christ may dwell in your hearts*." Eph. iii. 16, 17. And "at that day" - the day that ye receive the gift of the Holy Ghost - "*ye shall know* that I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and *I in you*." John xiv. 20. "And hereby we know that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us." 1 John iii. 24. And we "receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith*." Gal. iii. 14.

"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." We must have the blessing of Abraham in order to receive the promise of the Spirit. The blessing of Abraham is righteousness *by faith*. See Rom. iv. 1-13. Having this, Abraham "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had." And we, *having this*, can freely receive the promise of the Spirit circumcising the heart unto holiness and the seal of the righteousness of the faith which we had. Having the blessing of Abraham, and so being sons of God, God *sends* forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts. Gal. iii. 26; iv. 4-6. Having the blessing of Abraham, that you may receive the promise of the Spirit through faith, *then* ask that ye may receive - yea, ask and ye *shall* receive. For the Word of God has promised, and faith cometh by hearing the Word of God. Therefore ask in faith, nothing

wavering, "for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened."

Such is living faith - the faith that comes from the living God; the faith of which Christ is the Author; the faith which comes by the Word of God; the faith which brings life and power from God to men, and which works the works of God in him who exercises it; the faith which receives the Holy Spirit that brings the living presence of Jesus Christ to dwell in the heart and manifest Himself still in mortal flesh. This and this alone is living faith. By this Christians live. This is life itself. This is everything. Without this, everything is simply nothing or worse; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.

LIVING FAITH WORKS

WITH such faith as this, that is, with *true* faith, there never can arise any question as to works; for this faith *itself works*, and he who has it, necessarily works. It is impossible to have this faith and not have works. "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith *which* worketh by love." Gal. v. 6. This faith being a living thing, cannot exist without working. And coming from God, the only works that it can possibly work are the works of God.

Therefore anything that professes to be faith which of itself does not work the salvation of the individual having it, and which then does not work the works of God in him who professes it, *is not faith at all*, but is a fraud that that individual is passing off upon himself, which brings no grace to the heart, and no power to the life. It is dead, and he is still dead in trespasses and sins, and all his service is only a form without power, and therefore is only a dead formalism.

548

But on the other hand, the faith which is of God, which comes by the Word of God and brings Christ, the living Word, to dwell in the heart and shine in the life - this is true faith which through Jesus Christ only lives and works in him who exercises it.

Christ Himself living in *us*; Christ in you the hope of glory; God with us; God manifest in the flesh *now, to-day* in *our* flesh, by the faith of Jesus Christ - this and this only is living faith. For "every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ *is* come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ *is* come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world. Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them; because greater is He that *is in you*, than he that is in the world." 1 John 4:2-4.

Therefore, "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves." Jesus said unto them and to us all: "Have the faith of God." Mark xi. 22, margin.

A. T. JONES.

September 5, 1895

"Rome Pagan and Papal" *The Present Truth* 11, 36 , pp. 565-567.

THE UNCHANGEABLE POLICY OF CRAFT

"ROME never changes." This is the oft-repeated boast of the Papacy, and it is true. It is true, too, in a much larger sense than many realise, even of those who believe the proposition.

In its spirit, in its disposition, in its essential nature and characteristics, Rome is the same to-day that it was two hundred or five hundred years before Christ. Between Rome's beginning and our day, between 753 B.C. and 1894 A.D., she has appeared in different outward forms, she has taken on different phases, such as the kingly, the republican, the imperial, and the papal, but it has been Rome all the time - Rome in spirit, in nature, and in essential characteristics.

ROME IN PROPHECY

THERE is no world-power that occupies so large a place in the Bible as does Rome. Rome, from its rise in ancient time and in its pagan form, through all its career, its merging into the papal form, and on to its impending ruin in our own day, is traced in all its workings, and is marked in its every essential feature, by the pen of inspiration. And it is Rome all the time and always the same - cunning, crafty, insinuating, arrogant, violent, persecuting and bloody - always actuated by the same spirit and pursuing steadily the same policy. So constant, so persistent, and so characteristic is this policy, that it is singled out in the Scripture and distinctly defined as "*his policy*."

In the eighth chapter of Daniel there is a prophecy of the careers of Media and Persia, of Grecia under Alexander, and then under Alexander's successors, and of the power that should succeed these which by every evidence of Scripture and history, is demonstrated to be Rome only. And in that place it is briefly but powerfully sketched thus: -

And in the latter time of their [Alexander's successors'] kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many; he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.

Thus it is distinctly declared that "through *his policy* also, he shall *cause craft to prosper* in his hand," "and by *peace* shall *destroy* many." To know what this "policy" is, is to know Rome from beginning to end. To understand the workings of this "policy," is to understand the workings of Rome so well, even to-day, that she can never deceive nor get any advantage of him who understands it.

THE POLICY IN ANCIENT TIMES

IN Rollin's ancient history there is an analysis of this Romish policy and its workings in the progress of Rome to power and dominion over all the ancient nations. And so entirely is this "his policy" ever, that Rollin's analysis of it as it was manifested in ancient times is as perfectly descriptive of Rome's policy and its workings to-day as it is of it in ancient days. Here are the historian's words: -

The reader begins to discover, in the events related, one of the principal characteristics of the Romans, which will soon determine the fate of all the States of Greece, and produce an almost general change in the universe; I mean a spirit of sovereignty and dominion. This characteristic does not display itself at first in its full extent; it reveals itself only by degrees; and it is only by insensible progressions, which at the same time are rapid enough, that it is carried at last to its greatest height.

It must be confessed, that this people, on certain occasions, show such a moderation and disinterestedness, which from a superficial view seems to exceed everything we meet with in history, and which we feel it incumbent on us to praise. . . . But if we penetrate ever so little beyond this glaring outside, we soon perceive that this specious moderation of the Romans was entirely founded on a profound policy; wise, indeed, and prudent, according to the ordinary rules of government, but at the same time very remote from that noble disinterestedness so highly extolled on the present occasion.

Nothing could be more gentle and equitable than the conduct of the Romans in the beginning. They acted with the utmost moderation toward such States and nations as addressed them for protection. They succoured them against their enemies, took the utmost pains in terminating their differences and in suppressing all commotions which arose amongst them, and did not demand the least recompense from their allies for all these services. By this means their authority gained strength daily, and prepared the nations for entire subjection.

Under pretense of offering them their good offices, of entering into their interests, and of reconciling them, the Romans rendered themselves the sovereign arbiters of those whom they had restored to liberty, and whom they now considered, in some measure, as their freedmen. They used to depute

566

commissioners to them, to inquire into their complaints, to weigh and examine the reasons on both sides, and to decide their quarrels; but when the articles were of such a nature that there was no possibility of reconciling them on the spot, they invited them to send their deputies to Rome. But afterwards they used, with plenary authority, to summon those who refused to come to an agreement, obliged them to plead their cause before the Senate, and even to appear in person there. From arbiters and mediators,

being become supreme judges, they soon assumed a magisterial tone, looked upon their decrees as irrevocable decisions, were greatly offended when the most implicit obedience was not paid to them, and gave the name of rebellion to a second resistance. Thus there arose, in the Roman Senate, a tribunal which judged all nations and kings, and from which there was no appeal.

We have no room to doubt that Providence had decreed to the Romans the sovereignty of the world, and the Scriptures had prophesied their future grandeur; but they were strangers to those Divine oracles, and besides, the bare prediction of their conquests was no justification of their conduct. Although it is difficult to affirm, and still more so to prove, that this people had from the first formed a plan in order to conquer and subject all nations, it can not be denied but that if we examine their whole conduct attentively, it will appear that they acted as if they had a foreknowledge of this; and that a kind of instinct had determined them to conform to it in all things.

But, be this as it may, we see, by the event, to what this so much boasted lenity and moderation of the Romans was confined. Enemies to the liberty of all nations, having the utmost contempt for kings and monarchy, looking upon the whole universe as their prey, they grasped, with insatiable ambition, the conquests of the whole world; they seized indiscriminately all provinces and kingdoms, and extended their empire over all nations; in a word, they prescribed no other limits to their vast projects than those which deserts and seas made it impossible to pass. - *Book XVIII., under "Reflections on the Conduct of the Romans."*

ROME'S POLICY TO-DAY

THIS statement of Rome's policy and its workings is as true and as appropriate in the case of the Roman Church and the nations to-day, as it is in the case of the Roman State and the Grecian Republics in all time. It describes the policy of Leo XIII. and the ultimate purpose of it toward the governments and peoples of the world; toward the workingmen; as the self-appointed intermediary between capital and labour; and the would-be world's arbiter, to-day. Nor is the identity of this policy in Rome to-day, and in Rome of old, denied by the Papacy. In fact, it is asserted by the Papacy, and the continuance of this policy from ancient Rome is the acknowledged inspiration of modern Rome.

When Imperial Rome was falling to ruins under the violent inroads of the barbarians of the North, the spirit and policy of Rome not only survived but was deepened and perfected in papal Rome. And this spirit and policy were consciously and intentionally continued by the Popes of the time and were conscientiously received and diligently cultivated by each succeeding Pope.

Such was the heritage bequeathed to Leo "the Great," (A. D. 440-451) by his predecessors, and the arrogance of his own native disposition, with the grand

opportunities which offered during his long rule, added to it a thousandfold. "All that survived of Rome," says Milman, "of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone." At the very moment of his election he was absent in Gaul on a mission as mediator to reconcile a dispute between two of the principal men of the empire. He succeeded in his mission, and was hailed as "the Angel of Peace," and the "Deliverer of the Empire." In a sermon, he showed what his ambition embraced. He portrayed the powers and glories of the former Rome as they were reproduced in Catholic Rome. The conquests and universal sway of heathen Rome were but the promise of the conquests and universal sway of Catholic Rome. Romulus and Remus

567

were but the precursors of Peter and Paul. Rome of former days had by her armies conquered the earth and sea: now again, by the see of the holy blessed Peter as head of the world, Rome through her divine religion would dominate the earth. (Milman.)

This is Rome; Rome always, and Rome ever the same. This is "his policy" - craft and hypocrisy, hypocrisy and craft, always employed to feed an insatiable ambition for universal dominion. "Rome never changes," that is true. In "policy," in spirit, in working, in essential nature, it never has changed and it never can change. In all this, Rome is just as bad as it can be, and yet thinks itself better than God, and therefore how would it be possible to change? No, Rome never changes, - That is the truth. She never can change, - And that is the truth.

A. T. JONES.

October 17, 1895

"What Is His Name?" *The Present Truth* 11, 42 , pp. 661, 662.

WHEN the Lord told Moses to go to the children of Israel and had them out of Egypt, Moses inquired: "Behold, when I came unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; . . . this is my name forever."

BOTH EXISTENCE AND CHARACTER

THE name of the Lord expresses both existence and character. "I am" expresses existence. I am *that*, or *that which*, I am, expresses character. And to believe in God is to believe in both his existence *and* his character.

It is not enough to believe only in the existence of God. To believe only that He *is*, and not to believe that He is *what He is*, is not to believe in Him at all. For even to believe in His existence and then to believe Him to be of a character different from that which He really is, - this is only to believe in a different God

from that which He really is. And to believe in a different God from what He is, is really to believe in another God; but in reality there is no other God than He; all others are only imaginary. Therefore, even to believe that He is, and then believe Him to be different in character from that which He really is - this, in reality, is not to believe in Him at all. It is to believe in another than He, it is only to have another God, and so in idolatry.

Accordingly it is written: "He that cometh to God must believe that He is" - and *more*. He "must believe that He is, *and* that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." Heb. xi. 6. In other words, he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is what He is; he must believe both in His existence and in His character. This, and this alone is to believe in God. This and this alone is what it is to believe in His name.

THE NAME DECLARED

WHAT, then, is His character? what is His name? what is He? In one word the name is this: "GOD IS LOVE."

In another place His name is given in a more extended form, so that we may more fully understand what it really is. When Moses asked the Lord to show him His way, the Lord said: "I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken. . . . I will make all My goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim *the name of the Lord* before thee." "And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God." This is "Jehovah, Jehovah God;" "Jah;" and corresponds to "I am," expressing existence. And now comes that which expresses His character: "Merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." That is His name; and this is what He is.

MERCY, GRACE, LONGSUFFERING

"MERCIFUL," is full of mercy. Mercy is the disposition to treat people better than they deserve. It is not to treat persons thus from some outward constraint; but it is his disposition, it is His very inmost nature, to do it. It being His nature to do it, He cannot do otherwise.

Gracious. Grace is favour. Gracious is favourable; extending favour. This is what He is. This is His nature. This is why it is so often written, "Grace be to you." And because He is gracious, therefore, "Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." Eph. iv. 7. The measure of the gift of Christ is but the measure of "the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. ii. 2. So that is this gift of grace there is given *Himself* in His fulness. For "of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." John i. 16. This grace, even Himself, is given that all men might be saved, for "the grace of God bringeth salvation." Titus iii. 11. He is gracious. He is the Saviour. Thanks to His name.

Longsuffering: "God is longsuffering to usward, not willing that any should perish; but that all should come to repentance." And "the longsuffering of our Lord

is salvation." 2 Peter iii. 15. The longsuffering of the Lord is salvation, and he is longsuffering, - this is His nature, this is Himself, - consequently He is salvation. Therefore, "Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid; for the Lord JEHOVAH is my strength and my song; He also is become my salvation. Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation. Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." Isa. xii. 2, 3. For He is "the fountain of living waters." Jer. ii. 13.

ABUNDANTLY FORGIVING

ABUNDANT in goodness and truth, keeping mercy - treatment better than they deserve - for thousands; not simply for thousands of persons, but for thousands of *generations* of people. For, "Know therefore that the Lord thy God, He is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love Him and keep His commandments *to a thousand* generations." Deut. vii. 9. This is His nature. He is the faithful God, and He takes pleasure in them that hope in His mercy - them that hope in His disposition to treat them better than they deserve; in them that believe in His name, which is merciful, even to a thousand generations.

"Forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin;" not merely that He *will* forgive, if we do penance enough; not that He can be *persuaded* to forgive. No; but that He *is* forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin. Forgiveness is in Him. It is of Him. It is His very self to extend it to every soul. If men will not accept it when it is so freely and so constantly extended, they must perish in their sins of course; because

662

He cannot compel any to accept it, but He extends it. He extends it to every soul; and He extends it always. "I am that I am." This is My name forever, and this is My memorial throughout all generations." O, He is "forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." This is His name. Glory to His name!

"And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." This is His name. This is Himself. Therefore, "Stand up and bless the Lord your God forever and ever; and blessed be Thy glorious name, which is exalted above all blessing and praise." "O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt His name together."

A. T. JONES.

October 24, 1895

"Preaching and Baptizing in His Name" *The Present Truth* 11, 43 , pp. 677, 678.

"AND he said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached *in His name* among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke xxiv. 46, 47.

Christ is the revelation, not of Himself, but of the Father. For "no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." And "the word which ye hear is not Mine, but the Father's which sent Me." John xiv. 24.

Therefore when the word was spoken that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached *in His name*," it was the word of the Father. And the name in which this is to be preached is the Father's Name, - is that name which is "merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin."

CHRIST BEARS THE FATHER'S NAME

HOWEVER, it would be in no wise different so far as this particular fact is concerned, if Christ had spoken this of Himself, and had commissioned to preach in *His* name, for His original name is precisely the same as the Father's. He and the Father are one. And "He hath *by inheritance* obtained a more excellent name than" any of the angels. Heb. i. 4.

The only name that any person can inherit is his father's name. A person may have several names; but there is only one that he can inherit, and that is his father's; all other names that he may have must be given to him. Now Christ had "by inheritance" a name. It could not possibly be any other than His Father's name.

Having this name by inheritance, He has it by nature. He has it by the very fact of His existence. As certainly as He exists, this name - the name of the Father - belongs to Him. And the Father's name being His by nature, this name as certainly expresses His nature as it expresses the name of the Father. "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin" - this is the Father's name and nature; and this is the name and nature of the Son, because He has by inheritance - by nature - His Father's name.

Therefore to preach *in His name* is to preach in fulness of mercy, in grace, in long-suffering and abundance of goodness and truth, and in forgiveness of iniquity and transgression and sin; for

678

this is His name. Only thus can repentance and remission of sins really be preached.

FOR THE MAN WITH A GRIEVANCE

HOW can any one preach "in His name," who is ready to think himself slighted and to feel hurt if there is not shown to him the favour that he thinks he ought to receive? "His name" is "gracious," that is, *extending* favour, not fishing for favours, nor extending favour for favour.

How can any one preach "in His name" who thinks Himself oppressed or treated unjustly by the Conference Committee, and is fretting and sulking under it? "His name" is long-suffering and at the same time kind and abundant in goodness and truth, even under actual and deliberate injuries and outrages. And to preach "in His name" is to be possessed of this spirit and to preach in this spirit, even though such things should *really* be put upon us instead of their being wholly imaginary.

How can any one preach, or otherwise work, "in His name" who is holding grudges and ill feelings against others? His name is "merciful, . . . forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin;" and to preach, or do anything else, in His name is to do it in the fulness of the disposition and spirit to treat offenders better than they deserve, freely forgiving every kind of wrong.

BURIED IN HIS NAME

WHEN His ministers are sent forth to preach "in His name," they are also commanded to baptize in His name: "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." Acts ii. 38. If the preaching has been done in His name, the baptizing can be done in His name. Otherwise not, for in that case the persons to be baptized will not know His name; and if they do not know His name, how can they be baptized - buried, overwhelmed, lost sight of - in His name; for this is what baptism in his name signifies.

For a person to be baptized in His name, signifies much more than merely to have the phrase recited over him and then to be buried in the water. To be baptized in the name of the Lord, really signifies that just as the person is buried, overwhelmed, and lost sight of, in the water, so also is he buried, overwhelmed, and lost sight of, *in the name*, the character, the *nature*, of the Lord. It signifies that that person's old, original nature and character are no more to be seen in the world; but in their stead the nature and character of the Lord. It signifies that he is no more to be manifest in the world; but that God, instead of himself, is to be manifest in him in the world.

This is what baptism "in His name" signifies, both in the Greek words and in the doctrine of the Scripture. But how shall the people be baptized in His name, if they do not know His name! And how shall they know His name, if they are not instructed in His name, and to make manifest His name to the people? O, let the preaching be all "in His name" indeed, that the people may be truly baptized "in His name," that the promise may now be fulfilled, "My people shall know My name"!

A. T. JONES.

October 31, 1895

"My People Shall Know My Name" *The Present Truth* 11, 44 , pp. 692, 693.

THIS word is spoken of the people of God at the time when the church is to be clothed with the "beautiful garments" of his righteousness and endued with his power (Isa. lii. 1); when she is entirely separated from the world and all worldliness; and when she is entirely loosed from the captive bonds of sin (verse 2); and when she is to know the full redemption of the Lord. Verse 3.

It is the time when, again, as in Egypt, his people will be "oppressed without cause" (verse 4); when "they that rule over them make them to howl," and themselves "continually every day blaspheme" the name of the Lord. Verse 5. It is at such a time as this, and "therefore" that the Lord declares, "My people shall know My name." Verse 6.

And that time is *now*. Those who obey Him now, as in Egypt, are oppressed without cause. There, they were oppressed for the keeping the Sabbath of the Lord, and here, they are oppressed for the same thing. And now God will be revealed in power as He was then. Now as then the Lord will make "bare His holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God." Verse 10. "Therefore My people shall know My name; therefore they shall know in that day that I am He that doth speak; behold, it is I."

WHAT IT IS TO KNOW HIS NAME

HIS name is "merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." To know His name is to know all this. It is not merely to know *about* it, but it is to know *it*. It is not to know of it by the hearing of the ear; it is to know *it*, by the "hearing of faith" - to know it with the heart. As His name expresses what He is, to know His name is to know Him - not merely to know *about* Him; but to know *Him*. His name expresses His nature, and to know His name is to know His nature.

He is merciful. This is His name; and to know His name is to know mercy. It is to know what it is always to manifest from the heart treatment better than they deserve to all offenders. It is only by knowing Him, the fountain of mercy that this can be done. "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." Luke 6:36.

He is gracious. This is His name; and to know His name is to know what it is to be extending favour always to all people. Not favour for favour; but pure favour. Not selfishness; but graciousness.

He is long-suffering. His name, even as He says, is continually every day blasphemed; His law is trampled underfoot; His authority is defied; He Himself is abused and outraged; yet He suffers it long, He endures it long, and is still abundant in goodness and truth even toward all those who are doing all these

evil things. He is long-suffering thus toward all, because He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. This is His name; and to know His name is to know what it is wrongfully and unjustly to suffer contempt, injury, abuse, and outrage, to suffer these things long and still manifest abundance of goodness and truth to all, that if by any means they may be brought to repentance. "Charity suffereth long, and is kind." And "if I have not charity, I am nothing." "Charity is the bond of perfectness."

And now that the time of suffering, of contempt, of oppression, of abuse, and of outrage, is upon us, how precious the promise that we shall know His name, so that His holy disposition and character shall be manifest on all occasions! And how important it is that every one who has a name and place among His people, shall receive this promise in its fulness, that we may indeed know His name, and that the savour of His knowledge may be made manifest by us in every place!

He is forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin. This is His name; and to know His name is to know the forgiveness of iniquity and transgression and sin. It is to know this, each one for himself in his own, individual case; and then because of this, manifesting it to all people always. "Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven." Luke vi. 37. It is not condemnation that men in this world need. They have that already in abundance. It is not condemnation but *salvation* that the people of this world need. "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved." And "as My Father sent Me, so send I you." He does not send us to condemn anybody; but that they may be saved. His name is "forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin," and His people are to know His name - they are to know what it is to *be* this to all.

God is love. This is His name; and to know His name is to know love - *His* love. It is to know Him as He is Himself. And "he that loveth not, knoweth not God."

THE PROMISE OF THE DIVINE NATURE

IT is not in human nature of itself to manifest the disposition and character here outlined. It is not in human nature of itself always to treat people better than they deserve; to be always extending favour to the unthankful and the evil; to suffer long injustice and oppression without cause, and at the same time to be kind, and manifest abundance of goodness and truth; and to be always forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin. This is not natural. It is natural for men to treat people only as they deserve; to extend favours only for favours; to

693

resent injustice and resist oppression; to harbour enmity rather than to be forgiving.

This promise that the Lord's people shall know His name, is therefore in reality a promise that they shall know another nature. His name expresses His nature. To know His name is to know His nature. Therefore the promise that we shall know His name, is a promise that we shall know and be partakers of - and know *by being* partakers of - the Divine nature.

It is written that by the promises we are partakers of the divine nature. And surely here is the chief of the promises, the very promise itself, by which this shall be done.

"My people shall know My name." His name shall be manifest in His people. His *nature* shall be manifest in His people. God will again be manifest in the flesh. This is the everlasting gospel, and thus it is to be preached with a loud voice to every nation and kindred and tongue and people.

"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth! Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion. Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem; for the Lord hath comforted His people, He hath redeemed Jerusalem. The Lord hath made bare His holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God. depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence, touch no unclean thing; go ye out of the midst of her [Babylon]; be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord. For ye shall not go out with haste, nor go by flight; for the Lord will go before you; and the God of Israel will be your rereward." Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift! "The name of the Lord is a strong tower, wherein the righteous run and are safe." "My people shall know My name." Do you know His name!

A. T. JONES.

November 21, 1895

"Asking in His Name" *The Present Truth* 11, 47 , p. 742.

"VERILY, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father *in My name*, He will give it you." John 16:23. "And whatsoever ye shall ask *in My name*, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything *in My name*, I will do it." Chapter xiv. 13, 14.

What is His name? "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." What is it, then, to ask in His name, but to ask in the very spirit and nature of the fulness of mercy and graciousness, in long-suffering and abundance of goodness and truth, and forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin! It is to be imbued with His own Spirit, making manifest His own disposition and character in the heart, and then in this disposition making our requests known unto God.

WHAT IT MEANS

TO ask in His name means a good deal more than to present a series of formal or perhaps even selfish requests, and then put at the end of it the words "in Jesus' name." To pray "in His name," is to have the whole petition imbued

through and through with His name - with His disposition and character, with his nature. For His name is his nature. "For we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." Rom. viii. 26, 27. As the Spirit of God makes intercession for us, in order that our prayers may be such as they ought to be, it is evident that our prayers must be according to the mind of the Spirit to be acceptable with God. It is the Spirit of God that sheds abroad the love of God in our hearts (Rom. v. 5); it is by the Spirit that Christ dwells in the heart. Thus it is by the Spirit that we are made partakers of the Divine nature through the promises. And to ask according to the Spirit and *in* the Spirit, is to ask according to His nature, it is to ask in His name. This and this only is asking "in His name."

This is made plain by Mark xi. 25: "And when ye stand praying, *forgive*, if ye have aught against any." This shows that we are to pray in the very disposition and nature of the Lord. As He is "forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin," so are we to be. As this is His name, and we are to "ask in His name," so *when* we pray, and *as* we pray, we are to pray, "forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." This is what it is to ask in His name.

WHAT HINDERS TRUE PRAYER

TO pray to Him while we are unforgiving and holding hardness in the heart toward our brethren or any other man, and then close the prayer with the words, "In His name," is only to take His name in vain. It is only a mockery, both of prayer and of his name; for it is not done in his name at all; it is not done in fulness of mercy, in graciousness, in long-suffering and abundance of goodness and truth, nor in the forgiveness of iniquity and transgression and sin.

Oh, it is too true, as He says in another place, "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in My name." John xv. 24. There has been in us too much hardness, too much judging, too little long-suffering and kindness and goodness and truth to man and too little of the Divine nature, - all this has been too largely true for us truly to have asked "in His name."

But it is not too late yet. Let us thank the Lord and take courage, that it is *not* yet too late. We are in the time of which it is written, "My people shall know My name." Let us in sincerity of heart accept the promise in its fulness, that it may indeed be fulfilled in us as we walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.

Then, knowing His name, we shall believe in His name, we shall work in His name, we shall preach in His name, we shall baptize and be baptized in His name, we shall meet in His name, we shall pray in His name, *yes, whatsoever* we do, in word or deed, we shall do *all* in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him.

"And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity

and transgressions and sin, and before whom no man is guiltless [German version]; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation.

"And Moses made haste, and bowed his head toward the earth, and worshipped. And he said, If now I have found grace in Thy sight, O Lord, let my Lord, I pray Thee, go among us; for it is a stiffnecked people; and pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for Thine inheritance. And he said, Behold, I make a covenant; before all thy people I will do marvels such as have not been done in all the earth, nor in any nation; and all the people among which thou art shall see the work of the Lord; for it is a terrible thing that I will do with thee." (Read with this also Isa. lii. 1-12.)

And let all the people say, Amen, the Lord do so. A. T. JONES.

December 19, 1895

"We Would See Jesus" *The Present Truth* 11, 51 , pp. 805, 806.

"AND there were certain Greeks among them that came up to worship at the feast; the same came therefore to Philip, which was of Bethsaida of Galilee, and desired of him, saying, Sir, we would see Jesus."

The desire of these Greeks was certainly a very natural one. They had come up to Jerusalem to worship, and had found the name of Jesus upon everybody's lips. From the highest to the lowest, from the proud and courted Pharisee to the outcast leper, from the highest priest and the chief priests, supposed to be the purest in the nation, to the abandoned sinner, all, all were talking about Jesus - of course not all praising Him, not all glorifying Him; the chief priests and the Pharisees were most bitterly opposed to Him, and were only waiting impatiently for an opportunity to kill Him, while the common people were anxious to make Him a king. But whether it was to praise or to condemn, whether it was to kill or to make a king, the sole subject of it all was Jesus, and it was the most natural thing in the world that these Greeks should want to see the Person about whom so much was made.

From that day to this, the name that has been used most in this world is the name of Jesus. The one Person about whom more has been said, and of whom more has been made, than of any other person this world ever saw, is the Man Christ Jesus. True, as at the first, some have praised Him, and some have cursed Him; some have worshipped Him, while others have sought to kill Him, crying, "Crush the wretch," and often he has been wounded in the house of His friends; still the name more than all others that is used in the wide world to-day is the name of Jesus. And with those Greeks of old, we now say, "We would see Jesus."

Not, however, as they, simply because much is said of Him, neither for or against Him. But we would see Him as He is, for what He is. For even as saith the scripture, having not seen Him, we love Him (1 Peter i. 8); and because we love Him we would see Him. Having not seen Him, we love Him because He first

loved us. We love Him because He loved us and gave Himself for us. We love Him for His gentle pity for sinners such as we. We love him because in "the great love wherewith He loved us" He, "His own self, bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness." We love Him for his lofty humanity. We love Him for His "profound reverence for infinite goodness and truth." We love Him for the moral force and the benign influence of His mighty character. We love Him for his perfect goodness. For this cause would we see Him. We would see Him because of

- "the character He bears,

And all the forms of love He wears."

Yet we would not now see Him as He is. We would not now see His visage so married more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men. We would not now see Him a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. We would not now see Him oppressed and afflicted. We would not now see Him taken as a lamb to the slaughter. We would not now see Him in his travail of soul. We would not now see Him in his dreadful agony on the cruel tree.

No; we would see Him as He *is*. We would see Him "that liveth," though once dead, but now "alive forevermore, Amen," and who has "the keys of hell and of death." We would see Him as the disciples saw Him - "His face did shine as the sun," "and His raiment became shining," "white as the light," "exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth can white them."

We would see Him as Stephen saw Him - in glory, "standing on the right hand of God." We would see Him as Paul saw Him - shining in light "above the brightness of the sun." We would see Him as John saw Him - "His head and His hair white like

806

wool, as white as snow; and His eyes as a flame of fire; and His feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and His voice as the sound of many waters;" "and His countenance as the sun shineth in its strength." We would see Him as Isaiah saw Him - "sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up," and the train of His glory filling the heavenly temple, about Him standing the bright seraphim shading their glorious faces from His ineffable glory, and crying one unto another, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory." Isa. vi. 1-4 with John xii. 41.

We would see Him coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, and would hear His might voice saying to His angels, "Gather My saints together unto Me, those that have made a covenant with Me by sacrifice." And then and there in the midst of the church would we see Him and hear His glorious voice singing that song of promised praise to the Father (Heb. ii. 12). Oh, 'tis thus that "we would see Jesus"!

And we thank God, not only for the hope that we *shall* see Him as He is, but also that the signs are abundant all about us that show this "blessed hope" shall be fulfilled. So the blessed promise is that we shall not . . . "see Him as He is," but "we shall *be like Him*." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that *when He shall appear, we shall be like Him*; for *we shall see Him as He is*." We would see Jesus. But while so living

and walking, we would never for a moment forget that he "that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as He is pure." 1 John iii. 3. And, even so, we would indeed see Jesus. A. T. JONES.

December 26, 1895

"The Beginning of the Papacy" *The Present Truth* 11, 52 , pp. 821, 822.

IN studying the errors of the Papacy the question naturally arises, How came such a falling away from the truths of the Gospel as taught by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself and by His apostles, endued, as they were, by the Spirit of God? The answer is, It was by the self-exaltation of the creature above the Creator.

When Paul was at Thessalonica, he preached to the people about the second coming of the Lord. And after he went away he wrote them a letter, in which he referred to the same subject, in these words: "This we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. iv. 15-17.

The Thessalonians, forgetting the instruction they had received from the apostle personally on this subject, and being deceived by letters purporting to come from him, concluded that the Lord's coming might be expected at any moment. This coming to the apostle's knowledge, he wrote them a second letter, in which he exhorts them thus: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto Him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming." 2 Thess. ii. 1-8.

All this Paul had taught the Thessalonians when he was with them, as he reminds them in the fifth verse: "Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" Then, having recalled to their minds the fact, he simply appeals to their knowledge, and says, "And now ye know what withholdeth that he [the son of perdition] might be revealed in his time." This plainly sets forth the

prophecy of a great falling away or apostasy from the truth of the Gospel. The purity of the Gospel of Christ would be corrupted, and its intent perverted.

The falling away of which Paul wrote to the Thessalonians is referred to in his counsel to the elders, or bishops, of the church at Ephesus, whom he called to meet him at Miletus. To them he said: "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." Acts xx. 29-31.

This warning was not alone to the people of Ephesus in the three years that he was there. It is seen through all his epistles. Because of this readiness of individuals to assert themselves, to get wrong views of the truth, and to speak perverse things, the churches had constantly to be checked, guided, trained, reproved, and rebuked. But it was not alone nor chiefly from these characters that the danger threatened. It was those who from among the disciples would arise *speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.*

Through error or judgment, a man might speak perverse things with no bad intention; but the ones here mentioned would perverse things purposely and with the intention of making disciples for themselves - to draw away disciples after them instead of to draw disciples to Christ. These would pervert the truth, and would have to pervert the truth, in order to accomplish their purpose.

He who always speaks the truth as it is in Jesus, will draw disciples to Jesus, and not to himself. To draw to Christ will be his only wish. But when one seeks to draw disciples to himself, and puts himself in the place of Christ, then he must pervert the truth, and accommodate it to the wishes of those whom he hopes to make his own disciples. This is wickedness; this is apostasy.

There was another consideration which made the danger the more imminent. These words were spoken to the bishops. It was a company of bishops, or elders, to whom the apostle was speaking when he said: "Of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." From that order of men who were chosen to guide and to care for the church of Christ, from those who were set to protect the church - from this order of men there would be those who would pervert their calling, their office, and the purpose of it, to build up themselves, and gather disciples to themselves in the place of Christ.

To watch this spirit, to check its influence, and to guard against its workings was the constant effort of the apostle; and for the reason as stated to the Thessalonians, that the mystery of iniquity was already working. There were at that time elements abroad which the apostle could

822

plainly see would develop into all that the Scriptures had announced. And scarcely were the last of the apostles dead when the evil appeared in its practical workings; and to study the growth of this apostasy (as we shall in future numbers) is only to study the growth of the Papacy, for it was the Papacy in its earlier stages.

A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 12 (1896)

January 9, 1896

"The Papacy. Early Developments" *The Present Truth* 12, 2 , pp. 19, 20.

NO sooner were the apostles removed from the stage of action, no sooner was their watchful attention gone and their apostolic authority removed, than this very thing appeared of which the apostle had spoken (the "falling away," considered last week).

Certain bishops, in order to make easier the conversion of the heathen, to multiply disciples, and by this increase their own influence and authority, began to adopt heathen customs and forms.

When the last of the apostles was dead, the first century was gone; and within twenty years of that time the perversion of the truth of Christ had become widespread. In the history of this century and of this subject the historian Mosheim says: -

It is certain that to religious worship, both public and private, many rites were added, without necessity, and to the offense of sober and good men.

And the reason of this is stated to be that -

"The Christians were pronounced atheists, because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims, priests, and all that pomp in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. For unenlightened persons are prone to estimate religion by what meets their eyes. To silence this accusation, the Christian doctors thought it necessary to introduce some external rites, which would strike the senses of the people, so that they could maintain themselves really to possess all those things of which Christians were charged with being destitute, though under different forms."

This was at once to accommodate the Christian worship and its forms to that of the heathen, and was almost at one step to heathenize Christianity. No heathen element or form can be connected with Christianity or its worship, and Christianity remain pure.

Of all the ceremonies of the heathen, the mysteries were the most sacred and most universally practised. Some mysteries were in honor of Bacchus, some of Cybele, but the greatest of all, those considered the most sacred of all and the most widely practised, were the Eleusinian, so called because celebrated at Eleusis in Greece.

But whatever was the mystery that was celebrated, there was always in it, as an essential part of it, the elements of abomination that characterized sun-worship everywhere, because the mysteries were simply forms of the widespread and multiform worship of the sun. Among the first of the perversions of

the Christian worship was to give to its forms the title and air of the mysteries. For, Mosheim says: -

"Among the Greeks and the people of the East, nothing was held more sacred than what were called the mysteries. This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say that they also had similar mysteries, or certain holy rites concealed from the vulgar; and they not only applied the terms used in the pagan mysteries to Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's Supper, but they gradually introduced also the rites which were designated by these terms."

Of the Eleusinian mysteries, Anthon ("Ecclesiastical Dictionary") says: "This mysterious secrecy was solemnly observed and enjoined on all the votaries of the goddess; and if anyone ever appeared at the celebration, either intentionally or through ignorance, without proper introduction, he was immediately punished with death. Persons of both sexes and all ages were initiated at this solemnity; and it was looked upon as

20

so heinous a crime to neglect this sacred part of religion that it was one of the heaviest accusations which contributed to the condemnation of Socrates. The initiated were under the more particular care of the deities, and therefore their lives were supposed to be attended with more happiness and real security than those of other men. This benefit was not only granted during life, but it extended beyond the grave; and they were honored with the first places in the Elysian fields, while others were left to wallow in perpetual filth and ignominy."

There were the greater and the lesser mysteries. The greater were the Eleusinian in fact, and the lesser were invented, according to the mythological story, because Hercules passed near Eleusis, where the greater mysteries were celebrated, and desired to be initiated; but as he was a stranger, and therefore could not lawfully be admitted, a form of mysteries was adopted into which he could be initiated. These were ever afterward celebrated as the lesser, and were observed at Agræ.

In the course of time the lesser were made preparatory to the greater, and the candidate must be initiated into these before he could be initiated into the greater. "The person who assisted," says Anthon of the rites of initiation, "was called *Hudranos*, from *hudor*, water, which was used at the purification; and they themselves were called the initiated. A year after the initiation at the lesser mysteries they sacrificed a sow to Ceres, and were admitted into the greater, and the secrets of the festivals were solemnly revealed to them.

These mysteries, as well as those of Bacchus and others, were directly related to the sun. Says the *Encyclopædia Britannica*: "The most holy and perfect rite in the Eleusinian Mysteries was to show an ear of corn mowed down in silence, and this was a symbol of the Phrygian Atys." The Phrygian Atys was simply the incarnation of the sun, and the mysteries being a form of sun worship,

cannot be described with decency any further than is spoken by the Apostle Paul, in words spoken with direct reference to this subject. "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret." Eph. v. 11, 12.

It was to accommodate the Christian worship to the minds of a people who practised these things that the bishops gave to the Christian ordinances the name of mysteries. The Lord's Supper was made the greater mystery, baptism the lesser and the initiatory rite to the celebration of the former. After the heathen manner also a white garment was used as the initiatory robe, and the candidate, having been baptized, and thus initiated into the lesser mysteries, was admitted into what was called in the church the order of *catechumens*, in which order they remained a certain length of time, as in the heathen celebration, before they were admitted to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the greater mystery.

Nobody at all familiar with the rites of the Catholic Church to-day, need be told that confirmation and the white dress for the first communion, are simply relics of paganism.

Mosheim testifies that before the second century was half gone, before the last of the apostles had been dead forty years, this apostasy, this working of the mystery of iniquity, had so largely spread over both the East and the West, that it is literally true that "a large part, therefore, of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries."

A. T. JONES.

January 16, 1896

**"The Papacy. Adopting the Day of the Sun" *The Present Truth* 12, 3 ,
pp. 35, 36.**

LAST week we saw how, immediately after the apostles were dead, the corruption so heathenism began to be taken into the church, until the services, as the historian says, had the aspect of pagan mysteries.

Nor is this all. The worship of the sun was at this time universal. These apostates not being content with so much of the sun worship as appeared in the celebration of the mysteries, adopted the heathen custom of worshipping toward the east. So says Mosheim: -

"Before the coming of Christ, all the Eastern nations performed divine worship with their faces turned to that part of the heavens where the sun displays his rising beams. This custom was founded upon a general opinion that God, whose *essence* they looked upon to be *light*, and whom they considered as being circumscribed within certain limits, dwell in that part of the firmament from which He sends forth the sun, the bright image of His benignity and glory. The Christian converts, indeed, rejected this gross error [of supposing that God dwelt in that part of the firmament]; but they retained the ancient and universal custom of worshipping toward

the east, which sprang from it. Nor is this custom abolished even in our times, but still prevails in a great number of Christian churches."

The next step in addition to this was the adoption of the day of the sun as a festival day. To such an extent were the forms of sun-worship practised in this apostasy, that before the close of the second century the heathen themselves charged these so-called Christians with worshipping the sun. A presbyter of the church of Carthage, then and now one of the "Church Fathers," Tertullian, who wrote about A.D. 200, considered it necessary to make a defence of the practice, which he did to the following effect in an address to the rulers and magistrates of the Roman Empire: -

"Others, again, certainly with more information and greater verisimilitude, believe that the sun is our god. We shall be counted Persians perhaps, though we do not worship the orb of day painted on a piece of linen cloth, having himself everywhere in his own disk. The idea no doubt has originated from our being known to turn to the east in prayer. But you, many of you, also under pretense sometimes of worshipping the heavenly bodies, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise. In the same way, if we devote Sunday to rejoicing, from a far different reason than sun worship, we have some resemblance to those of you who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury, though they too go far away from Jewish ways, of which indeed they are ignorant."

And again in an address to all the heathen he justifies this practice by the argument, in effect, You do the same thing, you originated it too, therefore you have no right to blame us. In his own words his defense is as follows: -

"Others, with greater regard to good manners, it must be confessed, suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians, because it is a well-known fact that we pray toward the east, or because we make Sunday a day of festivity. What then? Do you do less than this? Do not many among you, with an affectation of sometimes worshipping the heavenly bodies, likewise move your lips in the direction of the sunrise? It is you, at all events, who have admitted the sun into the calendar of the week; and you have selected its day, in preference to the preceding day, as the most suitable in the week for either an entire abstinence from the bath, or for its postponement until the evening, or for taking rest and banqueting."

This accommodation was easily

36

made, and all this practice was easily justified, by the perverse-minded teachers, in the perversion of such scriptures as, "The Lord God is a sun and shield" (Ps. lxxxiv. 11); and "Unto you that fear My name shall the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in His wings."

As this custom spread, and through it such disciples were multiplied, the ambition of the Bishop of Rome grew apace. It was in honour of the day of the sun that there was manifested the first attempt of the bishop of Rome to compel

the obedience of all other bishops, and the fact that this attempt was made in such a cause, at the very time when these pretended Christians were openly accused by the heathen of worshipping the sun, is strongly suggestive.

From Rome there came now another addition to the sun-worshipping apostasy. The first Christians being mostly Jews, continued to celebrate the Passover in remembrance of the death of Christ, the true Passover; and this was continued among those who from among the Gentiles had turned to Christ. Accordingly, the celebration was always on the passover day, - the fourteenth of the first month. Rome, however, and from her all the West, adopted *the day of the sun* as the day of this celebration.

According to the Eastern custom, the celebration, being on the fourteenth day of the month, would of course fall on different days of the week as the years revolved. The rule of Rome was that the celebration must always be on a Sunday - the Sunday nearest to the fourteenth day of the first month of the Jewish year. And if the fourteenth day of that month should itself be a Sunday, then the celebration was not to be held on that day, but upon the next Sunday. One reason of this was not only to be as like the heathen as possible, but to be as unlike the Jews as possible; this, in order not only to facilitate the "conversion" of the heathen by conforming to their customs, but also by pandering to their spirit of contempt and hatred of the Jews. It was upon this point that the bishop of Rome made his first open attempt at absolutism.

We know not precisely when this began, but it was practised in Rome as early as the time of Sixtus I, who was bishop of Rome A.D. 119-128. The practice was promoted by his successors, and Anicetus, who was bishop of Rome A.D. 157-168, "would neither conform to that [Eastern] custom himself nor suffer any under his jurisdiction to conform to it, obliging them to celebrate that solemnity on the Sunday next following the fourteenth of the moon." In A.D. 160, Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, made a journey to Rome to consult with Anicetus about this question, though nothing special came of the consultation. Victor, who was Bishop of Rome A.D. 192-202, likewise proposed to oblige only those under his *jurisdiction* to conform to the practice of Rome; *but he asserted jurisdiction over all*, and therefore presumed to command all.

"Accordingly, after having taken the advice of some foreign bishops," says Mosheim, "he wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic prelates commanding them to imitate the example of the Western Christians with respect to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter. The Asiatics answered this lordly requisition by the pen of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who declared in their name, with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart in this manner from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this the thunder of excommunication began to roar. Victor, exasperated by this resolute answer of the Asiatic bishops, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowship with the church of Rome."

In view of these things it will readily be seen that between paganism and this kind of Christianity it soon became difficult to distinguish, and the third century only went to make any distinction still more difficult to be discerned.

A. T. JONES.

January 23, 1896

**"The Papacy. The Creation of the Papal Religion" *The Present Truth*
12, 4 , pp. 53, 54.**

LAST week we closed our study of the "falling away" with these words: "In view of these things it will readily be seen that between paganism and this kind of Christianity it soon became difficult to distinguish, and the third century only went to make any distinction still more difficult to be discerned."

In the latter part of the second century, there sprang up in Egypt a school of pagan philosophy called the "Eclectic." The patrons of this school called themselves "Eclectics," because they professed to be in search of truth alone, and to be ready to adopt any tenet of any system in existence which seemed to them to be agreeable to their ideas of truth. They regarded Plato as the one person above all others who had attained the nearest to truth in the greatest number of points. Hence they were also called "Platonists." "This philosophy was adopted," says Mosheim, "by such of the learned at Alexandria as wished to be accounted Christians, and yet to retain the name, the garb, and the rank of philosophers."

In the end of the second century, and especially in the first forty-one years of the third, there flourished in Alexandria one of these would-be philosophers - Ammonius Saccas by name - who gave a turn to the philosophy of the Eclectics, which caused his sect to be called the New Platonists. The difference between the Eclectic and the system founded by Ammonius was this: The Eclectics held, as above stated, that in every system of thought in the world there was some truth, but mixed with error, their task being to select from all systems that portion of truth which was in each, and from all these to form one harmonious system. Ammonius held that when the truth was known, all sects had the same identical system of truth; that the differences among them were caused simply by the different ways of stating that truth; and that the proper task of the philosopher was to find such a means of stating the truth that all should be able to understand it, and so each one understand all the others. This was to be accomplished by a system of allegorising and mystification, by which anybody could get whatever he wanted out of any writing that might come to his notice.

One of the earliest attaches to espouse this philosophy from among those who professed to be Christians, was Clement of Alexandria, who became the head of that kind of school at Alexandria. These philosophers, says Mosheim, "believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings; the one obvious, and corresponding with the direct import of the words; the other recondite, and concealed under the words, like a nut by the shell. The former they neglected, as

of little value, their study chiefly being to extract the latter; in other words, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out their true meanings. Some also, and this is stated especially of Clement, accommodated the divine oracles to the precepts of philosophy."

The close resemblance between the pagan philosophy and that of the New Platonists is illustrated by the fact that but one of the classes concerned could tell to which of them Ammonius Saccas belonged. The pagans generally regarded him as a pagan. His own kind of Christians counted him a good Christian all his life. The genuine Christians all knew that he was a pagan, and that the truth of the whole

54

matter was that he was a pretended Christian "who adopted with such dexterity the doctrines of the pagan philosophy, as to appear a Christian to the Christians, and a pagan to the pagans." He died A.D. 241.

Clement is supposed to have died about A.D. 220, and the fame and influence which he had acquired - and it was considerable - was far outshone by Origen, who had been taught by both Clement and Ammonius. Origen imbibed all the allegorical and mystifying processes of both Ammonius and Clement, and multiplied upon them from his own wild imagination. He was not content with finding two meanings in the Scriptures as those before him, but took the secondary sense, the hidden meaning, and added to it four additional meanings of his own. His system then stood thus: 1. All Scripture contains two meanings, the literal and the hidden. 2. This hidden sense has within itself two meanings, the moral and the mystical. 3. The mystical has within it yet two other meanings, the allegorical and the anagogical.

The Scriptures are of little use," taught Origen, "to those who understand them as they are written." With such a system as a basis, it is logical enough that the Catholic Church should forbid the common people to read the Scriptures. For Origen is one of the chiefest fathers of the Catholic Church; and "from the days of Origen to those of Chrysostom," says Archdeacon Farrar, "there was not a single eminent commentator who did not borrow largely from the works of" Origen. "He was the chief teacher of even the most orthodox of the Western Fathers."

By such a system as this it is evident that anyone could find whatever he pleased in any passage of the Scripture, and that the Scripture could be made to support any doctrine that was ever invented by the wildest fancy of the veriest fanatic. Even though the doctrine might be flatly contradictory to the Scripture, the Scripture could be made fully to agree with and teach the doctrine.

From this sketch of Platonism as held by Origen, the essential truth of the following passage will be readily seen: -

"This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by Origen and other Christians, did immense harm to Christianity. For it led the teachers of it to involve in philosophic obscurity many parts of our religion, which were in themselves plain and easy to be understood; and to add to the precepts of the Saviour no few things, of which not a word can be found in the Holy Scriptures. . . .

It recommended to Christians various foolish and useless rites, suited only to nourish superstition, no small part of which we see religiously observed by many even to the present day. And finally it alienated the minds of many, in the following centuries, from Christianity itself, and produced a heterogeneous species of religion, consisting of Christian and Platonic principles combined."

On the part of real Christians, those who loved the truth as it is in Christ, there was strong opposition from the first to this whole system of philosophy with its mystification and allegory. "But the friends of philosophy and literature gradually acquired the ascendancy."

A. T. JONES.

January 30, 1896

"The Papacy. The Establishment of the New Religion" *The Present Truth* 12, 5 , pp. 67, 68.

WHILE this effort was being made on the side of philosophy to unite all religions, there was at the same time a like effort on the side of politics. It was the aim of Elagabalus, (A.D. 218 to 222) to blen *all religions into one*, of which "the sun was to be the central object of adoration." But the elements were not yet fully prepared for such a fusion. Also the shortness of the reign of Elagabalus prevented any decided advancement toward success.

Alexander Severus - A. D. 222 to 225 - held to the same idea, and carried it into effect so far as his individual practice was concerned. "The mother of Alexander Severus, the able, perhaps crafty and rapacious, Mamea, had at least held intercourse with the Christians of Syria. She had conversed with the celebrated Origen, and listened to his exhortations, if without conversion, still not without respect. Alexander, though he had neither the religious education, the pontifical character, nor the dissolute manners of his predecessor, was a Syrian, with no hereditary attachment to the Roman form of paganism. He seems to have affected a kind of universalism: he paid decent respect to the gods of the capitol; he held in honour the Egyptian worship, and enlarged the temples of Isis and Serapis. In his own palace, with respectful indifference, he enshrined, as it were, as his household deities, the representatives of the different religions or theo-philosophic systems which were prevalent in the Roman empire, - Orpheus, Abraham, Christ and Apollonius of Tyana. . . . *The homage of Alexander Severus may be a fair test of the general sentiment of the more intelligent heathen of his time.*" - *Milman*. His reign was also too short to accomplish anything beyond his own individual example. But the same tendency went rapidly forward.

On the side of philosophy and the apostasy, the progress was continuous and rapid. About the middle of this century, Origen and Celsus, a pagan philosopher, held a protracted discussion upon the respective merits of the pagan and the Christian philosophy. And the standing of the two systems at this time, is well described in the following statement: -

"Heathenism, as interpreted by philosophy, almost found favor with some of the more moderate Christian apologists. . . . The Christians endeavored to enlist the earlier philosophers in their cause; they were scarcely content with asserting that the nobler Grecian philosophy might be designed to prepare the human mind for the reception of Christianity; they were almost inclined to endow these sages with a kind of prophetic foreknowledge of its more mysterious doctrines. 'I have explained,' says the Christian in Minucius Felix, 'the opinions of almost all the philosophers, whose most illustrious glory it is that they have worshiped one God, though under various names; so that one might suppose either that the Christians of the present day are philosophers, or that the philosophers of old were already Christians.' These advances on the part of Christianity were more than met by paganism.

During the next fifty years, while imperial policy varied, these elements worked steadily forward in the same general direction. Of the progress of the apostasy during this time, we have a powerful illustration in the practice of Gregory Thaumaturgus, the "wonder-worker."

Gregory was a pupil and a convert of Origen's. Origen strongly urged him "to devote his acquirements in heathen science and learning, to the elucidation of the Scriptures." When he left Origen's school at Alexandria, he returned to Pontus, and became Bishop of Neo Cesarea, A.D. 240 to 270, and how fully he followed the advice of Origen is shown by the following from Mosheim: -

"When Gregory perceived that the ignorant multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the pleasures and sensual gratifications which they enjoyed at the pagan festivals, he granted them a permission to indulge themselves in the like pleasures, in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, hoping that, in process of time, they would return of their own accord, to a more virtuous and regular course of life." There is no sort of doubt that, by this permission, Gregory allowed the Christians to dance, sport, and feast at the tombs of the martyrs, upon their respective festivals, and to do everything which the pagans were accustomed to in their temples, during the feasts celebrated in honour of their gods.

Neo Cesarea was one of the most important cities in Pontus. Yet so diligently did Gregory thus employ the talents committed to him by Origen, that it is related of him that whereas "there were said to be only seventeen Christians in the whole city when he first entered it as bishop, there were said to be only seventeen pagans in it at the time of his death." It is manifest, however, from Gregory's practice, that those who were by him brought to the Christian name were as much pagan as before except in the mere matter of the name.

In the time of Diocletian, that which was known as paganism was so far different from the original paganism of Rome that Milman plainly designates it as "the new paganism." This new paganism was so little removed from the apostate form of Christianity which we have traced, as really to differ from it only in name.

The standing of the two systems at the accession of Diocletian is thus described:

-

Among the cares of his administration, he by no means neglected the purification of the ancient religions. In paganism itself, that silent but manifest change of which we have already noticed the commencement, had been creeping on. . . . This new paganism, as has been observed, arose out of the alliance of the philosophy and the religion of the old world. These once implacable adversaries had reconciled their differences, and coalesced against the common enemy. Christianity itself had no slight influence upon the formation of the new system; and now an Eastern element, more and more strongly dominant, mingled with the whole, and lent it, as it were, a visible object of worship. From Christianity, the new paganism had adopted the unity of the Deity, and scrupled not to degrade all the gods of the older world into subordinate demons or ministers. The Christians had incautiously held the same language: both concurred in the name of demons; but the pagans used the term in the Platonic sense, as good but subordinate spirits, while the same term spoke to the Christian ear as expressive of malignant and diabolic agency. But the Jupiter Optimus Maximus was not the great Supreme of the new system. The universal *deity of the East, the sun*, to the philosophic was *the emblem* or representative; to the vulgar, *the Deity*. Diocletian himself, though he paid so much deference to the older faith as to

68

assume the title of Jovius, as belonging to the lord of the world, yet, on his accession, when he would exculpate himself from all concern in the murder of his predecessor, Numerian, appealed in the face of the army to the all-seeing deity of the sun. It is the oracle of Apollo of Miletus, consulted by the hesitating emperor, which is to decide the fate of Christianity. *The metaphorical language of Christianity had unconsciously lent strength to this new adversary; and in adoring the visible orb*, some, no doubt, supposed that they were not departing far from the worship of the "Sun of Righteousness."

Diocletian himself really contemplated the same fusion of all religions into one, with the sun as the one great universal deity, which Elagabalus had contemplated in his day; but by Galerius and the leading philosopher of the new paganism, he was persuaded to use all the power of the State in the effort to make paganism alone supreme over and against every form and every profession of the Christian name. The result, however, was as already related, that Galerius was compelled to issue a public edict confessing his failure.

Then came Constantine, the best imperial representative of the new paganism, and the most devout worshipper of the sun as the supreme and universal deity, with the avowed purpose, as expressed in his own words, "First to bring the diverse judgments formed by all nations respecting the Deity to a

condition, as it were, of settled uniformity." In Constantine the new paganism met its ideal and the New Platonism - the apostate, paganised, sun-worshipping form of Christianity - met its long-wished-for instrument. In him the two streams met. In him the aspiration of Elagabalus, the hope of Ammonius Saccas and Origen, and the ambition of the perverse-minded, self-exalted bishops, were all realised and accomplished - a new, imperial, and universal religion was created. Therefore, in Milman's words, "The reign of Constantine the Great forms one of the epochs in the history of the world. It is the era of the dissolution of the Roman empire; the commencement, or rather consolidation, of a kind of Eastern despotism, with a new capital, a new patriciate, a new constitution, a new financial system, a new, though as yet imperfect, jurisprudence, and, finally, a new religion."

The epoch thus formed was the epoch of the Papacy; and the "new religion" thus created was the PAPAL RELIGION. A. T. JONES.

February 6, 1896

**"The Papacy. Exaltation of the Bishopric" *The Present Truth* 12, 6 ,
pp. 83, 84.**

THE Scripture was fulfilled; there had, as shown in these columns last week, come a falling away.

But that there should come a falling away, was not all the prophecy - through that falling away there was to be revealed "that man of sin," "the son of perdition," "the mystery of iniquity," "that wicked," who would oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; and who when he should appear, would continue even till that great and notable event - the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Referring again to 2 Thess. ii. 4, it is seen that *self-exaltation* is the spring of the development of this power. As that Scripture expresses it, he "opposeth and exalteth *himself*." Or, as another scripture gives it, "He shall magnify *himself* in his heart." And another, "He magnified *himself* even to the prince of the host" - the Lord Jesus Christ. And yet another, "He shall also stand up *against* the Prince of princes." That is, he shall reign, or assert authority above, and in opposition to, the authority of Christ; or, as the thought is developed by Paul, this power would oppose and exalt itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple - the place of worship - of God, showing himself that he is God.

Referring also again to the instruction of Paul to the elders who met him at Miletus, there is seen a prophecy of this same spirit of self-exaltation, - a wish to gain disciples to themselves instead of to Christ. They would prefer themselves to Christ, thus at once putting themselves above Him, in opposition to Him. And this would be developed from among the bishops. "Of *your own selves* shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples *after them*."

This spirit was actively manifested in opposition to the apostle John while he was yet alive, for he says: "I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes who loveth to

have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not." 1 John 9. This assertion of pre-eminence was shown in prating against the apostle with malicious words, and not only rejecting him, but casting out of the church those members who would receive him. It was but a little while after the death of the apostles until this was carried to yet further extremes.

According to the word of Christ, there is no such thing as pre-eminence, or mastership, or sovereignty of position, among men in the church. There was once an argument among his disciples as to who should be counted the greatest, and Jesus called them unto him, and said: "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Mark x. 2-45.

And in warning His disciples of all times against the practice of the scribes and Pharisees of that time, who were but the popes of their day, He says they "love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. . . . Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." Matt. xxiii. 6-12.

ORDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

IN the church each member has the same rights as any other member; but for the good of all and the mutual benefit of all concerned, as well as better to carry on His work in the world, the Lord has established His church, and with it a system of church order in which certain ones are chosen to exercise certain functions for the mutual benefit of all in the organization. These officers are chosen from among the membership by the voice of the membership. Of these officers there are two classes, and two only, - bishops and deacons. This is shown by Paul's letter to the Philippians - "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Chap. i. 1.

Bishops are sometimes called elders; but the same office is always signified. When Paul gave directions to Titus in this matter, he said: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* in every city, as I had appointed thee: if any be blameless. . . . For a *bishop* must be blameless, as the steward of God." Titus i. 5-7. This is further shown in Acts xx., to which we have before referred; when Paul had called unto him to Miletus "the *elders* of the church" of Ephesus, among other things he said to them: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*," - *episkopoi* - bishops.

Peter also writes to the same effect: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." 1 Peter v. 1-3.

This text not only shows that the terms "elder" and "bishop" refer to the same identical office, but it shows that Peter counted himself as one

84

among them; and that not only by his precept but by his example he showed that in this office, although overseers they were not overrulers or lords.

Such is the order in the church of Christ, and as every Christian is God's freeman and Christ's servant, it follows, as has been well stated, that "monarchy in spiritual things does not harmonize with the spirit of Christianity."

HOW THE DIVINE ORDER WAS PERVERTED

YET this order was not suffered long to remain. A distinction was very soon asserted between the bishop and the elder; and the bishop assumed a precedence and an authority over the elder, who was now distinguished from the bishop by the title of "presbyter" only. This was easily and very naturally accomplished.

For instance, a church would be established in a certain city. Soon perhaps another church or churches would be established in that same city, or near to it in the country. These other churches would look naturally to the original church as to a mother, and the elders of the original church would naturally have a care for the others as they arose. It was only proper to show Christian respect and deference to these; but this respect and deference was soon *demanded*, and authority to require it was asserted by those who were the first bishops.

Again: as churches multiplied and with them also elders multiplied, it was necessary, in carrying forward the work of the gospel, for the officers of the church often to have meetings for consultation. On these occasions it was but natural and proper for the seniors to preside; but instead of allowing this to remain still a matter of choice in the conducting of each successive meeting or assembly, it was claimed as a right that the one originally chosen should hold that position for life.

Thus was that distinction established between the elders, or presbyters, and the bishops. Those who usurped this permanent authority and office took to themselves exclusively the title of "bishop," and all the others were still to retain the title of "presbyter." The presbyters in turn assumed over the deacons a supremacy and authority which did not belong to them, and all together - bishops, presbyters, and deacons - held themselves to be superior orders in the church over the general membership, and assumed to themselves the title of "clergy," while upon the general membership the term "laity" was conferred.

In support of these three orders among the "clergy," it was claimed that they came in proper succession from the high priests, the priests, and the Levites of

the Levitical law. "Accordingly, the bishops considered themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the high priest among the Jews, while the presbyters represented the priests, and the deacons the Levites."

A. T. JONES.

February 13, 1896

"The Papacy. The Man of Sin Revealed" *The Present Truth* 12, 7 , pp. 100, 101.

LAST week we traced the growth of the distinctions by which, after the days of the apostles, the ambitious bishops created the three orders among the "clergy," according to which "the bishops considered themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the high priest among the Jews, while the presbyters represented the priests, and the deacons the Levites."

These distinctions were established as early as the middle of the second century. This led to a further and most wicked invention. As they were now priests and Levites after the order of the priesthood of the former dispensation, it was necessary that they also should have a sacrifice to offer. Accordingly, the Lord's Supper was turned into "the unbloody sacrifice." Thus arose that which is still in the Roman Catholic Church the daily "sacrifice" of the mass. With this also came a splendor in dress, copied from that of the former real priesthood.

The estimate in which the bishop was now held may be gathered from the following words of a document of the second century: -

It is manifest, therefore, that we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord Himself. It is well to reverence both God and the bishop. He who honours the bishop has been honoured of God; he who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, does (in reality) serve the devil."

The next step was that certain bishops asserted authority over other bishops; and the plea upon which this was claimed as a right, was that the bishops of those churches which had been established by the apostles were of right to be considered as superior to all others. As Rome was the capital of the empire, and as the church there claimed direct descent not only from one but from two apostles, it soon came to pass that the church of Rome claimed to be the source of true doctrine, and the bishop of that church to be supreme over all other bishops. In the latter part of the second century, during the episcopate of Eleutherius, A.D. 176-192, the absolute authority of the church of Rome in matters of doctrine was plainly asserted in the following words: -

It is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the church, - those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father. Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of

all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vain-glory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorised meetings (we do this, I say); by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known church founded and organised at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of the bishops. For it is *a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church*, on account of its pre-eminent authority. . . . Since, therefore, we have such proofs, *it is not necessary to seek the truth among others* which it is easy to obtain from the church; since the apostles, like a rich man depositing his money in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth, so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For *she is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers*.

When this authority and power was asserted during the bishopric of Eleutherius, it is not at all strange that his immediate successor, Victor, A.D. 192-202, should attempt to carry into practice the authority thus claimed for him. The occasion of it was the question of the celebration of what is now Easter, as already related in the preceding chapter. This action of Victor is pronounced by Bower "the first essay of papal usur-

101

pation." Thus early did Rome not only claim supremacy, but attempt to enforce her claim of supremacy, over all other churches. Such was the arrogance of the bishops of Rome at the beginning of the third century.

The character of the bishopric in A. D. 250, is clearly seen by the words of Cyprian: -

Not a few bishops who ought to furnish both exhortation and example to others, despising their divine charge, became agents in secular business, forsook their throne, deserted their people, wandered about over foreign provinces, hunted the markets for gainful merchandise, while brethren were starving in the church. They sought to possess money in hoards, they seized estates by crafty deceits, they increased their gains by multiplying usuries.

As the bishopric became more exalted, and arrogated to itself more authority, the office became an object of unworthy ambition and unholy aspiration. Arrogance characterised those who were in power, and envy those who were not. And whenever a vacancy occurred, unseemly and wholly unchristian strife arose among rival presbyters for the vacant seat. "The deacons, beholding the presbyters thus deserting their functions, boldly invaded their rights and privileges; and the effects of a corrupt ambition were spread through every rank of the sacred order."

These discussions which gave opportunity for the further assertion of the dignity and authority of the bishopric. Cyprian, "the representative of the episcopal system," as Neander relates, declared that -

The church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers. . . . Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the church, and the church in the bishop; and if any one be not with the bishop, that he is not in the church.

He insisted that God made the bishops, and the bishops made the deacons, and argued thus: -

But if we [bishops] may dare anything against God who makes bishops, deacons may also dare against us by whom they are made.

Not long afterward, there arose another subject of controversy, which caused much contention with far-reaching consequences. As the bishops arrogated to themselves more and more authority, both in discipline and doctrine, "heretics" increased. Whosoever might disagree with the bishop was at once branded as a heretic, and was cut off from his communion, as Diotrephes had counted as a heretic even the apostle John. Upon this point the representative of the episcopal system further declared: -

Neither have heresies arisen, nor have schisms originated, from any other source than from this, that God's priest is not obeyed; nor do they consider that there is one person for the time priest in the church, and for the time judge in the stead of Christ; whom if, according to divine teaching, the whole fraternity should obey, no one would stir up anything against the college of priests; no one, after the divine judgment, after the suffrage of the people, after the consent of the co-bishops, would make himself a judge, not now of the bishop, but of God. No one would rend the church by a division of the unity of Christ.

He therefore argued that if any person was outside of this system of episcopal unity, and was not obedient to the bishop, this was all the evidence necessary to demonstrate that he was a heretic. Consequently he declared that no one ought "even to be inquisitive as to *what*" any one "teaches, so long as he teaches out of the pale of *unity*." In this way the truth itself could be made heresy.

Of the condition of the bishopric in 302, when the Diocletian persecution began, Eusebius says: "They were sunk in negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and were almost on the point of taking up arms against each other, and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity." Also some who appeared to be pastors were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalry, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.

The scripture was fulfilled. There *had* come a falling away; there was a self-exaltation of the bishopric; and THE TIME WAS COME WHEN THE MAN OF SIN

SHOULD BE REVEALED. 2 Thess. ii. 3.
A. T. JONES.

February 20, 1896

**"The Papacy. Constantine and the Bishops" *The Present Truth* 12, 8 ,
pp. 115, 116.**

THE CHURCH ENTERING POLITICS

AS shown last week, there had come as early as the latter part of the third century of the Christian era, a falling away from the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, so that the way was fully prepared for the setting up of the Papacy; but the perfect development of that power was not yet complete.

In order to its perfect development the Papacy must have the aid of the State. Before the Bishop of Rome could be exalted to the place he was to occupy and be recognised by all the world as the head of the Church, other bishops must be forced into submission to him by the strong arm of civil power, and the forces were at work that were to accomplish this.

One very important factor in the setting up of the Papacy was the Emperor Constantine. Coming to the throne, Constantine found Christianity a growing religious power in the empire, and after a time he conceived the idea of turning this new religion which seemed to be displacing paganism, to his own account; likewise the bishops, as we have seen, were grasping for civil power. As Draper says: "It was the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics; it was the aim of the bishops to make politics a branch of theology." Both were in a measure successful.

Of the state of the church at that time, Eusebius bears this testimony: -

When by reason of excessive liberty we sunk into negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and we were almost, as it were, on the point of taking up arms against each other, and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity, then the Divine judgment, which usually proceeds with a lenient hand, whilst the multitudes were yet crowding into the church, with gentle and mild visitations began to afflict its episcopacy, the persecution having begun with those brethren that were in the army. But as if destitute of all sensibility, we were not prompt in measures to appease and propitiate the Deity; some, indeed, like atheists, regarding our situations as unheeded and unobserved by a providence, we added one wickedness and misery to another. But some that appeared to be our pastors, deserting the law of piety, were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats,

rivalship, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.

The pagan persecution had caused all these divisions and disputes to be laid aside. Every other interest was forgotten in the one all-absorbing question of the rights of conscience against pagan despotism. Thus there was created at least an outward unity among all the sects of whatever name professing the Christian religion in any form. Thus was molded a compact power which permeated every part of the empire, and which was at the same time estranged from every material interest of the empire as it then stood. Here was power, which if it could be secured and used, would assure success to him who would gain it, as certainly as he could make the alliance. This condition of affairs was clearly discerned at the time. Constantine "understood the signs of the times and acted accordingly."

Draper says ("Intellectual Development of Europe"): -

To Constantine, who had fled from the treacherous custody of Galerius, it naturally occurred that if he should ally himself to the Christian party, conspicuous advantages must forthwith accrue to him. It would give him in every corner of the empire men and women ready to encounter fire and sword; it would give him partisans not only animated by the traditions of their fathers, but - for human nature will even in the religious assert itself - demanding retribution for the horrible barbarities and injustice that had been inflicted on themselves; it would give him, and this was the most important of all, unwavering adherents in every legion in the army. He took his course. The events of war crowned him with success. He could not be otherwise than outwardly true to those who had given him power, and who continued to maintain him on the throne.

Constantine was not the only one who saw this opportunity, but he being a accomplished politician, succeeded, while others failed. In addition to the advantages which offered themselves in this asserted unity of the churches, there was a movement among the bishops, which made it an additional incentive to Constantine to form the alliance which he did with the church. Although it is true that all the differences and disputes and strifes among the bishops and sects had been forgotten in the supreme conflict between paganism and freedom of thought, there is one thing mentioned by Eusebius that still remained. That was the ambition of the bishops "to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves." Nor was it alone government in the church which they were anxious to assert; but

GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE

as well, *to be used in the interests of the church*. For, as Neander testifies, "There had in fact arisen in the church . . . a false theocratical theory, originating, not in the essence of the Gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments."

This theocratic theory of the bishops is the key to the whole history of Constantine and the church of his time, and through all the dreary period that followed. It led the bishops into the wildest extravagance in their worship of the imperial influence, and coincided precisely with Constantine's idea of an absolute monarchy.

The idea of the theocracy that the bishops hoped to establish appears more clearly and fully in Eusebius's "Life of Constantine" than in any other one production of the time. The Church was a second Israel in Egyptian bondage. Maxentius, who was emperor in Italy, and one of the four rulers in the whole Roman Empire, each scheming for supreme control, was a second Pharaoh; Constantine, who overthrew him, was a second Moses. As the original Moses had grown up in the palace of the Pharaohs, so likewise this new Moses had grown up in the very society of the new Pharaohs.

When Constantine marched against Maxentius, it was the new Moses on his way to deliver Israel. When the

116

army of Maxentius was defeated on the banks of the Tiber, and multitudes were drowned in the river, it was the Red Sea swallowing up the hosts of Pharaoh. When Maxentius was crowded off the bridge and by the weight of his armor sank instantly to the bottom of the river, it was the new Pharaoh and "the horse and his rider" being thrown into the sea and sinking to the bottom like a stone.

Then was Israel delivered, and a song of deliverance was sung by the new Israel as by the original Israel at their deliverance. In describing this, Eusebius uses these words: -

"Let us sin unto the Lord, for He has been glorified exceedingly; the horse and rider has He thrown into the sea. He is become my helper and my shield unto salvation." And again, "Who is like to thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness, marvelous in praises, doing wonders?"

Such adulation was not without response on the part of Constantine. He united himself closely with the bishops, of whom Eusebius was but one, and in his turn flattered them. A. T. JONES.

February 27, 1896

**"The Papacy. The Church in the Fourth Century" *The Present Truth*
12, 9 , pp. 133, 134.**

TEMPORALLY EXALTED - MORALLY FALLEN

THE ambition of the bishops in the fourth century "to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves," led them, as we saw last week, to flatter Constantine by declaring him the new Moses that had come to deliver the church from bondage and set up a theocracy on earth, in which the bishops were to be the interpreters of the Divine will.

Such adulation was not without response on the part of Constantine. He united himself closely with the bishops, and, in his turn, flattered them. Eusebius says: -

The emperor was also accustomed personally to invite the society of God's ministers, whom he distinguished with the highest possible respect and honor, treating them in every sense as persons consecrated to the service of God. Accordingly they were admitted to his table, though mean in their attire and outward appearance; yet not so in his estimation, since he judged not of their exterior as seen by the vulgar eye, but thought he discerned in them somewhat of the character of God Himself.

This worked charmingly. Throughout the empire the courtly bishops worked in Constantine's interest; and as only Licinius now remained between Constantine and his longed-for position as sole emperor and absolute ruler, the bishops and their political church followers prayed against Licinius and for Constantine.

As these "worldly-minded bishops, instead of caring for the salvation of their flocks, were often but too much inclined to travel about and entangle themselves in worldly concerns," Licinius attempted to check it. To stop their meddling with the political affairs of his dominions, he forbade the bishops to assemble together or to pass from their own dioceses to others. This only tended to make the bishops more active, as the acts of Licinius could be counted as persecution.

Licinius next went so far as to remove from all public office whoever would not sacrifice to the gods; and the line was quickly drawn once more in his dominion in favor of paganism. This caused Constantine's party to put on a bolder face, and they not only prayed for Constantine against Licinius, but they began to invent visions in which they pretended to see the "legions of Constantine," says Neander, "marching victoriously through the streets at midday."

These enactments on the part of Licinius furnished the new Moses with an opportunity to conquer the heathen in the wilderness, and to go on to the possession of the promised land and the full establishment of the new theocracy. War was declared, and Constantine, with the labarum at the head of his army, took up his march toward the dominions of Licinius.

Another step was now taken in furtherance of the theocratical idea, and in imitation of the original Moses. It will be remembered that, after the passage of the Red Sea, Moses erected a tabernacle, and pitched it afar off from the camp, where he went to consult the Lord and to receive what the Lord had to give in commandment to Israel. Constantine, to sustain his part in this scheme of a new theocracy, and as far as possible to conform to the theocratical plans of the bishops, likewise erected a tabernacle, and pitched it a considerable distance from his camp. To this tabernacle he would repair and pretend to have visions and communications from the Lord, and to receive directions in regard to his expected battle with Licinius.

He soon carried this matter somewhat further, and provided a tabernacle in each legion, with attendant priests and deacons; and also another which was constructed in the form of a church, "so that in case he or his army might be led into the desert, they might have a sacred edifice in which to praise and worship

God, and participate in the mysteries. Priests and deacons followed the tent for the purpose of officiating therein, according to the law and regulations of the Church."

Such was the original of State chaplaincies. And it is but proper to remark that the system, wherever copied, has always been worthy of the original imposture.

The outcome of the war between Constantine and Licinius was the defeat and subsequent murder of the latter. And when, in violation of his solemn oath to his sister Constantia, Constantine caused Licinius to be executed. Yet the courtier-bishop justified the wicked transaction as being the lawful execution of the will of God upon the enemy of God.

When Constantine went to take his seat as presiding officer in the Council of Nice, his theocratical flatterers pretended to be dazzled by his splendor, as though an angel of God had descended straight from heaven. He who sat at Constantine's right hand that day, thus testifies: -

And now, all rising at the signal which indicated the emperor's entrance, at last he himself proceeded through the midst of the assembly, like some heavenly messenger of God.

Constantine, to sustain his part in the farce, declared openly in the council that "the crimes of priests ought not to be made known to the multitude, lest they should become an occasion of offense or of sin;" and declared that he himself would shield a bishop who should commit a crime, lest any should witness the sin and be injured by the bad example.

And when the council was closed, and the creed for which they had come together was established, he sent a letter to the "Catholic Church of the Alexandrians," in which he announced that the conclusions reached by the council were inspired by the Holy Spirit, and could be none other than the Divine will concerning the doctrine of God.

After the council was over, he gave a banquet in honor of the twentieth year of his reign, to which he invited the bishops and clergy who had attended the council. The bishops responded by pretending that it seemed to be the very likeness of the kingdom

134

of Christ itself. At the banquet "the emperor himself presided, and as the feast went on, called to himself one bishop after another, and loaded each with gifts in proportion to his deserts." This so delighted the bishops that one of them - it was James of Nisibis, a member of that monkish tribe that habitually lived on grass, browsing like oxen, was wrought up to such a height that he declared he saw angels standing round the emperor. Constantine, not to be outdone saw angels standing around James; and pronounced him one of the three pillars of the world. He said, "There are three pillars of the world; Antony in Egypt, Nicolas of Myra, James in Assyria."

Constantine himself occasionally appeared in the role of preacher, and "on these occasions a general invitation was issued, and thousands of people went to the palace to hear an emperor turned preacher." They were ready at the strong points to respond with loud applause and cheering. At times he would attack his courtiers for their rapacity and worldliness generally; and they, understanding him

perfectly, would cheer him loudly for his preaching, and go on in the same old way imitating his *actions*.

When his mother sent the nails of the "true cross" to him from Jerusalem with the instruction that some of them should be used as bridle bits for his war-horse, it was counted a further evidence that the kingdom of God was come; for it was made to be the fulfilment of that which "Zechariah the prophet predicted, 'that what is upon the bridles of the horses shall be holiness unto the Lord Almighty.'" And when he appointed his sons and nephews as Caesars to a share in the governmental authority, this was made to be a fulfilment of the prophecy of Dan. vii. 17, "The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom"!

Other instances of this mutual cajolery might be given, but space forbids. After Constantine's death Eusebius, whom Neander describes as "one of the best among the bishops of Constantine's court," pretended to hesitate as to whether it would not be committing gross sacrilege to attempt to write his life, and when he did write it he could compare him to no one but the Saviour Himself.

By the plain, unbiassed [*sic.*] facts of history, Constantine stands before the world as a confirmed and constant hypocrite, a perjurer, and a many times murderer, his own family not escaping his blood-thirsty jealousy. And yet this bishop, knowing all this, hesitated not to declare him the special favourite of God; to liken him to Jesus Christ; to make God indorse him to the human race as an example of godliness.

When one of the best of the bishops of his court, one who was familiar with the whole course of his evil life, could see in the life and actions of such a man as this, a Moses, and the kingdom of God - when in such a life this could be seen by one of the *best* of the bishops, we can only wonderingly inquire what could not be seen there by the worst of the bishops!

Can anybody wonder, or can any reasonable person dispute, that from such a mixture compose of such bishops and such a character, there should come *the mystery of iniquity in all its hideous enormity!*

It was thus that the Church played the harlot with the world in the early part of the fourth century. And thus it was by proving recreant to the Lord and by courting the favour of corrupt princes, that the Bishop of Rome was at last exalted to that place where he is described as sitting "in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

A. T. JONES.

March 5, 1896

"The Eastern Question. What Its Solution Means to All the World. No. 1. - A Look at the Past" *The Present Truth* 12, 10 , pp. 148-151.

NO RESPECT OF NATIONS WITH GOD

"THERE is no respect of persons with God." And there is likewise no respect of nations with God. There being no respect of persons with God, and nations

being composed only of persons, it is impossible that there should be respect of nations with God. Now everybody who has ever read the Bible knows full well that in ancient times God dealt with nations, calling them by name, and sending them direct and special messages. Who does not know the story of Jonah and Nineveh? But Nineveh was the great capital of the mighty nation of the Assyrians.

Read carefully the following passage: "In the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah came this word unto Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Thus saith the Lord to me; Make thee bonds and yokes, and put them upon thy neck, and send them to the king of Edom, and to the king of Moab, and to the king of the Ammonites, and to the king of Tyrus, and to the king of Zidon, by the hand of the messengers which come to Jerusalem unto Zedekiah king of Judah; and command them to say unto their masters, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Thus shall ye say unto your masters; I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come: and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him. And it shall come to pass, that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the Lord, with the sword, and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand. Therefore hearken not ye to your prophets, nor to your diviners, nor to your dreamers, nor to your enchanters, nor to your sorcerers, which speak unto you, saying, Ye shall not serve the king of Babylon; for they prophesy a lie unto you, to remove you far from your land; and that I should drive you out, and ye should perish. But the nations that bring their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serve him, those will I let remain still in their own land, saith the Lord; and they shall till it, and dwell therein." Jer. xxvii. 1-11.

There are no less than five nations distinctly called by name, and a definite message sent to each one as to His purposes concerning them and a sixth nation, Babylon. And no one can deny that in these messages the Lord, the God of Israel, made a perfectly fair proposition. He having made all things, His is the right to bestow any or all as seems best to Him. And now in the wisdom of His own counsels, for the accomplishment of His own great purpose, He had given all the nations to the control of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. Accordingly He sends to the people concerned the announcement of this fact, and calls upon them for their own good to accept this arrangement. He tells them that if they will willingly accept it and voluntarily submit to the government of the king of Babylon, it will be well with them, - they can remain in their own land in peace. But if they refuse to submit, then they will not only be subdued by the power of Nebuchadnezzar, but will be carried away from their own native country into a strange land.

Certainly no one could ask for a fairer proposition than this. But those people were like too many others, and thought their own way the best, and refused to believe the Lord, that it might be well with them and that they might so abide in peace; and so they were obliged by sorrowful experience to learn that they had better have believed the Lord, and in their sorrowful experience continually wish that they had believed the Lord. Even Jerusalem, the Lord's chosen city, and Judah, the Lord's own people, refused to believe the word of the Lord, and so refused to yield to the dominion of Nebuchadnezzar. They rebelled, joined in alliance with Egypt, and sustained a long and terrible siege before they would submit. But by Jeremiah the Lord repeated to them His purpose with the king of Babylon, and continually called upon them peaceably to submit, and assured them that Egypt and every other resource would be absolutely unavailing. For thus saith the Lord, "Behold Pharaoh's army, which is come forth to help you, shall return to Egypt, into their own land. And the Chaldeans shall come again, and fight against this city, and take it, and burn it with fire. Thus saith the Lord: Deceive not yourselves, saying, The Chaldeans shall surely depart from us: for they shall not depart. For though ye had smitten

149

the whole army of the Chaldeans that fight against you, and there remained but wounded men among them, yet should they rise up every man in his tent, and burn this city with fire. Jer. xxxvii. 8-10.

GOD'S OVERRULING PURPOSES IN THE AFFAIRS OF NATIONS

ONE point in the great purpose of God in bringing all nations under the sway of Nebuchadnezzar, was that He might the better bring to them the knowledge of Himself and His great power and wisdom to lead men in the right way. For after Nebuchadnezzar had subdued all the kingdoms and nations unto himself, he published to "all people, nations and languages, that dwell in all the earth" "the signs and wonders which the high God" had wrought toward him. Read Daniel iv. God knew long before, to what point Nebuchadnezzar would come in the knowledge of Himself, and what use He could make of this king in spreading to the nations the knowledge of God. And for this cause He brought the nations in subjection to him. The nations did not know this, but God knew it, and the nations should have believed the message of the Lord when He sent to them the word that even for their own temporal good they should willingly submit to the authority of the king of Babylon. In all this God was showing to the nations in that time, and it is written to show to the nations in all time, that "God rules in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will;" and that God has His own wise purpose to accomplish with the nations and kingdoms, even though the people may not know it, and though they will not believe it.

Now it is impossible to think that God dealt so personally with the nations of old, and yet that He has nothing to do with the nations now. It is certainly true that, as God is no respecter of persons, He is no respecter of nations, and He has His thought upon the nations of to-day, and has His purposes concerning, these as really as of old, or at any other time in the world's history. God's ways

have not changed; but the people and nations have forgotten or will not believe that God still rules in the kingdoms of men and works out through them His own deep counsels and wondrous purpose. And now the Government and people of England, yes of all the nations of Europe and even America, have, and have long had, their attention fixed upon the Government of Turkey. The Government of Turkey is a perplexity to the powers of Europe; and the powers of Europe are a puzzle to the people in their dealings with this perplexity. Is it true then that in this great question that vexes the mightiest powers and puzzles the peoples of the world, God has no part? Is it true that this world-absorbing question is outside the attention of God who of old time always ruled in the affairs of men? No; it is not true. God is "the same yesterday and to-day and for ever." With Him "is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." His love and care is as great for the great nations of to-day as it ever was for nations great or small in all time. His particular attention is not slackened with reference to these now any more than with those of old. In the words by His prophets were His counsels made known concerning the nations of old, and in these likewise are His counsels concerning the nations of to-day. And His purposes with the nations of to-day can be read in the books of the prophets of God, as certainly as they can be read there concerning the nations of old.

THE BREAKING UP OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

THREE distinct portions of Scripture are devoted to the Turkish power. Let us carefully and candidly examine these, that we may see what word the Lord has for us in this our day. The only organised nation within the bounds of history when the Bible record was closed - A.D. 98 - was the Roman Empire. The one only nation therefore above all others that could be considered first of all was the Roman Empire and the Roman power. This power and such as might succeed it in the course of time were the only ones that could be directly dealt with, because Rome was not only the one great power of the world, but within its bounds was also the very centre and pivot of God's work and purpose concerning the whole world for all time. The Roman Cesar Augustus had decreed that "all the world should be taxed," when Christ the Saviour of the world was born. By the authority of Rome in the Roman governor of Judea Christ was delivered to be crucified. Roman soldiers watched the tomb, and the Roman seal was upon the tomb, that was burst at the resurrection of the Prince of Life. Rome therefore being the great power of the world, and being also the centre of God's cause and purpose in the world for all time, it could not possibly be anything else than the first world-power to be dealt with by the Lord, and in the nature of things, the nations which should follow it to the end of time.

God had in old time foretold the fall of Babylon and the succession of Medo-Persia to her place of power in the world. He had told of the passing of this power from Persia and Media to Grecia, and from Grecia to Rome. And now, before closing the book of His counsels He would tell of the fall of Rome and the passing of power from her to others who should succeed. In the line of the Seven Trumpets of the book of Revelation is given the breaking up of the might, empire

and power of Rome. There are three great lines of prophecy in the book of Revelation, that run by sevens, and all extend to the end of time - the Seven Churches, the Seven Seals, and the Seven Trumpets. The line of the Seven Churches is the Lord's messages to the seven stages of the church to the end of time, and treats only of the church. The line of the Seven Trumpets marks the great events in the ruin of the Roman power, and what should follow to the end of time, and thus treats only of the world; while the line of the Seven Seals treats of the church and the world as they would be related to the end of time, and thus treats of both.

The trumpet itself is the symbol of war. And in this alone is a suggestion that the seven trumpets would announce wars. But as the Roman power was the centre of all, it would have to announce wars with Rome. The first four trumpets give the fall of the Western Empire of Rome. The fifth and sixth trumpets give the fall of the Eastern Empire of Rome. And the seventh trumpet gives the fall of all nations and of the world itself. Let anyone read Rev. chapters viii. and ix. and chaps. xi. 15-19; xvi. 18-20, and he can see for himself that the seventh trumpet ends all things of earth. The best exposition of the first six of the seven trumpets is Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," in the accounts of the Goths, the Vandals and the Huns; and of the Mohammedan Arabs and the Turks. By reading of the first trumpets in the eighth chapter it will be seen that a dreadful state of things is contemplated. Yet the last three are so much worse than the first ones that "Woe" is the chief characteristic of these. "I beheld and heard an

150

angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth, by reason of the other voices of the trumpets of the three angels which are yet to sound." Rev. viii. 13.

THE RISE OF THE TURKISH POWER IN PROPHECY AND HISTORY

THE fifth trumpet, the first woe, marks the rise and spread of the Mohammedan power; and the history that most clearly shows the fulfilment of the prophecy is found in chapters I. and li. of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." Anyone reading together Rev. ix. 1-4, 7, 8, and these two chapters of the history, cannot fail to see that the history is but the complement of the prophecy, especially Rev. ix. 4 and Gibbon, chapter ii. par. 10. This portion of the Scripture, it will be seen, views the rise of Mohammedanism and the time when they had a king over them, and then there is appointed a period of "five months" - one hundred and fifty days, and each day for a year (as used in symbolic prophecy, Eze. iv. 6), one hundred and fifty years - in which they were to hurt men. And from this time when they had a king over them they take on a specially destructive character, for the Word says, "They had a king over them . . . whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon." Verse 11. The margin of the verse gives the meaning of this name in both tongues, which is "A Destroyer." And as the Roman Empire is the leading thing contemplated in the prophecy, it is this, or what remained of it, which was to be destroyed by this destroyer.

In speaking of the events *preceding* the time when these men "had a king over them" the historian says: -

In this *shipwreck of nations*, some surprise may be excited by the escape of the Roman empire, whose relics . . . were dismembered by the Greeks and Latins. - *Chap. lxiv. par. 13.*

But now that they have a king over them, and take upon them more than ever the character of a destroyer, the empire can no longer escape. Consequently, in the very next paragraph, the historian continues in the following important words:

-

It was on the 27th day of July, in the year 1209 the Christian era, that Othman first invaded the territory of Nicomedia, and the singular accuracy of the date seems to disclose *some foresight* of the rapid and *destructive* growth of the monster. - *Chap. lxiv, par. 14.*

Several points in this quotation must be noticed.

1. Othman was the man who succeeded in bringing the disjointed elements of the Mohammedan power, into compact and distinctly organised governmental shape. From him consequently comes the term which still attaches to the government of the Turks, namely, the *Ottoman* Empire. From him dates the time when as never before "they had a king over them."

2. Note the expression of the *history* - "the *destructive* growth" of this monster. Thus distinguishing the very characteristic which is the one given in the Scripture concerning this very power of the destroyer.

3. The historian emphasises "the *singular accuracy of the date*" - a thing almost if not altogether without parallel in historical writing. In the original documents from which the historian drew his material, he found this date made so specific that he himself is forced to remark its "singular accuracy." Yet to those who recognise God's dealings with the nations and kingdoms, and who consider that from the time when these had a king over them a period of a hundred and fifty years is given in which to do a certain work, It is not surprising that the date should be signified with such singular accuracy as to excite the particular attention and remarks of the historian.

FULFILLED TO THE VERY DAY

JULY 27, 1299, then, this period in this "woe" began. One hundred and fifty years from this singularly accurate date, extends to July 27, 1419. Then the Word continues, "One woe is past and behold there come two woes more hereafter." And now yet other elements of destruction are to be let loose. "And the sixth angel sounded, and I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God, saying to the sixth angel which had the trumpet, Loose the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates. And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men."

An hour, and a day, and a month, and a year. Counting thirty days to the month, a year is 360 days, and "each day for a year" is 360 years. A month - 30

days - is 30 years. A day is one year. These together give 391 years. From July 27, 1149 the 391 years reach to July 27, 1810. But there is "an hour" yet. An hour is the twenty-fourth part of a day. And (a day for a year) this would be the twenty-fourth part of a year, *or fifteen days*. Fifteen days from July 27 extends to August 11. Therefore on August 11, 1810, this period of an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, would expire. For this length of time and to this date, the power of the Ottoman Empire was to continue. And on that very day, the actual power of the Turkish government passed into the hands of the Great Powers of Europe, and from that day to this, the very existence of the Ottoman Empire has been, and is now, solely by the support of these Great Powers. Several times since 1810 the Turkish government would have ceased to be, had it not been upheld specifically by those other powers. In a little pamphlet on the Turkish-Armenian question, lately published by the Armenian Society in London, we find the following statement concerning England's connection with this matter: -

"We are responsible for Turkey. We saved the Turk twice at least from the doom which he richly merited. The Duke of Wellington sixty years ago lamented that the Russians had not entered Constantinople in 1829 and brought the Ottoman Empire to an end. We have much more reason to lament that it was not destroyed in 1853 and again in 1878. On both these occasions we interfered to save it. But for us there would be no Sultan on the Bosphorus." - *Page 17*.

Again on the same page is a quotation from an article by the Duke of Argyle in the *Times* in which the Duke says: -

"It is not too much to say that England has twice saved Turkey from complete subjection since 1853. It is largely - mainly - due to our action that she now exists at all as an independent Power. On both these occasions we dragged the Powers of Europe along with us in maintaining the Ottoman Government."

We do not reproduce these statements for the purpose of attaching blame to England or to any other Power; but solely for the purpose of making clear the fact that the Ottoman Empire since 1840 has not existed by its own power but wholly by the action of the other Powers. In accordance with this fact the pamphlet truly says: -

"It is impossible to balk of the Ottoman Empire as if it were a nation

151

like the United States or like Holland. It is an artificial creation of treaties, that is kept in existence by the Powers for their own convenience."

Thus on the 11th day of August 1810, the time set by the Scripture for the existence and work of the Ottoman Empire as such, expired; on that day the sixth trumpet ceased to sound, and the second woe ended; and of the seventh trumpet - the third woe - we read: "The second woe is past, and behold the third woe cometh quickly. And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms

of our Lord, and of the Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We give Thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wert, and art to come; because Thou hast taken to Thee Thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and Thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that Thou shouldest give reward unto Thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear Thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth. And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in His temple the ark of His testament: and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail."

A. T. JONES.

March 12, 1896

"The Eastern Question. What Its Solution Means to All the World. No. 2. - The Events of the End" *The Present Truth* 12, 11 , pp. 148-151.

THE IMPENDING CONFLICT

WE broke off the study last week in the midst of our consideration of the events of the seven trumpets of Rev. viii., ix., and xi. 15-19, which reach from the breaking up of the Roman empire to the end of the world. The last three trumpets (the symbol itself suggesting war) are distinguished by the special announcement of woe in connection with them. Rev. viii. 13.

The fifth trumpet (the first "woe"), we found, signalled the rise and spread of the Mohammedan power, while the sixth trumpet (the second "woe") covers the 391 years (of chapter ix. 15), which terminated in July 1840, when the independence of the Ottoman Empire passed away, and it became a ward of the Great Powers. Continuing, the prophet says in chapter xi. 14, "The second woe is past; and behold the third woe cometh quickly." We quoted the rest of the chapter to show that it reached to the end. Please read these verses again as we consider them further.

Every expression in this record of the sounding of the seventh trumpet, proclaims the end of all things of this world. Look at them again in detail: -

1. The kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of Christ; His reign begins, in His own kingdom, upon His own throne, by His own power; of which kingdom and reign there shall be no end.

2. "The nations are angry:" the nations and rulers admit this, and each one is constantly fearful of any move on the part of the others, and is continually making its power stronger against the time when war will begin, which they all are sure must soon come. And they all dread the slightest step that might involve actual hostilities, because of the danger that if war is actually begun at any spot, it will suddenly spread and involve all in one horrible and universal war, of which no one can see any end except in universal ruin.

Indeed it is plainly stated by one of the leading authorities of the world that it is *as a bulwark against this great danger of universal war that the Ottoman Government has been maintained* these last fifty years. Read now the following lines from the speech of Lord Salisbury, at the Mansion House, November 9, 1895: -

Turkey is in that remarkable condition that it has now stood for half a century, mainly because the Great Powers of the world have resolved that *for the peace of Christendom it is necessary that the Ottoman Empire should stand*. They came to that conclusion nearly half a century ago. I do not think they have altered it now. *The danger* if the Ottoman Empire fall, would not merely be the danger that would threaten the territories of which that empire consists; *it would be the danger that the fire there lit should spread to other nations, and should involve all that is most powerful and civilised in Europe in a dangerous and calamitous contest*. That was a danger that was present to the mind of our fathers when they resolved to make the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire a matter of European treaty, and that is a danger WHICH IS NOT PASSED AWAY.

No more plain, positive, and emphatic fulfilment of prophecy could be given, than is thus given in that speech, that the world stands trembling in the times of the seventh trumpet, when "the nations are angry." And while, in the presence of this appalling danger, rulers, kings, and emperors are earnestly endeavouring by every possible means to maintain the peace of the world, what blundering blindness it is, what fatuous blindness it is, that the churches and the pulpits and the religious press should be exciting and stirring up the spirit and elements of war, calling for armies and navies to wipe out suddenly and without further consideration the Ottoman Government, and thus to break down the bulwark which the Powers have set on against the horrible flood of a universal war. Read also the following words from the Prime Minister's Mansion House speech: -

Throughout these negotiations nothing has pressed itself more strongly in my mind than the disposition of the Great Powers to act together, and their profound sense of the appalling dangers which any separation of their action might produce. Even those among them who in popular report have the reputation of being restless, have vied with the others in anxiety to conduct this great difficulty to a favourable issue, and to conduct it in a manner that shall keep all the Powers together in line, moved by the common motive and with the common aim, THE NOBLE AIM, *of the peace of Christendom* as the one spirit that governs their action.

AN ASTONISHING REVERSAL OF THINGS

WHAT an awful reversal of things it is, that, while warriors and rulers, to whom God has given to bear the sword, are doing their utmost day and night to maintain the peace of the world; churches and pulpits and religious papers, to

whom God has given to preach "peace on earth," should be day and night crying for war! When the very profession of the Gospel of peace itself has become thus perverted to the proclamation of war, what but mischief and ruin can be the end of it all?

In view of the danger of the situation as it is in fact amongst the nations; and in view of this awful

164

reversal of the order of things, and this fearful perversion of the right way, by the professors of the Gospel of peace, is it to be wondered at that the President of Robert College at Constantinople should write as follows of "The Present State of Europe"?

I believe that there is a general impression among thinking men in Europe that we are approaching a great crisis in the world's history. *It is certainly within the bounds of possibility that this year may see the great Christian nations engaged in a universal war.* I am by nature and choice an optimist (one who looks for good). I like to find out the good rather than the evil in men and nations; but a man must either shut his eyes, or fall back upon an unwarranted faith in God, to be an optimist in Europe to-day - so far as the immediate future is concerned. . . . It is perfectly plain that the civilisation of Europe is rotten to the core; and if we can learn anything from the lessons of history, it must pass through the throes of death before it can rise again to a new and higher life. If it were only the Governments which were corrupt the people might rise in their strength and overthrow them; but with a degenerate people there is no hope. - *New York Independent, February 6, 1896, pp. 9, 10.*

But it is not only that the nations are angry and that war must come, dreadful and universal; this is not all. What is to be the end of it? Read on in the events of the seventh trumpet. Rev. xi. 18.

THE WORLD'S CRISIS

3. "THY wrath is come." The wrath of God is defined (Rev. xv. 1) as "the seven last plagues." The nature and effects of these are recorded in Rev. xvi. 1-21; and they end precisely at the point and in the very things, that are marked in chapter xi. 19 as the ending of the seventh trumpet, and which indeed is nothing less than the ending of all things.

4. "And the time of the dead that they should be judged." And therefore in this time the proclamation not of war, but of the "everlasting Gospel" of peace is to be made "to every nation and kindred and tongue and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to Him, *for the hour of His judgment is come*, and worship Him that made heaven and earth and the sea and the fountains of waters." Rev. xiv. 6, 7.

5. "And that Thou shouldest give reward unto Thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear Thy name, small and great; and shouldest

destroy them that destroy the earth." It is at the resurrection of the just that the saints are to be rewarded, and this is by the coming of the Lord in glory. For He says, "Behold, I come quickly, and *My reward* is with Me to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. xxii. 12. And them that are wicked will be "destroyed by the brightness of His coming." 2 Thess. i. 7-10; ii. 8. For "The heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of His wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"

6. "And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in His temple the ark of His testament; and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail." The complement of this expression as to the thunderings, etc., is found in Rev. xvi. 17-21:

"And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done. And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell: and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath. And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found. And there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent: and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great."

All these things which we have traced by these numbered points - all these things were by the Word of God to "come *quickly*" after August 11, 1840; quickly after the date when the time of the rule of the Ottoman Empire by its own power passed away; quickly after that Empire was by the Great Powers set as a bulwark against the anger of the nations breaking out in an "appalling" and universal war. Half a century has passed since that time: and now in view of the undeniable facts and dangers that are vexing the governments and puzzling the people, - in view of all these things that are hanging over the world - how much more certainly is it now true that it assuredly "cometh quickly"! Get ready, get ready, get ready! Who will be ready? Who is ready?

HOW DANIEL'S PRAYER WAS ANSWERED

HOLDING in view now the field which we have so far surveyed, let us turn to another portion of the Word of God and inquire concerning the present time, and the place of Turkey and the nations.

"In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia," B.C. 536, Daniel was greatly troubled for the work and cause of God in the world. Dan. x. 1. In the first year of Cyrus that king had issued a decree for the return of Israel to their own land and

to rebuild the temple of God in Jerusalem. When the heathen who were in the land were not allowed for their own bad purposes to join in the building of the house and city, they hired counsellors at the court of Cyrus to prevent the building of the Temple at all. And these counsellors were kept at the court of Persia all the days of Cyrus. See Ezra iv.

Daniel himself was a principal officer in the government of Cyrus; and soon discovered these intriguers and their purposes there. But instead of beginning any counter-intrigue, he set his heart to seek God and to know His counsels, and have Him frustrate the intriguers and make His own cause a success in the world. Three full weeks was Daniel engaged in seeking, by fasting and prayer and supplication, a knowledge of the will of the God of heaven in the difficulties of the time. When three weeks were expired, the angel Gabriel came to him in vision, and said: "Fear not, Daniel, for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words." Verse 12.

As Daniel had been at this three full weeks, and yet "the first day" his words were heard and the angel was sent, what had delayed the angel all this time? The next verse tells why. "But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days."

This is precisely the three full weeks. To answer Daniel's prayer the angel had to go to the court of Cyrus and deal with the king in his

165

counsels, against those hired counsellors there. The angel continues: -

"But lo! Michael one of the chief princes came to help me, and I remained there with the kings of Persia. Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days. . . . Then said he: Knowest thou wherefore I am come unto thee? and now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia; and when I am gone forth, to the prince of Grecia shall come. But I will show thee that which is noted in the Scripture of truth; and there is none that holdeth with me in these things but Michael your prince."

FROM DARIUS TO ALEXANDER

THESE are the last verses of Daniel x., and in chapter xi. the angel gives his message concerning what should come "in the latte days." In doing this the angel begins at the time where he and Daniel then were, and follows events straight through to the end of the world and the resurrection of the dead. The eleventh chapter of Daniel is all the words of the angel. He says: -

"Also I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him. And now will I show thee the truth. Behold there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia [Cambyses, Smerdis, and Darius Hystaspes], and the fourth [Xerxes, the Ahasuerus of the book of Esther] shall be far richer than they all, and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia." Xerxes led an army of five millions across the Hellespont and against Greece.

As soon as the angel mentions Grecia he skips the remaining history of Persia and sketches Greece, saying, "And a mighty king shall stand up [Alexander the Great] and shall rule with great dominion and do according to his will [See also Dan. viii. 20, 21.] And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven [See Dan. viii. 22]; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled; for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside those."

At Alexander's death there was a period of confusion for about twenty years among the many able governors and generals of his great dominion. Finally, a four-fold division was accomplished, as in the words of the angel "toward the four winds of heaven" - the east, the west, the north, and the south. Seleucus secured the eastern portion extending from Syria to the river Indus. Cassander obtained Macedon and other Greek territory on the west. Lysimachus held Thrace and Bithynia on the north - territory of which Byzantium was then, and Constantinople is now, the centre. And Ptolemy had Egypt on the south.

"AT THE TIME OF THE END.

AFTER stating how Alexander's dominion should thus be divided into its four parts, he turns his attention to the two kingdoms - "the king of the south" and "the king of the north." And from verse 5 to verse 14 he treats solely of the succession of principal events occurring between these two. At verse 14 the Roman power - "the children of robbers," margin - enters the field and occupies the angel's attention for a large space and for a long time, "even to the time of the end." Verse 35. Finally in verse 40 he comes again, and *at the time of the end,* too, to "the king of the south" and "the king of the north." The territories of the northern and of the southern division of Alexander's dominion remain respectively the kingdoms of the north and the south unto the end, and from beginning to end, whatever power might occupy these respective territories would be the king of the north or of the south. Whatever power therefore which, at the time of the end, occupies the territory of Thrace and Bithynia, originally held by Lysimachus, will be the king of the north as certainly as was the power of Lysimachus itself.

It is not necessary to repeat here the evidences so fully given last week, that we are now, and the world has been since 1840, in "the time of the end." And now, as Constantinople is the centre of the territory originally held by Lysimachus the first "king of the north;" and as the power that now reigns in Constantinople holds the identical territory held by Lysimachus himself; it is plain enough that this power is "the king of the north" of the last verses of the eleventh chapter of Daniel, and of our own day. And as it is the Turkish Power that now occupies Constantinople and holds the territory originally held by Lysimachus, the first king of the north, it is also plain enough that the Turkish Power is the power referred to in the words "the king of the north" in the last five verses of Daniel xi.

THE KING OF THE NORTH AND HIS END

IN the 44th verse the angel says of this king of the north, - the Turkish Power, - "tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him and he shall go forth with fury to destroy and utterly to make away many." This was accomplished in the Crimean war when Russia from the north and east warred against the Ottoman Empire, and the Turkish Power was saved only by the support and power of Great Britain and other allies.

And now the last verse of Daniel xi. tells of the two events that all Europe are constantly expecting to see; the events that many people in mass meetings and other assemblies are loudly calling for; the events which are certain soon to take place; namely, the expulsion of the Turkish Power from Constantinople, and the wiping out of the Ottoman Empire. These are the words of the angel as to this looked-for event: "And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain; *yet he shall come to his end and none shall help him.*"

Constantinople itself is "between the seas." But this does not meet the word of the angel. No, but he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas "*in the glorious holy mountain.*" This can be no other place than Jerusalem; even as Jerusalem is even now called in the Turkish and Arabic "The Holy." It is certain therefore that the seat of the Ottoman Power will be removed from Constantinople, and will finally be planted in Jerusalem, and *then* it is just as certain that that power comes to an end.

Yea, "he shall come to his end and none shall help him." This expression shows that he would before have come to his end unless somebody had helped him. We have seen how fully this has been so since 1840. And in the autumn and winter of 1895-96, we have again seen that power standing for months on the very brink of expulsion from Constantinople; how that each morning as we arose and bought the daily paper we expected to read despatches telling that this had been accomplished. But in this crisis again somebody has helped him, and he still abides in his place. But the day is certain to come, and to come soon, when the Ottoman Power will be removed from Constantinople and will be planted in Jerusalem, and then he shall come to his end and none shall help him - and indeed he will come to his end simply because none will help him.

166

WHEN HE COMES TO HIS END

YET this is not all. The angel did not end his discourse here. No, no. He continues: "And *at that time* shall Michael stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time; and at that time Thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Dan. xii. 1, 2.

Whether the Turkish Power shall leave Constantinople, and when; whether it shall be wiped out, and if so, when; these are great and interesting questions, and multitudes are anxiously studying these questions. Yet great and interesting as these questions are in many ways, there is yet beyond all these the infinitely

greater question of what comes when these things are done, of what shall come *at that time*?

The Word of God is that "*at that time*" there shall be such a time of trouble upon the earth as never was since there has been a nation. This very thing we have seen by positive and highest proofs, is the very thing which the great nations are dreading; and against this universal woe of world-wide war and tumult, these Great Powers are holding the Ottoman Power as long as possible as a bulwark, knowing that when that bulwark shall have been broken down this appalling torrent must spread over all. In this matter the Word of God and the word of the Great Powers of the world, are in exact and perfect accord.

Who is ready for this "time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation"? Who? Whoever on the earth is not ready for the spreading over all nations of such a time of trouble as never was since there was a nation - whoever on earth is not ready for this, is not ready for the wiping out of the Ottoman Power. Therefore instead of churches and pulpits and religious papers calling for war, and urging the wiping of the Turkish Power off the earth, they would better, far better, be preaching the Gospel of peace, which they profess, and which they are so basely perverting; and by the sincere preaching of the Gospel of peace be preparing to stand in peace and quietness in God when this time of trouble shall break upon the world at the time of the ending of the Ottoman Empire. Who is doing this work? Who is ready for the time of trouble?

For this is not simply a great time of trouble by war amongst the nations; it is even more than this. It is a time of trouble caused by this, and also by the judgments of God upon the earth, and the coming of the Lord, the resurrection of the dead, and the end of all things. This is emphasised by the other portion of Scripture which treats of the Ottoman Power. In the sixteenth chapter of Revelation from beginning to end is the Lord's record of the seven last plagues in which "is filled up the wrath of God" to be poured upon the earth, and which in itself is the greatest element of this time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation.

THE PLAGUES OF GOD'S WRATH

IN this chapter, the story of the sixth plague is this: "And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared."

Now as for the real flowing river Euphrates, which rises in the mountains of Armenia and empties into the Persian Gulf, kings both of east and west have crossed and re-crossed it at will from the days of Chedorlaomer until now, without its ever having to be dried up that they might pass. This expression therefore cannot refer to the water of the literal river. What then? In the next chapter, verse 15, it is stated that "waters are peoples." The water of the Euphrates then, being dried up that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared, is clearly the ending of the power and people that occupies the country of the Euphrates. What power is this? - The Turkish Power alone.

This then is another plain declaration of the Word of God announcing the certain ending of the Turkish Power. And according to this scripture, what comes at the ending of that power? What are the kings of the east going to do when the way for them shall be thus prepared? Read on.

"And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame. And he gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon. And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done.

"And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings: and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell: and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath. And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found. And there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent: and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great."

NEED FOR WATCHING AND PRAYING

WE have now considered the three portions of Scripture which treat of the Turkish Power. We have seen that in all three of them the end of that power is announced by the sure Word of God. We also see that in all three places not only is the end of that power marked, but with this, and following swiftly upon it, there is also marked in unmistakable language universal world-destroying trouble, the coming of the Lord in glory, and the end of all things of this world.

This cannot be denied. It may not be believed; but it cannot be denied. No man therefore is ready for the ending of the Ottoman Empire who is not ready for the end of the world. And who is ready for this? Oh! let every one who names the name of Christ turn his whole attention to this. Let all such be sure that they themselves are ready for all these things, and then let them never rest, let them never hold their peace, till the warning of it is sounded to all people that whosoever will may come, whosoever will may be ready also, and that all may be watching and praying always "that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." Luke xxi. 36.

We see that the sure Word of God announces that upon the ending of the Ottoman Empire there comes - "at

that time" - a time of universal war, woe, and trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time. We see also the Great Powers of earth - the very ones which have this question constantly to deal with - expecting and dreading the "appalling danger" of this very thing, and in their uneasy expectancy doing everything in their power to hold back as long as possible the tide of woe which they know must come.

There is yet one other element to be noticed in this connection. And that is that the Turks themselves expect this very thing also. The Turks themselves expect to be removed from Constantinople. They expect then the seat of their power to be in Jerusalem. They expect then that the nations will come even there to war against them, and that then the end of all things comes.

In Constantinople in September and October last, I met a reliable Christian man, who told me that in a conversation which he had with a Turkish judge, the judge told him that they expected as the outcome of the dealings of the Powers that they would be dispossessed of Constantinople; that after that their capital would be Jerusalem; that against them there at last they expected the "Christian nations" to come to light; and that then Messiah and Mahomet would come. With the exception of Mahomet, this explanation as stated by the Turkish judge is precisely the thing that is spoken of this same time in the Scripture of truth. And the time of trouble thus brought as described in the Word of God, is precisely the "appalling danger" that is dreaded by the great Powers, and against which they agree in holding the Ottoman Empire as a bulwark.

When the Word of God three times declares it; and when the Turks themselves, as well as all the other Powers concerned, are expecting and dreading it; is it not high time that all the people should believe it? May the Lord in His mercy help all the people to hear it, to believe it, and then to proclaim it to earth's remotest limits that the world may be prepared and fully ready for that which by every evidence on the question is hanging ready to burst in fury upon a devoted world!

A. T. JONES.

March 19, 1896

"The Eastern Question. What Its Solution Means to All the World. No. 3. - Is the Trouble Religious or Political?" *The Present Truth* 12, 12 , pp. 179-181.

A SHORT-SIGHTED POLICY

IN studying the career of Turkey as set forth in the Bible, we have seen that it is an exceedingly short-sighted thing to do to call, as many have lately been doing, for the abolition of the Ottoman Power. In looking at it also from the side of this world only, and as the situation is in reality, we have seen likewise that it is a most unwise thing to demand of the Great Powers that the Turkish Power shall be obliterated without any further question.

From every consideration of Scripture, and the best interests of the whole world, we have seen that the mere setting aside, or bringing to an end, of the Ottoman Power, is the smallest part of the great subject involved. We have seen that beyond this and wrapped up in it lie, both in the Word of God and in the fate of the nations, events of infinitely greater importance than that thing in itself could be, considered in and by itself alone.

All this we have seen is strongly emphasised in the repeated statements of the Scriptures of truth and in the plain statements of the leading authorities among the nations. And yet there are other questions that may be asked, and other points that may properly be considered, in this connection.

There is no room for any sort of denial that particularly in England and America there have been made for a number of months, loud and repeated calls for the "blotting out," "the wiping off the earth," etc., of the Ottoman Power, without any kind of delay, and without regard to any other consideration.

CALLING FOR WAR

OF course none of those making such call, expected for a moment that the thing could be done without war. Yet the most urgent of these demands for the employment of armies and navies in such war, have come from churches, from pulpits, and from professedly Christian papers. We have in former articles called attention to the serious incongruity in professors of the Gospel of peace calling for war. We have pointed out what an awful reversal of things it is, and what a sad perversion of the right way, when the professed representatives of the Gospel and the Prince of Peace, to whom the sword is forbidden, should be calling for war; while warriors, emperors, and rulers, to whom the sword is committed, were employing every possible means to preserve peace.

WAR AND CHRISTIANITY

BUT now aside from all this, why should war be made upon Turk above all other Powers? It is said that Turkey is making war, and killing many people? Granted. But will making more war, and killing a great many more people, be any better? Is it wrong for the Turkish Power to make war, yet perfectly right for "Christian" Powers to make war? is it wrong, and a dreadful thing, for some or many people to be killed in a Turkish way; but perfectly right, and a blessed thing, for more people to be killed if only it be done in it "Christian"? This seems to be the theory upon which those "Christians" proceed who are demanding that war shall be made on Turkey.

But there is no Christian way of killing people. There is no Christian way of making war. The Author of Christianity who was ushered into the world with the proclamation of "Peace on earth, good will to men," has declared that "The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives but to save them." One of the greatest warriors of this age, declared that "War is hell." And as he himself lived in it for years, certainly he was qualified to express an opinion. Is there, then, not enough of that kind of "hell" in the world but, that professedly Christian people shall be

loudly demanding that "Christian" Powers shall make more of it, with prospect of its engulfing all the world?

A year and more ago, and for a long time, France made war on the people of Madagascar, and the people of Madagascar are "Christian" too. There was no demand that the French Power should be "wiped off the earth." At this present time, and for some time back, Italy has been making war in Abyssinia. And the Abyssinians are "Christian" too. Yet nobody is calling that the Italian Government shall be wiped off the earth.

But, is it said that Turkey is making war on its own subjects? - Granted again. At this hour Spain is making war on her own subjects in Cuba, and has been doing so for a long time, Yet who is calling for the Spanish Power to be blotted out?

IS IT BECAUSE THE ARMENIANS ARE CHRISTIANS

BUT it is said that Turkey is unlike all these, and worse than all these, in that it is making war on its subjects *on account of their religion* - because

180

they are Christians. It is not true that Turkey is making war on its subjects - on the Armenians - because they are Christians. Of this there is abundance of evidence, - in fact, all the evidence. Let us examine this evidence as it is.

1. There are thousands of other subjects of Turkey who are Christians as much as the Armenians, yet none of these are molested. If it be true that Turkey is making war on the Armenians because of their Christianity, why does it not make war on all Christians alike? Why does it make this marked distinction of one people only? There are thousands of Greeks who are born subjects of Turkey - Greeks who have never been subject to the Greek kingdom, but are descended from the ancient Greeks of Asia Minor, and have been subject to the Turkish Power ever since its conquest of that country. These Greeks all profess the Christian religion, yet they are not warred upon nor molested by the Turkish Power on account of their religion. These Turkish subjects are as free and as safe under Turkish rule as they would be if they were under British rule.

2. I myself and another Christian minister went to Turkey last September, arriving at Constantinople September 10, and remaining there till October 17 (except five days in the neighbourhood of Nicomedia). It will thus be seen that we were there at the time of the riot and the great disturbance in that city. We went to preach Christianity there, and we did it all the time we were there.

We went under the protectorate of no earthly power. No ambassador and no consul knew we were there until we were ready to come away. We not only went under the protectorate of no earthly power; but we went without any intention of calling for the protection of any such power.

AN OPEN BIBLE SCHOOL AMIDST RIOT

WE went expressly to hold a Bible School in Constantinople for six weeks; and we held it as intended, the full length of time, including the five days'

meetings near Nicomedia. We asked no governmental permission, even from Turkey, to bold the Bible institute in Constantinople, nor to hold the meetings near Nicomedia.

We held our Bible School in the Armenian quarter in Stamboul, and in the house of an Armenian family. Armenians, Greeks, Assyrians, and Jews - whosoever chose - attended the school throughout. The school was held daily, forenoon and afternoon, and some of the time in the evening also. It was held on the first floor of a house, whose door opened into the street; and in a room whose bay-window overhung the street with a large former window on each side of the bay-window. And as the weather was warm and pleasant so that the windows were open most of the time, the room in which the Bible School was daily held was practically open upon the street. This house was within three minutes' walk *of the Armenian Patriarch's Church* where the mischief was hatched which culminated in the riot of September 30, where those who started the riot took refuge and shut themselves in when they fled from the Turkish troops, and where Turkish troops were stationed round the church and passing to and fro day and night from the day of the riot until we had regularly closed the Bible School and departed from the city according to our original purpose.

In such a room, in such a house, in such a place, and at such a time, we held a Christian Bible School openly and daily for fifteen days before the riot, on the day and *at the hour* of the riot itself, and eleven days after the riot, and all without any sign of molestation on the part of the Turkish authorities or anybody else, except one Armenian woman who was opposed to her daughter's attending the school, and who came one day into the street in front of the house and delivered a long tirade, shaking her fists and beat-

181

ing her breast, and acting generally as if she were mad. She succeeded in attracting quite a crowd, and the Turkish police came down, but some one succeeded in getting her to go away barely in time to escape the police. And even then, when the police inquired at the house as to the cause of the disturbance, they neither then nor at any time afterward made any attempt in any way to molest us or to interfere with our school.

Now, if the Turkish Government is so much opposed to Christians as is so much declared in England and America, how could all this be as it was?

FREE FROM INTERFERENCE

3. As before stated, the house in which our Bible School was held was only about three minutes' walk from the Patriarch's church, where was the centre of all the trouble, and on a street traversed by the troops as they went to and from that church on guard duty.

In a house next to the Patriarch's Church, there were about eight men - Armenians and Greeks - who had come to Constantinople from the provinces to attend the school. They rented this building and boarded themselves there. And these men passed from that house to the school and back twice a day, on the day of the riot and afterwards in the presence of the troops, just as before the

disturbances began, and no Turk ever challenged them nor offered any of them any molestation at any time.

Our school faced one of the streets along which the troops passed, and the windows of the classroom opened on the street. And as the troops were always on horseback they could look into the windows and see at least the teacher as he stood at a table in the bay window. Yet no one of them ever made any sign either by look or motion that would suggest any dissatisfaction at what was going on there.

4. There was a Greek, a Christian - not of the Greek Church, but of "a sect" - who came to our school and meetings frequently, who is a decorative stone-worker. On the day of the riot he was working on a building with a company of Turks, and continued to do so on days following the riot, and he told us that no one offered to molest him in any way, or at any time.

5. While our Bible School was held, and in the "restless times" following the day of the riot, two persons were baptized in the sea not more than five or six minutes' walk from the Patriarch's Church, in the daylight too, and though there were Turks who saw it, not one of them showed any disrespect for it nor attempted to molest the administration of this Christian rite.

THE EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL EXPERIENCE

AGAIN it may be asked, if the Turks are so desperately opposed to Christians and Christianity as is represented by so many in England and America, how is it that all this work and these people could pass along there without any molestation or disrespect?

Certainly these points of actual experience are evidence that the Turkish Government is not opposed to Christians or to Christianity as such. Confirming this is the statement by Sir Philip Currie in the latest Blue Book up to February 18, that "Non-Armenian Christians were spared."

6. It is yet further true that the Turkish Government is not opposed even to all Armenian Christians. I personally know it to be a fact that there is a Christian sect there, composed largely of Armenians, and who are Christians only, taking no part whatever in politics, either Armenian or Turkish, nor yet of the Great Powers. They believe and follow the Scripture instruction, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers." They therefore are subject and respectful to the Turkish Power, paying the tribute and respecting the laws.

They are not only largely Armenians, but the leading teacher and preacher of them is a native Armenian, a born Turkish subject. Yet these Armenians are neither persecuted nor opposed by the Turkish Power. On the contrary the Turkish authorities have more than once protected them from the violence of the Armenians.

When one of them was stoned nearly to death by Armenians, and bruised and bleeding was making his painful way to a neighbouring village, the Turkish soldiers learning of his ill treatment went out on the road and met him and helped him into the village where other friends cared for him. At other times when some

of these have been arrested by mistake, they have been released immediately upon learning who they were.

"A GOOD DOCUMENT.

AMONG the publications of this sect is a lithograph chart of the Ten Commandments with several other Scripture verses concerning faith in Christ, etc., printed in a decorative way around the Ten. These they sell in the streets of Constantinople. One Armenian who was selling them was arrested by the police and put in jail. As soon as the Chief of the Imperial Police learned of it he ordered him instantly released, saying to the Superintendent, "That is a good document to be circulated, even in such a time as this." This occurred about the month of October or November, 1895. More than once when by false representation the professed Protestant Christians there had compassed the arrest of the leading teacher of this sect, the Turkish authority has released him upon mere inquiry.

I shall occupy no more space with facts such as these, though there are more. These points show plainly enough that the Turkish Government is not only not opposed to Christians or Christianity, but that it is not opposed to Armenian Christians. In its actions it not only distinguishes between Armenians and other Christians but it distinguishes between Armenians and Armenians. And all this makes it plain enough that the Turkish-Armenian difficulty and troubles are not on account of religion at all. The evidence establishing the real origin of the trouble will be referred to next week.

A. T. JONES.

March 26, 1896

"The Eastern Question. What Its Solution Means to All the World. No. 4. - Origin of the Present Trouble" *The Present Truth* 12, 13 , pp. 196-198.

"NOT RELIGION BUT REVOLUTION.

WHAT, then, is the real cause of the difficulty and of these great troubles? The answer is: It is not religion, but *revolution*. Whatever people in England or America may believe, or say, the truth is, and all the evidence shows it, that it is solely on account of their revolutionary practices that the Armenians are involved in this great trouble. Anyone who will spend a little time amongst them, can know this, and those who are there do know it. It is for this reason that Russia would not consent that the other Powers should use force in dealing with the Porte. In the second Parliamentary Blue Book on this question, is given the correspondence, and there it is stated by Prince Lobanoff that -

The fact is that the Armenian Committees in London and elsewhere aim at the creation in Asia Minor of a district in which the Armenians shall enjoy special privileges, and which will form the

nucleus of a future independent Armenian kingdom; and to this Russia will not and cannot agree.

That this view is correct is further shown by a statement by the editor (J. M. Buckley, D. D) of *The Christian Advocate*, of New York, the leading paper of the Methodist Church in America, January 23, 1896. The editorial is on "Bleeding Armenia," and after stating that there is "a small revolutionary body" operating both "outside of Turkey" and "within its bounds," there is the following passage: -

One of the representatives of this body said to Cyrus Hamlin: "We are determined to be free. Europe listened to the Bulgarian horrors and made Bulgaria free. She will listen to our cry when it comes up in the shrieks of women and children." To this Dr. Hamlin said: "This scheme will make the very name of Armenia hateful among all civilised people." He replied: "We are desperate, and we will do it." Dr. Hamlin communicated these facts to the world in an article in *The Congregationalist* in December, 1893.

This scheme was thus announced in December, 1893, and it was not till the summer of 1894 that the troubles began which have continued to the present. As early as May, 1893 a revolutionary agitator named Damatian since. August 20, 1895, the British Consul at Erzeroum in a despatch to the British Ambassador at Constantinople wrote as follows: -

The party of action among the Armenians have kept very quiet of late, having been persuaded that a contrary course would only prejudice the Armenian cause, and impede diplomatic action for the introduction of reforms. It is, however, *more than probable that*, if disappointed in their expectations, *they will renew their agitation with increased violence, and endeavour to provoke reprisals on a scale certain to involve European intervention.*

THE RIOT IN CONSTANTINOPLE

IN perfect accord with this fore-cast of August 20, there came the outbreak in Constantinople, September 30, which originated wholly in two thousand Armenians marching in a body from the Patriarch's Church to the Porte to demand that the Sultan should sign the propositions of the Powers. These "Armenians carried revolvers and knives, all of one pattern," says the British Ambassador in his report. The first shots were fired by the Armenians, killing a Turkish officer. Then the Turkish troops returned the fire, and with such effect that the Armenians soon fled, and, says the British Ambassador, "one thousand armed Armenians, with women and children, took refuge in the Church of the Patriarchate."

Now I personally know that this movement in Constantinople, September 30, 1895, was made for the purpose of bringing on such a crisis as would necessitate armed intervention of the Powers to restore order, and in the hope that thus they might be delivered from the Turkish rule and find a protectorate in the British Power. Our Bible School was in session at the hour when this armed force started from the Patriarch's Church to the Porte. I myself was conducting

the lesson of the hour. Suddenly the doors in the houses along the street were opened, and out rushed, all at once, the people, - men, women and children, - and poured along the street to a point where they could see the force as it marched toward the Porte. The sudden rush of so many crested something of a sensation in the school, though only for a moment, when we continued till the regular time for the close of the session.

When the session had closed, and those in attendance went into the street to go to their homes, they asked those who were in the street what was the cause of the sudden rush of all the people. The answer, and the only answer that was given, was: "*The British fleet is coming in*, and they a [referring to the Armenians who had gone up to the Porte] have gone up to compel the Sultan to sign." And it was their daily expectation for more than a week afterward that the British fleet would then come in, and take them under its protection.

Five days afterward, October 5, the British Ambassador reported to the Government at London, that, "Grave fears are entertained that the Armenian

197

Committee is organising some further demonstrations." And not long after this the Armenians of Zeitun suddenly arose and captured the Turkish garrison of nearly six hundred troops, destroyed the barracks, and took possession of the city, where they sustained a considerable siege.

ORGANISED POLITICAL REVOLUTION

THESE facts present evidence sufficient to show beyond dispute that there is a widespread revolutionary movement amongst the Armenians, and that it is carried on altogether for the purpose, and in the hope, of creating such a condition of affairs even at the deliberate expense of "the shrieks of women and children," that the Great Powers will intervene and make them and the country free. And as a part of this plan, it is plain to those who know the facts, that many of the reports to the English and American papers have been exaggerated out of all semblance of the truth, and some indeed have not had a vestige of truth upon which to base even an exaggeration.

For instance: When the English papers reached Constantinople giving the accounts of the riot there, we read that "Stamboul is a desert;" "the shops are closed;" "the churches are filled with men, women, and children, refugees, to keep from being massacred."

The truth is, that Stamboul was no more of a desert than it usually is, except for the closing of the Armenian shops; and after two days after the riot even these were not closed for fear of the Turks, but for fear of the Armenians.

I myself saw a circular letter sent by the Armenian Revolutionary Society to the Armenian shopkeepers. This letter was written in Armenian, and was interpreted to me by an Armenian. It called for money for the Armenian cause, and told them not to "dare" to open their shops; that "thousands of eyes which they did not know" were watching them with the certainty of reprisal if they did disregard this warning. And the letter was not signed by the President, nor the

Secretary of the Society, nor by the Society itself, but it was signed with a smoking revolver and a drawn sheath-knife.

Under these circumstances, is it strange that the Armenian shops were closed long after all danger was past? and long after the time when the shop owners would have been glad to open their shops?

As for the churches being filled with men, women, and children, refugees, my etc., as though there was a general resort of the Armenian populace to the churches, this also is not true. Of the armed body that left the Patriarch's Church to compel the Sultan," those of them that escaped did take refuge in the church from which they started. But as for the Armenian people generally, they were in their homes and are about their daily work as usual, and without any molestation. There may have been, there probably were, some women also in the Patriarch's Church. For there were some women there she before the riot, inciting the men to arise and avenge their injuries.

The day before the riot, in the midst of the assembly in the church, a woman sprang to her feet and exclaimed, "Woe, woe, to the Armenians! Why do you sit still? Why do you not arise and avenge your injuries?"

"FOR THE FAITH.

Another woman came into the house of the Armenian family where I was living, the next day after the riot. As she seated herself the handle of a large knife was exposed in the folds of her dress. The lady of the house asked her, "What have you that great knife for?" She replied: "To kill Turks with." Then she drew it forth and showed how it must be used so as certainly to kill. Suiting actions to words, she said, "You take it in your hand this way; and then turn it, so. If you only drive it in straight and pull it out again, they may live. But if you give it such a turn as that they are sure to die."

The lady of the house then said to her: "How is it that you know so much about it? Have you been doing it?" She answered: "Not here in Constantinople; but in Armenia I have."

Then said the lady of the house, "Why, you silly woman, what can you hope to accomplish by that? What can you do but get yourself killed?" Exultingly the woman exclaimed: "Suppose I do get myself killed! Is it not the best death to die? What is more glorious than to die for the faith!"

There may have been some such women as these, refugees in the churches. But in that part of the city where I was, and near to the Patriarch's Church, too, it is certain that the women and children in general were at home as before, and were in safety there, as we all were. Again, for days long despatches were published, telling of the capture of Zeitun by the Turks and the "massacre of ten thousand Christians." When in truth the only capture was its capture by the Armenians.

At Harput it was reported that "thousands of Christians" had been slaughtered. But the report of the missionary who was through it all at Harput, says there were "one hundred killed in the whole city."

At Sassoun it was reported "ten thousand" killed. It is now allowed even by the Armenian Society that there were "nine hundred killed."

At Trebizond it was said there were many thousands wiped out. The British consul's official report says "not much above five hundred."

Now I do not say that 900 or 500, or even 100 killed, is a small thing. Any number killed is vastly too many. One person killed is far too many. But as compared with tens of thousands several times repeated, 900 and 500, and 100 all put together are not many.

Now in all this I have only stated the case as it is, and the facts as I personally know them to be, in truth. Yet let me not be misunderstood. I have said nothing, and I have nothing to say against the Armenians gaining their freedom, or even their independence, if they can. No subject people is to be blamed for desiring to be free and independent. All that I have attempted to say, and all that I do say is, that when the Armenians, or any other people, start out to gain their freedom, and have to fight for and do fight for it, and get beaten, and have a harder time than they expected, then let them not raise the cry that they are oppressed and persecuted and massacred, *on account of their religion*. This cry raises an entirely false issue.

Again, I would not say a word against any effort of societies to relieve the privations and miseries of the Armenians. They are suffering greatly, the innocent with the guilty. Let anybody, and everybody, send means as he chooses to relieve their distress. But when calls are made in their behalf, and the people are appealed to, to furnish relief, because the Armenians are martyrs for Christianity, it is all a mistake, and a wholly false issue.

That many Armenians who are not revolutionists, some of whom may possibly be Christians, have suffered, is undoubtedly true; but let it be remembered that this is what the revolutionists planned for. They calculated

198

that if they fomented sedition the innocent would suffer with the guilty, and far more, and that "the shrieks of women and children" would rouse the world to assist them in securing independence.

Nor have I attempted to make any apology for, or any special showing in favour of the Turkish Government. I have simply written the facts as they are, and as I found them by experience to be; and that is all. As to the merits of the political controversy between the Armenians and the Turkish Government, I have nothing to say one way nor the other, I know that it is wholly political, and not religious at all. And merely to give what I know to be the truth of the case as to that point is what I have done and all that I intended to do.

THE ALL-IMPORTANT QUESTION

BUT above it all, and back of it all, lies the much greater question as it lies in the Word of God, at the Turkish Empire and its standing in the world and the end of it which must certainly come soon. And when the Turkish Government does come to its end, then comes that "time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation." Who is prepared for this? And at that time comes the

deliverance of God's people, "every one that shall be found written in the book." Who is ready for this? Is your name in the book of life? Are you ready for all these things that must shortly come to pass?

A. T. JONES.

April 30, 1896

"Who Cannot Be Saved?" *The Present Truth* 12, 18 , pp. 278, 279.

THE Chaldeans in the time of Abraham were idolaters. Abraham's own father served "other gods than the Lord." Joshua xxiv. 14, 15. Thus Abraham was born and grew up among idolatrous influences; yet from the midst of this idolatry, and in spite of all these idolatrous influences, Abraham found the one true God, and worshipped Him, and was recognised by the Lord as His friend.

This demonstrates that every other person, though he be born of idolatrous parents, and grow up amidst idolatrous influences, can also find the one true God. Abraham is a witness to all the world that all the heathen can find God, and worship Him truly and be accepted of Him. Every one who seeks God truly will find Him truly. For to every one who calls, God answers; every one who feels after Him, finds Him (Acts xvii. 27); and to every one who finds God's *existence*, He reveals His character.

It is written: "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" It is intended that the first of these questions shall be answered by "yea." It is only by its being answered "yes" that there can be any place for the second question. It would be meaningless to ask, "Canst thou find out the Almighty *unto perfection*?" if He cannot be found out at all. Therefore to the question, "Canst thou by searching find out God?" every man must answer, "Yes," for even "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, *being understood by the things that are made*, even His "eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" who do not search and find Him out.

The second question must be answered by "no" as certainly as the first one must be answered by "yea." No man can, even by reaching, find out the Almighty to perfection, because man himself is sadly imperfect, and imperfection attached also to all that is before him; but does not leave mankind here: He reveals Himself in His perfection, and gives eternal life to all who will receive it that they may spend eternity in finding out God in all His glorious perfection.

Thus it is true that every one who will find God's existence, to him God will reveal His character. So it was with Abraham. So it was with Cornelius; to him who had found out God's existence, the Lord even sent an angel to tell him where to send for a man to make known to him God's character. So also it was with the Greeks of Athens, so overwhelmingly sunken in idolatry - "art," it is called now. They had idolised, had made gods of all things that they could imagine, till they were brought at last to the contemplation of something of which they did not know what to think or to imagine, and therefore they set up an altar, and

inscribed upon it, "To the Unknown God." And even to this faint call the Lord answered. Though they had discovered but a faint glimmer of His existence, even to this He gladly responded; and His apostle stood before them in their highest official place, and said to them all, "The Unknown God, . . . Him declare I unto you. God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He

279

is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; . . . He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; *that they should seek the Lord*, if haply they might *feel after Him*, and *find Him*, though He be not far from every one of us."

Thus it is to all men everywhere and in all ages. They that seek Him, they that even *feel* after Him, find Him. And so easy is it to find Him; so quickly does He respond to the feeblest call; so fully does He reveal Himself upon the faintest glimmer that is recognised of His existence, that when His wondrous work is finished, there is found standing before His throne, ascribing to Him their salvation, a great multitude that no man could number; and this vast host is composed of people "out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." These who are there "out of" every kindred and tongue and people and nation, are living and eternal witnesses that *every one* of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, *who is not there*, might just as well be there as these. The last that one individual is there, of any single kindred or tongue or people or nation that was ever on the earth, is indisputable evidence that all the individuals of every kindred and tongue and people and nation could just as certainly and just as easily be there, as that this one is there; and the fact that one is there demonstrates that all the others are without excuse for not being there.

Oh, it is not hard to find the Lord! for He is not far from every one of us; He is so near that but to feel after Him is to find Him. it is not hard to be, saved; for "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." "Look unto Me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God." By doubts, and queries, and unbelief generally, people make it hard to be saved; but in the Lord's way it is not hard. "My yoke is easy." Take it upon you.

Abraham is evidence that every heathen can find the Lord. Abraham, and that great multitude out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, and even Jesus Christ Himself, the second Adam, - are all witnesses that God saves human beings - whoever puts his trust in Him, whosoever is "willing" to be saved - with the salvation of the Lord. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Who can refuse?

A. T. JONES.

May 21, 1896

"Adam's Failure and Christ's Triumph" *The Present Truth* 12, 21 , pp. 324, 325.

"BE OF GOOD CHEER.

OF man it is written, "I have created him for My glory." This expresses the true object of every man's existence. He was created, and he exists, that he may glorify God. In that grand consummation when the object of their creation is accomplished in all who will have it so, it is shown how this is done. For of that time and of those people it is written: "Then cometh the end, when He [Christ] shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father. . . . For He [Christ] must reign, till He [the Father] hath put all enemies under His [Christ's] feet. . . . And when all things shall be subdued unto Him [Christ], then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him [the Father] that put all things under Him [Christ], that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. 15:24-28.

Thus the object of man's creation and existence is that he may glorify God; and this is done by God being manifest in him, by God being all in him; so that a man is properly himself, and meets the object of his existence, only as God is manifest in him. Man was never made to manifest himself nor to glorify himself nor anybody else but God; and when he does glorify himself or anybody else but God, he misses the purpose of his creation and the object of his existence; and if he continues to do so to the end, he completely frustrates the object of his existence. God's ideal of a man is not found in man alone, nor in any combination of man with any other except God. God and man united, God and man being one, and God the one, God all that there is in the man, and this upon the man's own free choice, - this and this alone is God's ideal of a man.

THE FIRST ADAM'S FAILURE

IT was so in the beginning when man was first created. He was made in the image of God. God was reflected in him, and was glorified in him, so that he was "the image and glory of God." "And did not He make one? . . . And wherefore one? That He might seek a godly [godlike] seed." Mal. ii. 15. Thus would it ever have been had Adam remained faithful to God, but he chose to and did give himself up to another, and became one with that other; and then this other one, the evil one, was reflected in him and is manifested through him; so that man is not really himself even in evil. Man is not strictly himself, even in the way of evil which he has chosen.

Yet God did not leave the man without hope, enslaved under the power of the evil one whom he had chosen. God said to Satan: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed." By this word the Creator of the man set him free again to choose between good and evil, to choose the service of God or the service of Satan. By this word God again set the man free to choose whether God shall be manifest in him or not; to choose whether God shall be glorified in him or not; to choose whether the object of his creation and existence shall be accomplished, or whether it shall be frustrated in him. And therefore the Lord is ever saying to all men, "*Now is the accepted time; . . . now is the day of salvation.*" "*Choose you this day whom ye will serve.*"

And to show, in spite of a world of sin and against the disadvantage of sinfulness, how fully, how completely, *whosoever chooses* can glorify God in this world, - for this cause God sent His only begotten Son, and for this cause Jesus freely came, He freely *chose* to come, into the world of sin. For this cause the Son of God became the second and "last Adam." He came and lived a whole lifetime on the earth; and as His course on earth was closing, in perfect fulness of truth He could say to God, "I have glorified Thee on the earth."

How different is this from the fact Adam! Yes, how different in everything was the "last Adam" when He succeeded, from the first Adam when he failed! The first Adam stood in a perfect world, a world in which every conceivable thing bore the living impress of the goodness and glory of God. Yea, more than this, he stood in the most beautiful place in the perfect world - in "Eden, the garden of God," where there was "every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also." Yes, yet more than all this, the man himself, the crowning piece of God's creation, was perfect and upright; he was acquainted with God; he was crowned with glory and honour; he was in possession of faculties of such power and precision as to be able at first sight so fully to comprehend the essential nature of every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, - yea, of "every living creature," - that he could immediately speak the name of it.

In every faculty and every feature he stood "the image and glory of God," in a world that in all things reflected only the goodness and glory of God. And *this* man, in *such* a place, chose to abandon all that he was, all that was about him, and God who was above him; he chose a leader and a way that were contrary to God; he chose to abandon the object of his own existence; he chose to frustrate the purpose of God in his own creation; he chose not to glorify God on the earth. Instead of choosing that God should be manifested in him, glorified in him, and that in this he himself should be manifested and glorified, he chose that the arch-enemy of God should be manifested in him, and that he himself, with the whole world that had been committed to him, should be sunk to the lowest depths of degradation, and lost. What a failure was this! For such a man, in such a place, what a deplorable, what an inexcusable, what an altogether wretched failure!

THE SECOND ADAM'S GLORIOUS TRIUMPH

FOUR thousand years after this failure of the first Adam, the second and last Adam came into the world. But what a world in which the first Adam stood! It was not a world in which the curse which had been let loose by the failure of the first Adam, had been raging furiously for four thousand years; a world which had been completely ruined once, and which was ripe for utter ruin the second time; a

325

world in which "sin had become a science," and which had thus been brought to such a condition that demons nor men nor even angels could see any alternative but that the race must be blotted from the earth.

How widely different also was the second Adam Himself from the first! The second Adam came not at the point where the first Adam stood when he failed, but at the point at which mankind stood at the end of four thousand years of

degeneracy; not in the condition of power and glory in which the first man stood when he failed, but in the condition of weakness and the honour in which the race was involved at the end of this long period of the reign of sin. He came at that point, - "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," bearing our infirmities and our sicknesses, with the iniquities of us all laid upon Him, made "in all points" like sinful man, "made . . . to be sin." And under all this disadvantage; yet further, He became so weak that of His own self He could do nothing (John v. 30) any more than any other man who is without God. Chapter. xv. 5.

And yet in all this fearful contrast from the first Adam, and this terrible disadvantage, "this Man," putting His trust in trod, went from birth to death, a *whole lifetime*, through this forlorn world; and as His course was ending, He could truthfully and in grand though solemn triumph say to *the Father*: "I HAVE GLORIFIED TIME ON THE EARTH," and to *all mankind* could ring out the glad word, "BE OF GOOD CHEER; I HAVE OVERCOME THE WORLD." What a victory was this! For such a man, in such a place, what a joyous, what an altogether commendable, what an all-over glorious victory was this!

Oh, there is good cheer in it! There is not only good cheer in it, it is *itself* altogether good cheer; for it has demonstrated, that however great the abundance of sin, however low a man may have been brought by it, he can overcome the world, he can glorify God on the earth.

O then, poor, sin-laden, weak, discouraged soul, "Be of good cheer." By the Divine faith brought by Jesus Christ to every human being, you can overcome the world, you can glorify God on earth. Rest on that Divine faith which is given to you, and say with "this Man," "*I will put my trust in Him;*" bind then also with "this Man" and in "this Man" you, too, can glorify God on the earth; for He says, "The glory which Thou gavest Me *I* have given them."

And let every soul that has named the name of Christ take up this blessed note of "good cheer," and sound it the louder and yet more loud, until the whole earth shall be filled with the continuous, joyful sound, like the noise of many waters, yet "sweet as from blest voices uttering joy," ringing in the ears and in the heart of every soul: "Be of good cheer; in Him you can overcome the world, in Him you can glorify God on the earth. Be of good cheer!"

"And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" Now thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of His knowledge [that glorifies Himself] by us in every place."

A. T. JONES.

June 11, 1896

**"How to Know that the Bible Is the Word of God" *The Present Truth*
12, 24 , pp. 373, 374.**

THE Bible comes to men as the Word of God. In every part it speaks to men as from God and upon the authority of God. But how shall men who do not know God know that it is the Word of God? This is the question that thousands of

people ask. They ask, "What proof is there, where is the evidence that it is the Word of God?"

There is evidence - evidence that every man can have - evidence that is convincing and satisfactory. Where is it, then? Let us see.

WHOM SHALL WE ASK

BEING the Word of God, where could evidence be found that it is such? Where should we expect to find such evidence? Is there anyone of greater knowledge than God, or of greater authority than He, of whom we may inquire? - Certainly not. For whoever God may be, there can be no higher authority, there can be none of greater knowledge.

Suppose, then, we were to ask God whether this is His Word, and suppose He should tell us in just so many words, "The Bible is My Word," we should have *His word* for it. But *we have that already*, over and over; so that even then we should have no more evidence than we now have in abundance; and the evidence would be in nowise different; for it would be the evidence of His word, and that we already have.

The Word of God bears in itself the evidence that it is the Word of God. It is impossible that it could be otherwise. If God had never yet spoken a word to the human family, and should this day send a message to all people at once and in their own native tongues, that word, being the word of God, would *have* to bear in itself the evidence of its being the word of God; for the people could not possibly inquire of any other, because there is no other person whose knowledge or authority is equal to this. Bearing in itself the evidence of its being the word of God, all the people could

374

obtain this evidence by accepting it as the word of God. Each one who did this would know that it was the word of God, for he would have the evidence in the word, and by accepting it, also in himself.

HOW TO GET THE EVIDENCE

THIS is precisely the position that the Bible occupies toward the people of this world. It comes as the Word of God. As such it must bear the evidence in itself, for there can be no higher, no better evidence. Whoever receives it as the Word of God, receives in it and in himself the evidence that it is the Word of God. And so it is written, "When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it *not as the word of men*; but as it is in truth, the word of God, which *effectually worketh also* in you that believe." 1 Thess. ii. 13; Acts xvii. 1, 2. And again: "A new commandment I write unto you, which thing is true *in Him* and *in you*." 1 John ii. 8. And again, "My doctrine is not Mine, but his that sent Me. If any man will [is willing to] do His will, *he shall know* of the doctrine, *whether it be of God*, or whether I speak of Myself." John vii. 16, 17. Thus he who accepts the Word as the Word of God. He who will not accept the Word cannot have the

evidence; in rejecting the Word, he rejects the evidence, because the evidence is in the Word.

To make this yet plainer if possible, especially to those who doubt that the Bible is the Word of God, we may for the sake of the case suppose that it were not, and that the God of the Bible were not, and that the God of the Bible were not the true God. Suppose then that we should find the true God and ask Him, and suppose He would say, "It is not the Word of God." We should then have only *His word*; and the only way that we could know that this answer were true would be by believing its, by accepting it as the word of God.

So that the only way in which any person could surely know that the Bible is not the Word of God, would be by the Word of God. And even though they had the word of God to this effect, the only way that they could be sure of it - the only *evidence* they could have - would be by believing that word. But there is no word of God that the Scriptures are not the Word of God, while there is the word of God that the Scriptures are the Word of God. That Word of God bears in itself the evidence that it is the Word of God. And every soul who will receive it as it is, will get the evidence. The evidence will be plain to him who believes the Word.

A. T. JONES.

October 1, 1896

"Bible Studies on the Christian Life. The Power of Sin" *The Present Truth* 12, 40 , p. 629.

ALL would find the way of salvation easy if they would make the right calculation at the beginning. Jesus says, "My yoke is easy;" and it is so. He says, "My burden is light;" and it is so. But many people who are in the way do not find His yoke easy nor His burden light. And all the difficulty is that they do not make the right calculation as to the contest that is met in the way. Jesus said: "What king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an embassy, and desireth conditions of peace."

Many start in the way, and this is the right thing to do. But by not properly estimating the force against them nor their power to meet it, they do not prosper in the way as they should, nor as they expected. They do not rightly estimate the power of sin, nor their power to meet it successfully. In a little while they find themselves failing repeatedly, and then, after many "ups and downs," they begin to think that that is the way, and then begin to excuse sin, and apologise for it, and try to strike conditions of peace in that sort of experience. But this will never do. Victory can never come that way.

No; sit down first, and "consult" as to what are the forces against you, and whether you are able to meet them, and if not able to meet them, then what to do in order to meet them successfully; for no apology, no compromise, no peace, must ever be sought or allowed with sin. "Consult" the chart of the field of battle,

the Bible. "Consult" the One who knows, as to the power of the enemy. "Consult" the Great Commander in the field, as to what equipment and what power are essential to assure victory, not only "at last" but at *first*. Time, even much time, spent in this consultation at the beginning, would be always a gain rather than in any sense a loss.

The difficulty does not lie with any one, in any failure to acknowledge the *fact* of sin. With every one the whole difficulty lies in failure to acknowledge the *power* of sin. Everybody is willing to admit that he has done wrong, - that he has aimed to do right, but has missed the mark; and this is only to miss the mark. Many are willing to be specific, and to say that they have actually sinned, and are altogether sinners, and to confess it to the Lord. It is well, it is right, to do all this; and yet all this can be done, and, in fact, is done by many, without their acknowledging or confessing the power of sin.

Many do all this, and yet depend upon themselves and what is of themselves, to defeat sin. They insist that they could do better if only they had a better chance; but circumstances are unfavourable - the neighbours are bad; the church-members are not all converted, and therefore matters of church or Sabbath-school work are unpleasant and "trying;" their own family relations are not the best. All these things and such as these are counted hindrances to progress in the Christian life; and they themselves could do better and be better Christians if circumstances were only as favourable as they should be. These persons hold that inside they are all right, the good is there; it is outside where the evil lies, and the good that is in them does not have a chance to show itself. If only all the evil influences without, and all opposing circumstances were taken away, then, ah! *then*, they could easily enough be Christians of just the right kind.

But this is all a deception. It is but an argument presented by the deceitfulness of sin. It is not anything outside of us nor around us, but only what is *in* us, that can hinder us from being Christians of just the right kind. It is only the power of sin working in us that can ever hinder us in the least from being straightforward Christians. And until that *power* is recognised and confessed, we cannot be delivered from it. But when it is recognized and confessed, we can be delivered from it; and just as constantly and just as thoroughly as it is recognised and confessed, just so constantly and so thoroughly can we be delivered from it. And deliverance from the power of sin is Christianity. The life that is delivered from the power of sin is a Christian life in truth, and it cannot be anything else.

The word of God has made this as plain as anything can be made. The whole thought of Scripture is to show that there is power in sin. The Scripture does not want men to entertain any other view of sin than that there is power in it, and that this power is absolute so far as man himself is concerned. The statements of Scripture, and the very terms in which these statements are framed, show this.

A. T. JONES.

October 8, 1896

"The Slavery of Sin" *The Present Truth* 12, 41 , pp. 641, 642.

WHERE sin abounded, Romans v. 21 says that "sin hath reigned." And to reign is "to hold and exercise sovereign power;" "to exercise commanding influence; to dominate; to exercise control over; control as by right or superior force;" "to prevail irresistibly; exist widely or to the exclusion of something else." That is what the word of God says that sin does in men and with men as they are of themselves. And until that fact is recognised, no man can be delivered from the power of sin. The word used, and translated "reigned," is a word that signifies and relates to governments and the reign of sovereigns. And when the Word of God thus speaks, it wants us to understand that men in sin are under the government and sovereign power of sin, just as men who are in an earthly kingdom are under the power of that government.

Again: the Scripture describes the condition of the sinner thus: "I am carnal, sold under sin." In these times a man who was sold was a slave, and was in all things absolutely subject to his master. Why, then, is this statement used with reference to men under sin, unless that is the actual condition of men under sin? Yet more than this: this statement was originally written to the saints who were in Rome. The figure was taken from the Roman system of slavery. And when the brethren in Rome read it, it was the system of Roman slavery that was suggested, and that was intended to be suggested, to their minds as an illustration of the condition of the sinner under the power of sin.

Now the Roman government was a sheer despotism of the worst sort. The relation of the government to the citizen was such that he was but a slave. Who has not read or heard these words? "The Roman Empire filled the world, and when that empire fell into the hands of a single person, the world became a safe and dreary prison for his enemies: to resist was fatal, and it was impossible to fly." That was the condition of a *citizen* under the Roman government; but the figure used in this scripture is not of Roman citizenship but of Roman *slavery*. And when that was the condition of the Roman citizen, what must have been the condition of the Roman slave! Roman slavery was a system of bondage imposed upon men by a government that stood toward its own citizens as this quotation describes. The slave was confined in the hands of his

642

owner by such a government as this. The master had absolute power in all things, even to life or death, over the slave. The owner could torture his slave to death or kill him out of hand, and no one could question it; for the government, such a government, confirmed the owner in the absolute possession and control of the one whom he had bought with his money.

And the figure furnished by that system of government and of slavery, is adopted by the Lord in defining the relationship of the sinner to sin, and the condition of the sinner under the power of sin. And the lesson which we are taught in these words of Scripture, and which we are expected to learn from these words, is not simply the fact of sin, but the *power* of it. And if people would only see this more and recognise it so, there would be more salvation from sin in

the world and among those who profess to be Christian, and there would therefore be much more Christianity in the church.

This same thought is expressed in the same way by Jesus, in the following words: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." This is the way the King James Version reads, and so on the face of the text its force is lost; for when people read it nowadays, they know that the position of a servant is such that he can leave it at any time, and cease to be a servant. Looking at it that way, they decide that they can leave the service of sin at any time, by their own power, and by their own power cease to be servants of sin.

But this is not what Jesus said. What He really said is this: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is a *slave* of sin." The Greek word is *doulos*, and signifies "properly, a *born bondman*, or *slave*." Note, it is not simply one *made* a slave; but one *born* a slave. That is what Jesus said; and that is what the Word says yet to every one that is under the power of sin. Thus in the words of Christ here, as in the other places, it is the power of sin over the sinner, rather than the fact of sin upon Him, that is taught, and that He wants men to understand. And He wants us to understand that this power is properly illustrated only in the system of Roman slavery as it was then in the world.

This power is shown to be such that in its reign, in its mastery over the man who knows only the birth to slavery, the natural birth, it keeps him back from doing the good that he would do, and that he loves, and causes him to do the evil that he would not do, and that he hates. For it is written: "I am carnal, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I." "The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do." "For *to will* is present with me; but how *to perform* that which is good I find not."

But why is this! Why is it that a man does the evil that he hates? Why is it that he does not the good that he would? Why is it that he cannot perform the good that he wills? Oh! "It is not more I that do it, but *sin* that dwelleth in me." I would not do it; but *sin* that dwells in me causes me to do it. I would do good, but sin that dwells in me holds me back, and will not let me do it. "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?"

How could the supreme, sovereign, and absolute power of sin be more plainly shown than it is in the scriptures cited in this article? And how could the complete, abject, and helpless slavery of the man who knows the natural birth be more fully depicted than in these same scriptures? O that men would believe it! O that they would recognise it, and confess it, always! Then they could be delivered. For there is deliverance. There is deliverance as complete as is the captivity. There is freedom as absolute as is the slavery. There is the reign of another power, as certainly supreme and sovereign as was ever the power of sin. But until we recognise and confess the power of sin as the word of God declares it, we cannot know the power of God declares it, we cannot know the power of God as the word of God presents it. Until we acknowledge the complete sovereignty of the power of sin, we cannot acknowledge the complete

sovereignty of the power of God.
A. T. JONES.

October 15, 1896

"The Power of Grace" *The Present Truth* 12, 42 , pp. 661, 662.

THERE is power in grace as certainly as there is power in sin. And there is "much more" power in grace than there is in sin. For "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound."

We have found that there is power in sin to reign over man, and hold him under its dominion. And just as certainly there is power in grace to reign over sin, and hold man under the dominion of grace against all the power of sin. For "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that [in order that] as sin hath reigned, . . . even so might grace reign."

The word "reign" here applied to grace, is the same word precisely that is applied to sin. It means as to grace precisely what it means as to sin. The definition of "reign" is just as true when referring to grace as when applied to sin: "To hold and exercise power; to exercise commanding influence; to dominate; to prevail irresistibly; exist widely, or to the exclusion of something else."

All this is true of grace as certainly as it is true of sin. As certainly as sin holds and exercises sovereign power, and prevails irresistibly to the exclusion of everything else where it reigns, so certainly grace will hold and exercise sovereign power, and will prevail irresistibly to the exclusion of sin, where it is allowed to reign. For "as sin hath reigned. . . . *even so* might grace reign." "As" and "even so" - think of these expressions. "As" and "even so" - what do these words mean? - They have no other meaning than "to the same extent or degree; in the same way; like; even as; just as." Like as sin hath reigned, - just as sin hath reigned, - to just that same degree it is intended that grace shall reign, and to that degree grace will reign wherever it is allowed to do so.

These expressions emphasise the necessity, before pointed out, that the reign of sin shall be recognized as absolute. The reign of grace must be absolute, or else its purpose will be frustrated. But the reign of sin must be recognised as absolute, or else the reign of grace cannot be so; for just as sin reigned, *even so* grace. Therefore it is perfectly plain that *not* to recognise the power and reign of sin as absolute, is to frustrate the grace of God.

This is why it is that the Scriptures insist so strongly upon the fact of the power and reign of sin over men. This is why the Lord wants that fact recognised and ever held in mind. The Lord wants men to be absolutely free from sin, and to be the servants of righteousness. But this cannot be, so long as men fail fully to recognise the power and reign of sin. Therefore he tells men over and over and always insists that of themselves they have no power at all against sin; that they are slaves to a power which keeps them from doing the good that they would, and compels them to do the evil which they hate. This the Lord tells to men

because it is all true; and he wants men to believe what he tells them as to the power and reign of sin, so that they may know the power and reign of grace.

For grace is to reign as fully as ever sin did. The power of sin is to be so broken that the slave is free, and no more serves sin. "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Men have served sin; they do serve sin. But God has provided that henceforth they shall not serve sin; that they shall be free from sin, and the servants of righteousness only, as formerly they were free from righteousness and the servants of sin only. "For sin shall *not* have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace." "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that *as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life* by Jesus Christ our Lord."

It is therefore perfectly plain that to obtain the reign of grace in our behalf, it is essential that we confess the reign of sin. To know the power of grace, it is essential to confess the power of sin. And to insure the continued power and reign of grace, it is essential that there be a continued confession of the power of sin. To insure the absolute reign of grace, it is essential that we continually confess our absolute weakness and helplessness in the presence of the power of sin: to confess that in us "dwells no good thing;" and that we have "no confidence in the flesh." Then the way is clear for grace to manifest itself. And there being nothing to hinder the power of grace, its reign will be complete.

We are constantly to *confess* our weakness, our absolute helplessness; but we are *not* to deplore it. Just here is where many miss the right way. They do feel their weakness, they confess that they do; but they do this only to deplore it and fairly to work themselves into discouragement and even despair over it. This is all wrong; this is to take the wrong road entirely. It is right, yes, it is essential, that we confess always our weakness, our absolute helplessness. This is the key of the whole situation. But in stead of deploring it, thank God for it; for Christ says: "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness." Instead of being discouraged by your weakness, glory in it; for it is written, "Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me." So long as we feel that we have any strength to cope with sin, we depend upon this instead of upon grace, and so we are defeated; we depend upon ourselves instead of upon the Lord, and so we fail. But when we constantly confess our absolute weakness, and recognise the fixed fact that there is no power, no help, no good thing, in us against the power of sin, then we shall depend wholly upon the Lord: all our hope will, be in grace. And the way being thus fully opened and held unhindered to the work of grace, grace will fully occupy the place, and will reign against all the power of sin.

662

And then "sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace."

Thus it is that "when I am weak, then am I strong." It is only when we are weak, that we can possibly be strong. No Christian wants to feel any other way than weak, because then he knows that the way is open for grace to reign; and thus when he is weak, then he is strong - "strong in the Lord, and in the power of

his might." When you feel strong, you are certainly weak; for strength is not of yourself that you can *feel* it, but of the Lord, that you may *believe* it. When you feel strong, you think you can stand; but "let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." But when you feel weak and know that you cannot stand, then "he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand." Thank the Lord that you do feel your weakness, and even then believe that your weakness is greater than you feel. And then *believe* in the Lord's strength for you, and in His abiding grace to impart this strength to your life, and reign there over all the power of sin - reigning through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord. Then as it is the truth of God that "as sin hath reigned, . . . even so might grace reign," and "sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are. . . under grace," - then, under the reign of grace, it will be found just as easy to do right, as under the reign of sin it was easy to do wrong. Then it will be found, indeed, that His yoke is easy, and his burden is light.

A. T. JONES.

October 22, 1896

"Shall It Be Grace or Sin?" *The Present Truth* 12, 43 , pp. 677, 678.

IT can never be repeated too often, that under the reign of grace it is just as easy to do right, as under the reign of sin it is easy to do wrong. This must be so; for if there is not more power in grace than there is in sin, then there can be no salvation from sin. But there is salvation from sin; this no one who believe in Christianity can deny.

Yet salvation from sin certainly depends upon there being more power in grace than there is in sin. Then, there being more power in grace than there is in sin, it cannot possibly be otherwise than that wherever the power of grace can have control, it will be just as easy to do right as without this it is easy to do wrong.

No man ever yet naturally found it difficult to do wrong. His great difficulty has always been to do right. But this is because man naturally is enslaved to a power - the power of sin - that is absolute in its reign. And so long as that power has sway, it is not only difficult but impossible to do the good that he knows and that he would. But let a mightier power than that have sway, then is it not plain enough that it will be just as easy to serve the will of the mightier power, when it reigns, as it was to serve the will of the other power when it reigned?

But grace is not simply more powerful than is sin. If this were indeed all, even then there would be fulness of hope and good cheer to every sinner in the world. But this, good as it would be, is not all; it is not nearly all. There is much more power in grace than there is in sin. For "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." And just as much more power in grace than there is in sin, just so much more hope and good cheer there are for every sinner in the world.

How much more power, then, is there in grace than there is in sin? Let me think a moment. Let me ask myself a question or two. Whence comes grace? -

From God, to be sure. "Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ." Whence comes sin? - From the devil, of course. Sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. Well, then, how much more power is there in grace than there is in sin? It is as plain as A B C that there is just as much more power in grace than there is in sin, as there is more power in God than there is in the devil. It is therefore also perfectly plain that the reign of grace is the reign of God; and that the reign of sin is the reign of Satan. And is it not therefore perfectly plain also, that it is just as easy to serve God by the power of God as it is to serve Satan with the power of Satan?

Where the difficulty comes in, in all this, is that so many people try to serve God with the power of Satan. But that can never be done. "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt." Men cannot gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles. The tree must be made good, root and branch. It must be made new. "Ye must be born again." "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." Let no one ever attempt to serve God with anything but the present, living power of God, that makes him a new creature; with nothing but the much more abundant grace that condemns sin in the flesh, and reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord. Then the service of God will indeed be in "newness of life;" then it will be found that his yoke is indeed "easy" and his burden "light;" then his service will be found indeed to be with "joy unspeakable and full of glory."

Did Jesus ever find it difficult to do right? Every one will instantly say, No. But why? he was just as human as we are. He took flesh and blood the same as ours. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." And the kind of flesh that he was made in this world, was precisely such as was in this world. "In all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren." "In all things"! It does not say, In all things *but one*. There is no exception. He was made in all things like as we are. He was of Himself as weak as we are; for He said, "I can of Mine own self do nothing."

Why, then, being in all things like as we are, did He find it always easy to do right? - Because He never trusted to Himself, but His trust was always in God alone. All His dependence was upon the grace of God. He always sought to serve God, only with the power of God. And therefore the Father dwelt in Him, and did the works of righteousness. Therefore it was always easy for Him to do right. But as He is, so are we in this world. He has left us an example, that we should follow His steps. "It is God which worketh in *you* both to will and to do of His good pleasure," as well as in Him. All power in heaven and in earth is given unto Him; and He desires that you may be strengthened with *all might*, according to His glorious power. "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;" and He strengthens you with might by His Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your heart by faith, that *you* may be "filled with all the fulness of God."

True, Christ partook of the Divine nature, and so do you if you are a child of promise, and not of the flesh; for by the promises ye are partakers of the Divine nature. There was nothing given to Him in this world, and He had nothing in this world, that is not freely given to you, or that you may not have.

All this is in order that you may walk in newness of life; that henceforth you may not serve sin; that you may be the servant of righteousness only; that you may be freed from sin; that sin may not have dominion over you; that you may glorify God on the earth; and that you may be like Jesus. And therefore "unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. . . . Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God,

678

unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." And I "beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain."

A. T. JONES.

October 29, 1896

"Who Shall Reign?" *The Present Truth* 12, 44 , pp. 691, 692.

"THE kingdom of God is within you." To see that this is a universal truth it is necessary only to read the connection, and know to whom these words were originally spoken. Here is the passage: "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, He answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you." Luke xvii. 21, 22.

Those Pharisees were not believers in Christ. On the contrary, they were constantly spying upon Him, laying traps for Him, persecuting Him, and laying plans to kill Him. And yet to these and such as these the Lord says, "The kingdom of God is within you." And when this is true of such as those, it is evident that it is true of everybody in the world; and that it is a universal truth that the kingdom of God is in man. And if God is not recognised and allowed to reign in his kingdom that is within, it matters not to such persons when the outward kingdom and reign may come; they can have no part in it anyhow; it would mean only destruction and perdition to them.

Man was made to glorify God. "I have created him for My glory." Christ came into the world to make manifest the purpose of God in the creation and existence of man; and when He had finished His course upon the earth, He said to the Father, "I have glorified Thee on the earth." In order to glorify God on the earth, "He emptied Himself." And when He emptied Himself, and took the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, God dwelt in Him, and worked in Him, and was manifest in Him so entirely that none but God was seen in all His life. And thus be glorified, He made manifest, God on the earth.

This is God's purpose in the creation and existence of man; and this is that which will be manifest in all intelligences in the universe when the grand work of redemption shall have been completed. For when the end comes; when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when God shall have put all things under Christ's feet, and so shall have subdued all things unto the Son, "then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, *that God may be all in all.*" Then all that will be in any one, or that will be manifest in any one, will be God. And thus God being all in each one, He will

be all in all of them. This was God's purpose concerning man when He created him. The purpose was that God, and God alone, should be manifest in the man. The purpose was that God should dwell in him and walk in him, that God alone should reign in him and rule over him. This was the condition of the man when God put him upon the earth and in the garden. Thus God established His temple, His throne, and His kingdom, in man. And thus it is that to all mankind it is true that "the kingdom of God is within you."

Yet the Lord made man free. God cannot have any compulsory or necessitous service. And to be happy, even with God, man must be free. His service, even to God, to be happy service must be from choice, willingly and freely made. "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land." Whosoever will, let him come. And in the nature of things, freedom of choice to serve the Lord, carries with it freedom of choice not to do so. When God established His kingdom in man to reign there, He would reign there, He could reign there, only upon the man's choice. And the Lord put the man in the garden, and arranged everything there for the exercise of his freedom of choice. He put the tree of knowledge of good and evil in the midst of the garden, and with *no boundary about it*. Access to this tree was left as open as to any others, except in the word of the Lord, "Thou shalt not eat of it." And whether he would eat of it or not was for the man to choose.

And the man did choose the wrong way. And he did this by choosing to follow the will and the way of another than God. And in so choosing, he did choose that another than God should have a place in him. And thus be allowed a usurper to enter this kingdom of God, and occupy the throne there, and demand worship in this temple that was in him. Yet the kingdom is of right the Lord's, even though the usurper has occupied it. The throne is the Lord's, even though the usurper sits upon it. Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord; and it was still the throne of the Lord, though Solomon afterward sat upon it in iniquity. The temple is of right the Lord's, even though a false god is there, and a false worship be conducted there. It is "in the temple of God" that the great usurper sits "as God," "showing himself that he is God." Thus it is that the kingdom is God's, even though the usurper be ruling in it; and the throne is the Lord's, even though the usurper be occupying it. And thus it is true that to every man that cometh into the world the word is spoken, "The kingdom of God is within you."

Then the further question comes to every man that cometh into the world, Who shall reign in this kingdom? Will you have the usurper to reign there? or will you allow the rightful King to reign there? Will you have the usurper to reign there only to your ruin? or will you have the rightful King reign there only to salvation? Shall the usurper occupy the throne only in iniquity? or shall the rightful Lord occupy it only in righteousness? Shall the usurper rule only to shame? or will you have the One "whose right it is" to rule there only to glory, both present and eternal? This is the consideration that presents itself to the constant thought and the ever present choice of all mankind. And therefore the living and ever-present word is, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." To-day, "while it is called To-day," "if ye will

hear His voice, harden not your hearts." "Now is the accepted time; . . . now is the day of salvation."

"The kingdom of God is within you." Who shall reign in this kingdom in you? Who shall reign there "now," "to-day," "While it is called To-day"? Choose ye, choose ye, "choose ye this day" who. All that the rightful King asks of you, that He may take His own place in His own kingdom, and reign there, is that by an active, intelligent choice, you shall now choose Him to reign. For, "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear My voice, and open the door, I will come in to him." "My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." "I will dwell in them and walk in them, and they shall be My people, and I will be their God." "I will put My laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts." "I will be thy King." Then in its full, true, and rightful sense, will the kingdom of God be in you; for there is the kingdom, and there will then be the King, the throne, and the laws of the kingdom.

"The kingdom of God is within you." Choose ye this day who shall sit and rule in that kingdom. Choose that the rightful King shall have His own place in his own kingdom. He cannot reign there without your choice. Upon your choice He will reign; He will reign the King that He is, with the power that is His - with power "by His Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; . . . that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Then God will be manifest in you, and you will glorify God on the earth.

This was the purpose of God when He created man at the first; and this is His purpose in creating him again in Christ Jesus. Choose ye this day that this purpose shall be met in you. And not to choose is to choose. *Not* to choose that God shall reign, *is* to choose that he shall *not* reign. And to choose that God shall not reign, is to choose that Satan - the usurper - shall reign. Not to choose that God shall be glorified in you, is to choose that he shall not be glorified in you. And to choose that God shall not be glorified in you, is to choose that Satan shall be glorified in you. And for God to be glorified in you, self must be emptied, that God may be all. Self must be emptied in all, that God may be all in all.

A. T. JONES.

November 5, 1896

"Who Shall Be Glorified?" *The Present Truth* 12, 45 , pp. 709, 710.

MAN was not made to glorify himself, but to glorify the Lord only. He was not made to make known himself, but to make known only the Lord. "I have created him for My glory." When the man was made and put in the garden, God dwelt in him and walked in him; he was crowned with glory and honour from God, and God was glorified in him. God was manifest in him; in him the image of God was seen. He was made thus ever to reflect, to make known, the image and glory of God. The word of God was to be his life and his guide. By having the word of God to live in him, he was to continue to glorify God. God told him the way that he should walk and live, and also the way he should not take and die.

So long as the man believed this word, so long as he walked in this way, he would glorify God, God would be made known through him, the image of God would be seen reflected in him. But if the man should not believe this word, and should take the other way, just then he would separate from God, and God could not be made known through him, the image of God could not then be reflected in him; and as certainly as the man should separate himself from God, though the Lord could not then be glorified, made manifest, reflected, in him, yet so certainly *somebody* would be manifested in him, somebody would be glorified there.

Who would this "somebody" be? That would depend upon who was chiefly concerned in His separating from God. If the man himself, altogether of himself and in the invention of his own heart, should turn from the word of God and take the other way, then it would be only himself that would be exalted, only himself that would be manifested. But if some other one should show the way and give the word that would separate from God, and if the man were to accept this word and take this way, then it is perfectly plain that not the man himself but the one whose suggestion he accepted, whose word he believed; and whose way he followed, this is the one who would be exalted, this the one who would be manifested and reflected in the man.

Now mankind is separated from God. That is a fact. But how was this separation accomplished? Was it altogether from man himself? Did he originate it? - No; everybody knows that this is not the way in which it was brought about. But Satan, "the serpent, said," "Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." And this word was believed, this word was accepted, instead of the word of God; and this way was taken instead of the way of the Lord. Then as certainly as it was the word and the way of Satan that was accepted by man instead of the word and way of God, so certainly was Satan accepted and followed instead of God. Therefore it was not God that was manifested in man when he sinned, it was not man himself; but it was Satan instead of God and instead of man himself.

Again: the man was to receive all his information from God. He was to believe the word of God and be guided by that, this way his mind would be formed from God, his thought would be the thought of God - in short, he would have the mind of God. But when he received and believed the word of Satan, his thought became the thought of Satan - in short, his mind became the mind of Satan. This is why it is that the carnal mind, the natural mind, "is enmity against God," and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Notice, this mind is not said to be at enmity with God; but it is enmity against God. If it were at enmity with God, it might be reconciled to God by the taking away of that which put it at enmity. Man is at enmity with God, and is reconciled to God by the taking away of that which has set him at enmity, and this is "the enmity." Christ "abolished *the* enmity" that He might reconcile men unto God. But this is not so with the carnal mind, the natural mind, the minding of the flesh. It is enmity itself. It never can be reconciled to God; "for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." And the reason that it is enmity and cannot be subject to God, is precisely because it is the mind of Satan.

These considerations show conclusively that the "somebody" who is exalted, manifested, reflected, in man separate from God, is none other than Satan. So then when man was created, not to glorify himself but to glorify God, and then chose another way, still he does not glorify himself but glorifies Satan. So that in having his own way separate from God, no man from Adam until now has ever really had his own way; he has had Satan's way, in fact; and, separate from God, it never can be otherwise.

The only possible way in which any man can ever reach the point where he really can have his own way, is everlastingly to choose God's way. Man was not created to have his own way separate from God. He was created to have his own way, with God. For man was created not only to glorify God, but also that he himself should be glorified. Man was created not only that God should be glorified in him, but also that he should be glorified in God. Not only is God to be made known in man, but man himself is to be made known in God. "Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him. And if God be glorified in Him [in the Son], God shall also glorify Him [the Son] in Himself [in God]." And this is why it is that though now we are the sons of God, "it doth not yet appear what we shall be."

And in this world it never will "appear what we shall be." We are the sons of God; and in this it is with us as with the original sons of God. While we are in this world, we are to let it appear in us what God is. Then when this is finished, God, in the world to come and in eternity,

710

will make it appear what we shall be. In this world we are to glorify God. In the world to come and through eternity God will glorify us. He asks us to retake Hire manifest in this world where He is not known, and when that is past, He will make us manifest in all worlds where we are not known. "Then that honour Me I will honour."

Who, then, will not choose the Lord's way? Who will choose his own way apart from God, the way in which he cannot have his own way even when he chooses it? Who will not choose the Lord's way, the only way in which he can possibly have his own way? Who will try to be "himself" in the way in which he cannot possibly be himself. Who will not seek with all the heart to be himself in the only way in which it is possible to be himself that is, in God? Who will seek to exalt himself instead of God, when all that he can do by it is to exalt Satan instead of both himself and God?

To all men let the question be asked for ever, Whom will you glorify? - God or Satan? "Choose ye this day," - "To-day, while it is called to-day."

A. T. JONES.

November 12, 1896

"Receive Not the Grace of God in Vain" *The Present Truth* 12, 46 , pp. 725, 726.

CAN every believer have grace enough to keep him free from sinning? - Yes. Indeed, everybody in the world can have enough to keep him from sinning. If any one does not have it, it is not because enough has not been given; but because he does not take that which has been given. For "unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." Eph. iv. 7. The measure of the gift of Christ is Himself wholly, and that is the measure of "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." To the fulness of the Godhead there is, indeed, no measure; it is boundless, it is simply the infinity of God. Yet that is the only measure of the grace that is given to every one of us. The boundless measure of the fulness of the Godhead is the only thing that can express the proportion of grace that is given to every one who is in this world. For "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." This grace is given in order that "as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord," and in order that sin shall not have dominion over you, because you are under grace.

It is given also "for the perfecting of the saints." The object of it is to bring each one to perfection Christ Jesus - to the perfection too, that is fully up to God's standard; for it is given for the building up of the body of Christ, "will we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." It is given to "every one of us," "till we all come" to perfection, even by the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. Again, this grace is given to every one where sin abounds; and it brings salvation to every one to whom it is given. Bringing salvation in itself, the measure of the salvation which it brings to every one is only the measure of its own fulness, which is nothing less than the measure of the fulness of the Godhead.

As the boundless grace is given to every one bringing salvation to the extent of its own full measure, then if any one does not have boundless salvation, why is it? - Plainly it can be only because he will not take that which is given.

As boundless grace is given to every one, in order that it shall reign in him against all the power of sin, as certainly as ever sin reigned; and in order that sin shall not have dominion, then if sin still reigns in any one, if sin yet has dominion over any one, where lies the fault? - Clearly it lies only in this, that he will not allow the grace to do for him and in him that which it is given to do. By unbelief he frustrates the grace of God. So far as he is concerned, the grace has been given in vain.

But every believer, by his very profession, says that he has received the grace of God. Then if in the believer grace does not reign instead of sin; if grace does not reign instead of sin, it is plain enough that he is receiving the grace of God in vain. If grace is not bringing the believer onward toward a perfect man in the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, then he is receiving the grace of God in vain. Therefore the exhortation of the Scripture is, "We then, as workers together with Him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain." 2 Cor. vi. 1.

The grace of God is fully able to accomplish that for which it is given, if only it is allowed to work. We have seen that grace being altogether from God, the

power of grace is nothing but the power of God. It is plain enough therefore that the power of God is abundantly able to accomplish all for which it is given, - the salvation of the soul, deliverance from sin and from

726

the power of it, the reign of righteousness in the life, and the perfecting of the believer unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, - if only it can have place in the heart and in the life to work according to the will of God. but the power of God is "unto salvation to every one that *believeth*." Unbelief frustrates the grace of God. Many believe and receive the grace of God for the salvation from sins that are past, but are content with that, and do not give it the same place in the soul, to reign against the power of sin, that they did to save from sins of the past. This, too, is but another phase of unbelief. So as to the one great final object of grace - the perfection of the life in the likeness of Christ - they do practically receive the grace of God in vain.

"We then, as workers together with Him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain. (For He saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succored thee: behold, *now* is the accepted time; behold, *now* is the day of salvation.) Giving no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blamed." Nor does this word "ministry" refer simply to the ordained ministry of the pulpit; it includes every one who receives the grace of God, or that has named the name of Christ. For "as every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." Therefore He does not want any one to receive the grace of God in vain, lest that grace and its blessed working be misrepresented to the world, and so men be further hindered from yielding to it. He does not want His grace to be received in vain, because when it is, offence is given in many things, and the ministry of grace itself is blamed. Yet when the grace of God is not received in vain, but is given the place that belongs to it, "no offence" will be given "in anything," and the ministry will not only be not blamed but will be blest.

And now to show how complete and all-pervading the reign of grace will be in the life where it is not received in vain, the Lord has set down the following list, embracing "all things," and in which we shall approve ourselves unto God. Read it carefully: -

"In all things approving ourselves" unto God,
"In much patience,
In afflictions,
In necessities,
In distresses,
In stripes,
In imprisonment,
In tumults,
In labours,
In watchings,
In fastings;
By pureness,
By knowledge,

By longsuffering,
By kindness,
By the Holy Ghost,
By love unfeigned,
By the word of truth,
By the power of God,
By the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left,
By honour and dishonour,
By evil report and good report:
As deceivers, and yet true;
As unknown, and yet known;
As dying, and, behold, we live;
As chastened, and not killed;
As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing;
As poor, yet making many rich;
As having nothing, and yet possessing all things.

This list covers all the experiences that can ever enter into the life of any believer in this world. It shows that where the grace of God is not received in vain, that grace will so take possession and control of the life, that every experience that enters into the life will be taken by grace, and turned to making us approved unto God, and building us up in perfection unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. "We then, as workers together with Him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain."

A. T. JONES.

November 19, 1896

"Ministers of God" *The Present Truth* 12, 47 , pp. 742, 743.

FROM the list that the Lord has drawn, in 2 Cor. vi. 1-10, it is plain that there is nothing that can ever come into the life of the believer in Christ, but that the grace of God will take it and turn it to the good of the believer, and make it serve only to his advancement toward perfection in Christ Jesus. This the grace of God will do always, and nothing but this, if only the believer will allow the Lord to have his own way in his life; if only he will allow grace to reign. Thus it is that "all things are for your sakes;" and this is how "all things are for your sakes;" and this is how "all things work together for good to them that love God." This is grand. It is indeed glorious. It is salvation itself. This is how the believer is enabled "always" to "triumph in Christ."

This, however, is but half the story. The Lord proposes not only to save him who now believes, but He will use him in ministering to all others the knowledge of God, that they also may believe. We are not to think that the Lord's grace and gifts to us are only for us. They are for us first, in order that not only we ourselves shall be saved, but that we may be enabled to benefit all others in communicating to them the knowledge of God. We ourselves must be partakers

of salvation before we can lead others to it. Therefore it is written: "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." And, "all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation."

Thus every man who receives the grace of God, at the same time receives with it the ministry of that grace to all others. Every one who finds himself reconciled to God, receives with that reconciliation the ministry of reconciliation to all others. Here also the exhortation applies, "We. . . beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain." Are you a partaker of grace? Then "minister the same" to others; do not receive it in vain. Are you reconciled to God? Then know that he has given to you also the ministry of reconciliation. Have you received this ministry in vain?

If we do not receive the grace of God in vain, if only we will allow grace to reign, the Lord will cause it to be that "in all things" we shall approve "ourselves as the ministers of God." This is the truth. The Lord says it, and it is so. "In *all things* approving ourselves as the ministers of God." That is, in all things we shall be conveying to others the knowledge of God. And thus the Lord proposes not only to cause us always "to triumph in Christ," on our own part, but also to make "manifest the savor of his knowledge by us *in every place*." That is, He proposes to make known to others *by us*, and in *every place*, the knowledge of Himself.

We cannot do this of ourselves. He is to do it by us. We are to co-operate with Him. We are to be workers together with Him. And when we do thus co-operate with Him, then as certainly as we do so, so certainly will He cause us always to triumph in Christ, and will also make manifest the knowledge of Himself by us in every place. He can do it, thank the Lord. Do not say, do not even *think*, that He cannot do this by you. He *can* do it by you. He will, too, if only you will not receive His grace in vain; if you will only let grace reign; if you will be worker together with Him.

It is true that there is a mystery about how this can be. It *is* a mystery how God can make manifest the knowledge of Himself by such persons as you and I are, in *any* place, much less in *every* place. Yet mystery though it be, it is the very truth. But we do not believe the mystery of God? - Assuredly we do believe it. Then never forget that the mystery of God is God manifest in the flesh. And you and I are flesh. Then the mystery of God is God manifest in you and me, who believe. Believe it.

Do not forget, either, that the mystery of God is *not* God manifest in sinless flesh, but God manifest in sinful flesh. There could never be any mystery about God's manifesting Himself in sinless flesh - in one who had no connection whatever with sin. That would be plain enough. But that he can manifest Himself in flesh laden with sin and with all the tendencies of sin, such as ours is - that *is* a mystery. Yea, it is the mystery of God. And it is a glorious fact, thank the Lord! Believe it. And before all the world, and for the joy of every person in the world, in Jesus Christ He has demonstrated that this great mystery is indeed a fact in human experience. For "as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same." "*In all things* it behoved Him to be made

like unto his brethren." And therefore God "made Him to be sin for us." "He hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." Thus, in our flesh, having our nature, laden with iniquity, and Himself made to be sin, Christ Jesus lived in this world, tempted in all points like as we are; and yet God always caused Him to triumph in Him, and made manifest the savour of His knowledge by Him in every place. Thus God was manifest in the flesh, - in our flesh, in human flesh laden with sin, - and made to be sin in itself, weak and tempted as ours is. And thus the mystery of God was made known to all nations for the obedience of faith. Oh, believe it!

And this is the mystery of God to-day and forever - God manifest in the flesh, in human flesh, in flesh, laden with sin, tempted and tried. In this flesh, God will make manifest the knowledge of Himself in every place where the believer is found. Believe it, and praise His holy name!

This is the mystery which to-day, in the third angel's message, is again to be made known to all nations for the obedience of faith. This is the mystery of God, which in this time is to be "finished," - not only finished in the sense of being

743

ended to the world, but finished in the sense of being brought to completion in its grand work *in the believer*. This is the time when the mystery of God is to be finished in the sense that God is to be manifest in every true believer, in every place where that believer shall be found. This is, in deed and in truth, the keeping of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

"Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world," - I have revealed God in the flesh. Our faith is the victory that has overcome the world. Therefore, and now, "Thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savor of his knowledge by us in every place."

A. T. JONES.

December 3, 1896

"Kept by the Word" *The Present Truth* 12, 49 , pp. 773, 774.

IN the Christian life everything depends upon the Word of God. It is true that God is able, and desires, to keep us from sinning; but this must be done through His Word. So it is written, "By the word of Thy lips I have kept me from the paths of the destroyer." "Thy word have I hid in my heart, that I might not sin against Thee." This is the way that God has appointed, and there is no other way to have this thing accomplished.

Nor is this way appointed merely because He arbitrarily chose that this *should* be the way, and then laid it upon men that this *must* be the way that they should go. His Word is the way of salvation and the way of sanctification (Christian living), because this is the way that the Lord does things; because this is the way that He manifests Himself. It was by His word that He created all things in the beginning; it is by His Word that he creates men anew; and it will be by His word that He will re-create this world and all things pertaining to it. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth. . . . For He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast."

"Being born again, . . . by the word of God." "And He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. . . . And He said unto me, It is done."

It is not only that the worlds were created by the word of God; but they are also sustained by the same word. "By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby [by the word of God] the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. But the heavens and the earth, which are now, *by the same word* are kept in store." So also it is not only that the Christian is created by the word of God, but by that same word he is sustained, nourished, and caused to grow. God holds up "all things" by His powerful word. And the Christian is among this "all things" no less than any or all the worlds.

There can be no question whatever that all the worlds are held up, and held in their places, by the Lord. But it is not only all the worlds, it is "*all things*" that are held up and held in place by the Lord. And it is as true of the Christian as it is of any star in the firmament or any world on high. Nor can there be any question that the stars and the world are held up and held in their courses by the word of the Lord. And no less than this can there be any question that the Christian is held up and held in his right course by the word of the Lord.

This is to be believed and depended upon by every one who professes the name of Christ. You and I can no more hold ourselves up and in the right way than can the sun or the earth. And as certainly as the worlds are dependent upon his word, so certainly is the Christian to depend upon his word. And when this is so, the Christian is kept in the way of the Lord as certainly and as easily as is any planet in the universe. It is written that he "is able to keep you from falling." And he says, "I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness." "Yea, he *shall be* holden up; for God is able to make him stand."

O struggling, failing Christian, is not that word which holds up great worlds able also to hold up you? Trust that word. Depend implicitly upon it. Rest wholly *upon* it: and they you will find rest *in* it. Trust the Lord to hold you up, just as you trust him to hold up the sun. His word holds up the sun, and His word

774

is over and over to you, "Fear thou not; for I am with thee." "I will uphold thee." I will keep thee, thou art Mine. "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." I will never leave thee till I have done that thing which I have spoken to thee of.

"The word of God is quick ["living," R. V.] and powerful." "Powerful" means "full of power." The word of God is living and full of power, to do for you, with you, and in you, all that that word says. Believe that word, trust it: for it is the word of the living God. It is the word of the pitying Saviour. "Receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls." "I commend you to God, and to *the word* of His grace, which is able to build you up." You "are kept by the power of God through faith." The power of God is manifested through His word, and therefore it is His powerful word. Faith comes by hearing the word of God; therefore it is the *faithful* word, the word full of faith. Therefore when He says, you "are kept by the power of God through faith," it is only saying in another way, You are kept by the word of God, "unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last

time." Believe that word, trust it, and find its keeping power.
A. T. JONES.

December 10, 1896

"The Power of the Word" *The Present Truth* 12, 50 , pp. 790, 791.

"AS the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

The earth can bring forth vegetation only because of the moisture that comes upon it by the rain or the snow from heaven. Without this, everything would fade and perish. So also is it with the life of man and the word of God. Without the word of God the life of man is as barren of power and of good as is the earth without rain. But only let the word of God fall upon the heart as the showers upon the earth; then the life will be fresh and beautiful in the joy and peace of the Lord, and fruitful with the fruits of righteousness which are by Jesus Christ.

Notice, too, it is not *you* who are to do that which he pleases; but, "It shall accomplish that which *I* please." *You* are not to read or hear the word of God, and say, *I* must do that, *I* will do that. You are to open the heart to that word, that *it* may accomplish the will of God in you. It is not *you* who are to do it, but *it*. "It," the word of God itself, is to do it, and you are to *let* it. "*Let* the word of Christ dwell in you."

That is stated in another place thus: "When ye receive the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, *which effectually worketh* also in you that believe." Thus it is the word of God that must work in you. You are not to work to do the word of God: the word of God is to work in you to cause you to do. "Whereunto I also labour, striving according to *his working*, which worketh in me *mightily*."

The word of God being living and full of power, when it is allowed to work in the life, there will be powerful work wrought in that individual. As this word is the word of God, the power, of which it is full, is only the power of God; and when that word is allowed to work in the life, there will be the work of God manifested in the life - it is his power working mightily. And thus it is *God that worketh* in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure. "*It* shall accomplish that which I please." Let it.

From these scriptures it is plain that we are expected to look upon the word of God only as *self-fulfilling*. The word of God *is* self-fulfilling. This is the great truth presented everywhere in the Bible. This is the difference between the word of God and the word of men. And this is just the difference emphasised in the passage that says, "When ye received the word of God, . . . ye received it *not as the word of men*, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe."

There is no power in the word of a man to do what it says. Whatever may be the man's ability to accomplish what he says, there is no power in the man's word itself to accomplish what He says. A man's word may express the easiest possible thing for him to accomplish, and you may thoroughly believe it, yet it is altogether dependent upon the man himself to accomplish it apart from his word. It is not his word that does it. It is he himself that must do it; and this just as really as though he had spoken no word at all. Such is the word of men.

791

It is not so with the word of God. When the word is spoken by the Lord, there is at that moment in that word the living power to accomplish what the word expresses. It is not needed that the Lord employ any shadow of any other means than that word itself to accomplish what the word says. The Bible is full of illustrations of this, and they are written to teach us this very thing, - that we shall look upon the word as the word of God, and not as the word of men; and that we may receive it thus as it is in truth, the word of God, that *it* may work effectually in us the will and good pleasure of God.

"By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth. . . . For He spake, and it was." "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." At first there were no worlds at all. More than this, there was none of the materials of which the worlds are made. There was nothing. Then God spoke, and all the worlds were in their places. From whence came the worlds, then? Before He spoke, there were none; after He spoke, there they were. Whence, then, did they come? What produced them? What produced the material of which they are composed? What caused them to exist? It was the word which was spoken that did it all. And this word did it all, because it was the word of God. There was in that word the divinity of life and spirit, the creative power, to do all that the word expressed. Such is the word of God.

"And this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." The word of God in the Bible is the same, - the same in life, in spirit, in creative power, - precisely the same as that word that made the heavens and all the host of them. It was Jesus Christ who spoke the word at creation; it is He who speaks the word in the Bible. At creation the word which He spoke made the worlds; in the Bible the word which He speaks saves and sanctifies the soul. In the beginning the word which He spoke created the heavens and the earth; in the Bible the word which He speaks creates in Christ Jesus the man who receives the word. In both places, and everywhere in the work of God, it is the word that does it.

Let the word of God dwell in you richly. Receive it, not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you. Then, "as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth: it shall not return unto Me void, but *it* shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto it sent it." "To you is the word of this salvation sent." "And now, brethren, I commend you to God and to the word of

His grace, which is able [literally, "full of power"] to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified."

A. T. JONES.

December 24, 1896

"The Word that Works" *The Present Truth* 12, 52 , pp. 822, 823.

IN the eighth chapter of Matthew it is related that a centurion came to Jesus, "beseeching Him, and saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tormented. And Jesus saith unto him, I will come and heal him. The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but *speak the word only*, and my servant shall be healed. . . . And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way: and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour."

Now what was it that the centurion expected would heal his servant? - It was "the word only," which Jesus would speak. And after the word was spoken, what did the centurion depend upon, to what did he look, for the healing power? - It was "the word only." He did not look for the Lord to do it in some ways apart from the word. No. He heard the word, "So be it done unto thee." He accepted that word as it is in truth the word of God, and expected *it*, depended upon *it*, to accomplish that which it said. And it was so. And that word is the word of God to-day as certainly as in the day that it was originally spoken. It has lost none of its power, for that word "liveth and abideth forever."

Again, in John iv. 46-52 it is related how a certain nobleman, whose son was sick at Capernaum, came to Jesus at Cana of Galilee, and "besought Him that He would come down, and heal his son; for he was at the point of death. Then said Jesus unto him, Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe. The nobleman saith unto him, Sir, come down ere my child die. Jesus saith unto him, Go thy way; thy son liveth. And the man believed the word that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way. And as he was now going down, his servants met him, and told him, saying, Thy son liveth. Then inquired he of them the hour when he began to amend. And they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him. So the father knew that it was at the same hour, in the which Jesus said unto him, Thy son liveth."

This is the power of the word of God to the man who receives it as it is in truth the word of God. This is the power that "effectually worketh also in you that believe." This is the way that the word of God accomplishes that which He pleases, in those who will receive it, and let it dwell in them. Notice that in both instances the thing was accomplished at the very time when the word was spoken. Notice also that the sick ones were not in the immediate presence of Jesus, but some distance away - the latter was at least a day's journey away from where Jesus was spoken to by the nobleman. Yet he was healed at once, when the word was spoken. And that word is living and full of power to-day, as certainly as it was that day, to every one who receives it as was done that day. It

is faith to accept that word as the word of God, and to depend upon *it* to accomplish the thing that it says. For of the centurion when he said, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed," Jesus said to them that stood around, "I have not found so *great faith*; no, not in Israel." Let Him find it now everywhere in Israel.

Jesus says to every one of us, "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." It is *through the word* that this cleansing is wrought. The Lord does not propose to cleanse you in any way apart from His word, but through the word which He has spoken. There, and there alone, are you to look for the cleansing power, receiving it as it is in truth the word of God which effectually worketh in you, and accomplishes that which He pleases. He does not propose to make you pure except by the power and indwelling of his pure words.

823

A leper said to Jesus, "Lord, if Thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." And Jesus answered him, "I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed." Are you mourning under the leprosy of sin? Have you said, or will you now say, "Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean"? The answer is now to you, "I will; be thou clean." And "immediately" *you are cleansed* as certainly as was that other leper. Believe the word, and praise the Lord for its cleansing power. Do not believe for that leper away back there; believe it for yourself here, now, immediately. For the word is to you now, "Be thou clean." Accept it as did those of old, and immediately it worketh effectually in you the good pleasure of the Father.

Let all who have named the name of Christ receive his word to-day as it is in truth the word of God, depending upon that word to do what the word says. Then as Christ loved the church, and gave Himself for it, "that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish," even so it will be now to the glory of God.
A. T. JONES.

December 31, 1896

"Living by the Word" *The Present Truth* 12, 53 , pp. 837, 838.

"MAN shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Even physically, man cannot live on what has no life in it. Dead air is death to him who breathes it. Dead water or dead food likewise. Whatever we take in the way of food or drink must have in it the element of life, or else we cannot live on it. So also in order that men may live by the word of God, in the nature of things that word has in it the element of life. Therefore this word is called "the word of life."

It being the word of God, and being imbued with life, the life that is in it is necessarily the life of God; and this is eternal life. Therefore it is truly said that the words of the Lord are "the words of eternal life." Whenever the word of God comes to any man, at that very time and in that word, eternal life comes to that

man. And when the man refuses to receive the word, he is rejecting eternal life. Jesus Himself has said it: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, *hath everlasting life.*" He "*is passed* from death unto life."

Jesus used the example of our living by bread as an illustration of our living by the word of God. This thing was not chosen at random. In all the words of the Lord, whatever was brought into them was definitely to teach an all-important lesson. Physically, we do live by bread - using the term "bread" as embracing all proper victuals. But in order that we shall live by bread, it is essential that it be *inside of us*. And in order to live by the word of God, it is just as essential that it shall be inside of us.

No one supposes that he could live by buying the very best of bread and looking at it occasionally, or by analysing it, and endeavoring to solve the mysteries of its composition and *how* it could sustain life. Yet thousands of people really seem to suppose that they can live by the word of God that way. Many people buy a Bible of eight or ten times the proper size, with a lot of notes of darkening counsels in it, lay it on the center-table, and pride themselves that they "believe the Bible;" and they really seem to think that by this in some mysterious way they will live. But it would be just as sensible and just as beneficial for them to buy a beautifully decorated loaf of several times the usual size, and lay it on the center-table, but not eat any, and then proclaim that they "believe in good living."

Men do not expect to live by bread in any such way as that: and they *cannot* live by the word of God in any such way. In order to live by bread, everybody knows it must be taken into the mouth, and be properly masticated and prepared for the digestive process, and then by swallowing be committed to the digestive process, that the life that is in it may be conveyed to all parts of the system. So with the word of God; it must be received as it is in truth the word of God; it must be given a place in the heart as the word of life; then it will be found to be indeed the word of life.

In fact, in the Bible, this very idea of living by bread *by eating it*, is carried over and applied to the word of God. Look at Eze. ii. 8 to iii. 4, 10: "But thou, son of man, hear what I say unto thee; Be not thou rebellious like that rebellious house: open thy mouth, and eat that I give thee. And when I looked, behold, an hand was sent unto me; and, lo, a roll of a book was therein; and He spread it before me; and

it was written within and without: and there was written therein lamentations, and mourning, and woe. Moreover he said unto me, Son of man, eat that thou findest; eat this roll, and go speak unto the house of Israel. So I opened my mouth, and he caused me to eat that roll. And he said unto me, Son of man, cause thy belly to eat, and fill thy bowels with this roll that I give thee. Then did I eat it; and it was in my mouth as honey for sweetness. And he said unto me, Son of man, go, get thee unto the house of Israel, and speak with My words unto them." "Moreover He said unto me, Son of man, all My words that I shall speak unto thee receive in thine heart, and hear with thine ears."

Before the prophet could speak the word of God to others, he must find it to be the word of God to himself. Before he could convey it as the word of life to others, he must know it as the word of life to himself. And in order that this should be so to him, he was commanded to eat it, swallow it, and fill himself to the innermost parts with it. He was to hear it and receive it in the heart. And this instruction is to every one who would live by the life of God. Every one who has taken upon him the name of Christ, is directed to "hold forth the word of life;" but it must be life to him in the innermost parts before he can hold it forth as the word of life to others. A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 13 (1897)

January 7, 1897

"Eating of the Word" *The Present Truth* 13, 1 , p. 6.

THIS same thought is expressed in another place: "Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and Thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart." It is worth noting that this does not say, I did eat the chapters, or, I did eat the verses, or even, I did eat the subjects. No. It says, "Thy *words* were found, and I did eat *them*" - the *words*. Here is where thousands miss the real benefit of the word of God. They try to grasp too much at once, and so really get nothing. Words are nothing to us if we do not get the real thoughts that they are intended to express. And the greater the mind of him who speaks, the deeper are the thoughts that are expressed, even in the simplest words. Now the mind of him who speaks in the Bible is infinite; and the thoughts there expressed in simple words are of eternal depths because they are the revelation of "the eternal purpose, which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

With our less than finite minds we are not capable of grasping at once the thoughts conveyed in many of the words of the Bible - we are not capable of comprehending the words of a whole chapter, or even of a whole verse at a time. One word at a time, of the words of God, is as much as our minds are capable of considering with profit. This every one must certainly admit who believes and receives it as the word of God, expressing the thoughts of his infinite mind in his eternal purpose. Certainly any one who professes to receive the words of the Bible as the word of the eternal God, expressing His thought in His eternal purpose, would have to have a good deal of conceit of his own powers of mind to think himself capable of grasping at once the thought of a number of those words.

"Be not wise in your own conceits." "Be not high-minded." Do not think it too small a thing for you to take one word of God at a time, and consider it carefully, and meditate upon it prayerfully, and receive it into your heart as the word of life to you. Do this, receive it this way, and you will find that word to be to you indeed the word of life, and the constant joy and rejoicing of your heart. Do not think this too slow a process of getting through the Bible, or through some book or chapter

of the Bible. In this way you will get through it to infinitely better advantage than to run through it without comprehending it. In this way you get every word, and every word that you get is eternal life to you. For Jesus said that man shall live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." This shows that there is life in every word, and as certainly as you receive a word of it into your mind and heart, in that word and by that word you have eternal life.

Look again at the words of Jesus: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." How do you live, physically, by bread? Is it by gulping great chunks or whole slices at a time? - You know it is not. And you know that if you should attempt to live by bread in that way, you would not live at all very long. You know that in living by bread, you do so by taking a bite at a time, and a proper bite, too. And knowing this, then did not Jesus, in using this fact as an illustration, and in the dependent expression, "every word of God," intend to teach us that one word of God at a time is the way to live by it, just as one morsel of bread at a time is the way we live by bread? Is not this same lesson also conveyed in that other scripture, "Thy words were found, and I did eat them"?

"Son of man, . . . eat that I give thee." Eat this word of God. Eat "every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Then you will live healthfully and strongly in spiritual and eternal things, just as by eating the best of food, you live healthfully and strongly physically. Eat this bread of heaven as you eat the bread of earth, and you will find it to be to you in the things of heaven just as the other is in the things of earth.

A. T. JONES.

January 21, 1897

"Living by the Word - Now" *The Present Truth* 13, 3 , p. 35.

"NOW the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."

And "now righteousness of God is made known." "Now" is it at this very moment, even while you read. At this very moment, then, the righteousness of God is manifested "unto all, and upon all them that believe." Do you believe in Jesus Christ "now," at this moment? Do you? If you say, Yes, then "now," at this very moment, the righteousness of God is made known to you and upon you. Do you believe it? The Word of God says that it is; do *you* say that it is?

The Lord wants you to say that what He says is so; that it is so "now," at this moment; and that it is so to you and in you. "A new commandment I write unto you, which thing is true in him and in you." When the Lord says a thing, it is true, even though nobody in the world ever believes it. It would be true in Him, but not in them. But He wants it to be true in you as well as in Himself. And when you

acknowledge that what He says is true to you "now," at this moment, then that thing is true in Him *and in you*.

Many people are ready to admit, in a general way, that what the Lord says is so; they will admit that it may be so to other people; but that it is so to themselves, just now, they will not say, If you do not have faith for yourself, faith of your own, you do not have faith at all, for as you are not living yesterday nor to-morrow, but just now, while it is "now," so if you do not believe "now," you do not believe at all. Therefore the word of God is that "now" is the accepted time.

Do you believe in Jesus Christ as your personal Saviour "now?" You can answer that in one moment; you know that you do. Then this moment thank the Lord that his righteousness is manifested unto you and upon you. He not only says it, but he gives you witnesses to the fact, - it is witnessed by the law and the prophets. That law which you have transgressed, that law that has shown you guilty before God, that very law "now," in view of the manifestation of the righteousness of God, witnesses that you have a just claim to this righteousness, and that you are thereby justified through the faith of Jesus Christ.

"Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." Would you rather have the righteousness of God "now" than to have your sins? You say, Yes. Very good. God has "now" set forth Christ Jesus "to declare" to you "His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past." Will you let the sins go "now," this moment; and take the righteousness which He is set forth purposely to give, and which He "now," this moment, freely gives? "Being justified freely." "Being" is present tense. "Was" is past; "shall be" is future; but "being" is present. Therefore the Lord says to you and of you who believe in Jesus, "Being [*now*, at this moment] justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, . . . through the forbearance of God."

But the Lord does not drop the subject yet. He emphasises the present power and blessing of this infinite fact. "To declare, I say, *at this time* His righteousness." First He says that it is "now" that the righteousness of God is manifested unto all and upon all them that believe; then He speaks of all such as "*being* justified freely;" and next He emphasises it all thus: "To declare, I say, *at this time* His righteousness." Oh, poor, trembling, doubting soul, is not this assurance enough that "now," at this moment, the righteousness of God is yours? that "now" you are being justified freely by his grace? "at this time," righteousness is declared to you for the remission of all your sins that are past?

Is not this enough? It is enough to satisfy the Lord; for He says, "To declare, I say, at this time, His righteousness: *that He might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.*" Then as it is all-sufficient to satisfy the Lord, is it not enough to satisfy you? Will you "now" take the fulness of this blessed "gift of righteousness," which is life, so that the Lord, by seeing the fruit of the travail of His soul, shall be satisfied again, and so, by your rejoicing, be doubly satisfied? This is all He asks of you. For "to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

Here is the word of God, the word of righteousness, the word of life, to you, "at this time." Will you be made righteous by it "now?" Will you live by it "now?" This is justification by faith. This is righteousness by faith. It is the simplest thing in the world. It is simply whether the word of God shall be true in you "now" or not. God spoke to Abraham, "Tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: . . . So shall thy seed be." And "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." "Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him; but for *us also*, to whom *it shall be imputed*, if we believe on Him that raised up our Lord Jesus from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

"Now," "at this time," it is true; it is true in Him. Now, at this time, let it be true in you.

A. T. JONES.

January 28, 1897

"The Comfort of God" *The Present Truth* 13, 4 , p. 54.

GOD desires to make manifest the knowledge of Himself "by us in every place." In order that this may be done, it is essential that we recognise Him in every place. He will not reign in our lives without our consent. It is by our consent. It is by our co-operation that all is to be done. "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land." "Willing" is the present acting of the will. "If ye be willing," is therefore to say, If the present acting of your will is that God shall be glorified that His will shall be done, and you yield yourself to His will, ye shall eat the good of the land. "Choose ye this day," each day, "while it is called to-day," "whom ye will serve." Thus it is that in order that God may make manifest the knowledge of Himself by us in every place, it is essential that we acknowledge Him in every place.

To acknowledge this is only to acknowledge the truth. It is so much the truth that it is the truth whether we acknowledge it or not. When Paul stood on Mars Hill, with a crowd of the greatest heathen before him, among whom there was not one Christian, he spoke the word of God, - that He is "not far from every one of us." Not far is near; so that He is near to every man in the world. So near is He, indeed, that He stands at the very door, He will most gladly enter and reign in the life, and make manifest the fragrance of the knowledge of himself by that man in every place.

The Lord being thus near even to the heathen, and thus near to those who continually refuse to open to Him the door of their lives, how much more is it true that He is near to those who have opened the door, and have yielded themselves to Him. To all these He says, "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." "I the Lord thy God will hold thy right hand." "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. . . . Fear ye not therefore, ye are of

more value than many sparrows." Yea, even "the very hairs of your head are all numbered."

All this shows that nothing can enter your life or mine, of the value of a sparrow, but that God is there to meet it and watch over it, and make it turn to our good and to His own glory. It shows that nothing can enter your life that is of as much importance as one of the hairs of your head, but that God is there to meet it and make it turn to your good. And thus "we know that all things work together for good to them that love God." Therefore it is written that "the God of all comfort," "comforteth us in all our tribulation." This world is a world of trial, of difficulty, of trouble. "Man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward." Such being the sort of world that this is, so long as we are in this world, we shall meet, and we are only to expect to meet, just such things as are in the world. We are not to ask to be kept *from* the trials that this world presents, but to be kept while *in* them. We are to ask for grace and discernment to find God there, that we may find His grace in every trial, His power in every difficulty, His comfort in all our tribulation.

This, too, not only that all the experiences of this world may be made to work for our own good and our own salvation, but also that by all these experiences we may be prepared the better to pass on that salvation to those who do not know it. Indeed, this latter is the very point dwelt upon in the passage which declares, "The God of all comfort," "comforteth us in all our tribulation." Here it is in full: "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort; who comforteth us in all our tribulation, *that we may be able* to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God." As the object of God's comforting us is to make us able to comfort others, it is plain enough that the purpose of our meeting the trials that this world affords, is to enable us to help other people who meet these same trials. In order for us to be a real help to others, we must understand their experiences, their trials, their troubles.

People who are of this world only, have only the experiences that this world affords. But God wants them to know a better experience than any of these. He wants them to know Him. He wants them to know Him everywhere and in all things. He wants them to know His power and His comfort, that will take all these experiences, and turn them to the salvation of those who meet them. And you and I, who profess to know Him, who have taken His name upon us, - He expects that we shall acknowledge Him in all these things, and that we shall thus find His power and His comfort turning all the bitter into sweet, turning *for* us all that seems to be against us, and thus be ourselves made able to comfort them that are in any trouble, with the comfort which we ourselves have received from God when we were in the like experiences that others meet who do not know God. Thus the Lord proposes to cause us always to triumph in Christ, and also to make manifest the knowledge of Himself by us in every place and to all people.

A. T. JONES.

February 4, 1897

"The Ministry of Comfort" *The Present Truth* 13, 5 , p. 70.

AS a sparrow cannot fall on the ground without your Father, much less can anything fall into your life without your Father. And when anything does fall into your life, it is only that you may be more able to minister to all others the knowledge of God; it is only that you may be able the better to convey to others the knowledge of the salvation of God. This also is written. Here it is: "And whether we be afflicted, it is for your consolation and salvation." Why was Paul afflicted? - It was for the consolation and salvation of other people. Why was Christ afflicted? Why was He, the majesty of heaven, made as we are, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief? - It was for the consolation and salvation of all. Why, then, are *you* afflicted? - It is for the consolation and salvation of other people. That is the truth. The Lord says it, and it is so.

Yet many, instead of looking at trials and afflictions in this way, allow Satan to deceive them into thinking that the Lord is angry with them, and is punishing them for some great sin that they are afraid they have done. And so instead of meeting, in their trial or their affliction, "the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort," they see only the black, scowling face of a god of vengeance, of their own imaginings and Satan's suggestion. And thus, instead of meeting God's purpose in being, by these experiences, made better able to comfort them that are in any trouble, and to bear consolation and salvation to other people, they only cripple themselves in them. Let it not be so any more. Let God be true, and say with Paul: "Whether we be afflicted, it is for your consolation and salvation;" "or whether we be comforted, it is for your consolation and salvation." So that whether we are in affliction or in comfort, there is to be consolation and salvation to others in it.

There are on every hand those who are in trouble, those who are afflicted, those who are sorely tried and in discouragement. They do not know God; they do not find Him and His comfort, His power, His strength, His courage. Christians are in the world to convey to these poor, troubled souls the comfort of God. Christians are here to say to them that are cast down. In God "there is lifting up;" to say to the discouraged, "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world;" "be strong and of a good courage;" to the weak, "The joy of the Lord is your strength." Christians are here to "comfort them which are in *any* trouble."

And now the Lord knows whom you will meet next week or next year. He knows now what will be the trouble of those souls when you do meet them. He wants you to be able, when you meet those souls, to comfort them with the comfort of God. But you are not prepared now to do that; for you have never had the experience that will be the experience of those souls when you meet them. Therefore, that you may be able to minister to their good when you meet them next week or next year, the Lord leads you to-day through the experience which you need in order that you may be able to comfort them when you meet them. So that what He is doing with you now by these experiences, is simply making you a better minister of his grace, a better minister of the knowledge of Himself in every place. It may be that He leads you through the dark waters that fairly go over the soul. But do not fear nor faint. Jesus went that way before you. And now He says,

"Fear thou not; for I am with thee. . . . I the Lord thy God will hold thy right hand."
"I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." I comfort thee, that thou mayest be able to comfort them which are in any trouble; that thou mayest be for consolation and salvation, in every place.

This is what the Father did with the Son in this world, that He might bring consolation and salvation to you and me. This is what Jesus did with Paul, "for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting." If "it became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings," shall we say that it does not become us? If, in order "that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God," "in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren," shall it be that we, whom He has made a royal priesthood, shall shun to partake of like experiences of our fellow men, in order that we may the better convey to them the knowledge of God? If in order that He might be "able to succour them that are tempted," it was necessary that He Himself should suffer, being tempted in all points like as we are, shall it be that we shall shun the trials and sufferings of mankind, and so shut ourselves of mankind, and so shut ourselves off from being able to succour the tempted, to comfort the afflicted, and to lift up the cast down?

No, no! "As my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost." "As He is, so are we in this world." We are here in Christ's stead, praying men "in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." Therefore let every one who has name the name of Christ say in the joy and courage of a living faith, "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort; who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God. For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ. And whether we be afflicted, it is for your consolation and salvation, which is effectual in the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer: or whether we be comforted, it is for your consolation and salvation." 2 Cor. i. 3-5.

A. T. JONES.

March 25, 1897

**"In the School of Christ. The Science of Salvation" *The Present Truth*
13, 12 , pp. 179-181.**

[Summary of an address at the recent General Conference of our Society's Workers.]

SALVATION is not simply a science; it is the chief, the key, the centre of all sciences. It is the most scientific of all things that are dealt with by the minds of men in this world. So that when God's people take the salvation of God *as it is in God*; when His cause of salvation in the world shall stand as representing indeed

His ideas of salvation, then there will be revealed to the world the science that is above all other sciences.

The word "science" means, literally, *knowledge*. The science of botany is the knowledge of botany. So that one scientist has defined science to be "the product of thinking." All the knowledge - the science - that the world has is the product of the world's thinking.

GOD'S THINKING

NOW salvation is the knowledge of God: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the living and true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." It is therefore science. But this knowledge is not the product of man's thinking: it is the product of *God's* thinking. For "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." Therefore salvation, being the product of God's thinking, is not only science, but is the highest of all sciences.

Again: That which is recognised by the world as science is the product of men's thinking. It is with the mind that men think. It is with the mind, then, that men deal with all these sciences. And salvation deals with the mind itself. And who is it that in salvation deals with the mind? - It is God Himself. Then as it is God Himself who works out, who makes known, this science; and as this science is the product of God's thinking; it follows again that the science of salvation is the highest, the deepest, the broadest science that is known, not only to the mind of man, but to the whole universe.

Let us read a few Scriptures: "Be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind." "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God." "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us a mind." "We have the mind of Christ." The only way the Lord can reach us is through the mind. He deals with us only through the mind. He governs us only through our minds. With the mind I myself serve the law of God." And the first of all the commandments is this: "Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with *all thy mind*." The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." The carnal mind that cannot be subject to the law of God - cannot be - must be changed, must be exchanged for another mind which always serves the law of God. That change of mind is salvation. That renewing of the mind is wrought by God in the work of His salvation, and it can be wrought by no other. Therefore it is the highest of all sciences - the highest that is known to the mind of man, the highest that is known to the universe.

HIGH AUTHORITY

IF I could bring to you to-night evidence that those who understand all other sciences testify that they see more in it worthy of their consideration than in all the other sciences, would you not say then that I am safe in talking as I do - from

a scientific standpoint? Well, I have just such authority, - a company that understands all other science, - and I have the evidence truly stated that they are more interested in this than in all the others put together.

In 1 Peter i. 10-12, the apostle is speaking of salvation and there I read follows: -

"Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into."

What things do the angels desire to look into? - The salvation of God when it is preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. The Greek word for "desire," here means "to set ones heart upon." And the Greek word for "look into" means, "to look carefully into, to inspect curiously - of one who would become acquainted with something." Such is the attitude of the angels toward the subject of salvation.

It is perfectly safe to say that all the angels understand all other sciences infinitely more thoroughly than any man understands, or ever understood, any one single science. But the angels are more interested in the subject of salvation than in all the other sciences. They who know the most of all others, are most interested in this one. We are in the best of company - yes, the best of scientific company; and I am not making a play on the word "science." The salvation of God is truly a scientific thing, not falsely so-called, but genuinely, supremely scientific.

WHAT THE ANGELS LEARN

BUT this is not all: not only do the angels desire to look into this, as those who would become acquainted with something; but they do learn by looking into this and studying it. Turn to Eph. iii. 8-11, and you will see this thought expressed: -

"Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ; to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the mani-

180

fold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

The angels, the principalities, and powers, earnestly desire to look into this Gospel of salvation when it is preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. And as they study the power of God in saving men they learn new

revelations of the wisdom of God - the manifold wisdom of God - according to His eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.

A STUDY FOR ETERNITY

BUT God is from eternity to eternity. Now, from eternity to eternity there was, there is, a purpose - His eternal purpose which is purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord. How long will it take the angels to get to the depth, to exhaust the study, of that eternal purpose? - To eternity. That is plain enough. Then as that purpose is revealed in the Gospel, is made known through the mystery of God, which is, "Christ in you, the hope of glory," it is plain enough that the angels are studying it. And as they look into it, they see there revealed the manifold wisdom of God, according to His eternal purpose. They desire to look into it. They do so, and thus learn.

Well, then, as they understand all other sciences more than any man understands any one, when they are more interested in this than in all the others, and learn from this; is not that a fact upon which you and I can with safety trust ourselves? Then is not this, too, a subject more worthy of our thought, our highest thinking, than all others put together? And cannot we set our hearts upon this, and give our whole soul to it without being unscientific?

I am not making an attack on other sciences. I am not saying that all other sciences should be ignored, and counted as unworthy of any attention. No; I am saying that this is greater than all of them; and that whatever we study in them must be studied in subjection to this which is greater than they. Would any man be strictly scientific to put his best and highest thinking on a science, when he had the highest possible authority that there was a higher one at his hand? Then any man who does not put his highest thinking and all his powers, upon this science first of all, and allow it to lead all other sciences, is not scientific. And he is not wise either. For this science is salvation.

A GREAT SCIENTIST

ONE man named in the Bible was thoroughly versed in universal science - all the natural sciences of this world. Here is the Scripture: -

"And God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the sea shore. And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt. For he was wiser than all men; than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol; and his fame was in all nations round about. And he spoke three thousand proverbs; and his songs were a thousand and five. And he spoke of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall; he spoke also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes." Kings iv. 29-33.

He spoke of trees from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon to the hyssop that springeth out of the wall. What is that called in science? - Botany. He understood botany better than anyone else in the world.

He spoke also of beasts. What would be the scientific word if it were put there to-day? - Zoology. Solomon understood zoology better than any man that lives in the world to-day. He taught for it says he spoke of all these things. He taught these sciences.

"And of fowl." What is that science? - Ornithology. Then Solomon taught in the sciences of botany, zoology, ornithology.

What next? "And of creeping things." What science is that? - Entomology.

"And of fishes." What science is that - Ichthyology.

People who read this passage of Scripture, do not usually think of Solomon as a universal scientist. But if it had been said that Solomon spoke of botany, zoology, ornithology, entomology, and ichthyology, they would be ready to say, What a wonderful man Solomon was!

Yet though he so thoroughly understood all these sciences, here is what he says: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter;" the sum of all that hath been said, is: "Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man: for God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing whether it be good or whether it be evil."

In his estimation, what took precedence of all sciences put together? - The salvation of God.

This science that Solomon understood and taught was not such science as that of Huxley, Darwin, and the other scientists of this age. With the natural mind man can delve into natural sciences, and make many discoveries. And though they are not all correct, yet they can discover some points that are true. But that was not Solomon's way. God gave to Solomon wisdom, so that he saw into all this by the light of God. He spoke of this by the wisdom of God. Thus the science which Solomon taught was God's science. The botany that he taught was genuine, Divine botany. The zoology that he taught was Divine zoology. It was God's views, God's truth, God's science in all these things. It was not science falsely so-called.

THE WORLD'S NEED

THAT being God's science, and it being Divine in itself, why did not the Lord give it all to us? Why did He not give to the world Solomon's treatise on botany, and on all these other subjects? - Because that is not what the world needs first of all. A man might have all that, he might understand all that, as did Solomon. Yet what good would it do him, if he did not have the science of salvation first of all? Solomon had it all; yet when he turned his heart from God, from the science of salvation, and from the study of that with all his heart, what good did his knowledge of the other sciences do him? How much power was there in it to keep him back from his natural self, and from the corruption that was in him.

When he turned his heart from the science of salvation, though he had all the others, he was just as bad, just as wicked, swallowed up as thoroughly in idolatry and every profane thing, as, though he did not know the A B C of anything.

Thus we can see why it is that the Lord did not preserve to man all there is of science. Suppose they had it all, as Solomon did, and could teach it as Solomon

taught it. With the heart not surrendered to God, with the soul not saved, what good would science do them? It could not restrain them from any kind of wickedness and corruption that is in the heart.

These safe sciences are not what the world needs to-day, first of all. The heart needs to be purified, the soul needs to be saved, the whole character rebuilt, the mind transformed into the very image and glory of God, so that the life shall reflect His righteousness, to make manifest the knowledge of God alone to all the world. Though we have all that all the sciences can give, it will profit nothing without salvation; for it will be but a little while till we shall have none of it at all. This is worth thinking about for ourselves to-day,

181

in all our studies; readings, and researches.

There are men to-day thinking on all these scientific subjects, but they do not think right. They get so far along that they find no place for God at all. And the man without God, without the guidance of the thought, the mind of God, is not able to think right on these other subjects. But the mind is not right until it is renewed in the image of Him who created it. The mind is to be transformed, renewed. We are to have another mind altogether. Every thought is to be brought into obedience, in subjection, to Christ.

That is the work of salvation. It is to restore the image of God in the soul; to bring the mind where it will be but the reflection, the outshining, of the righteousness, the thought, of the living God. When that is done, and the work of God is finished in this world, in making known the knowledge of God to all people, then the Lord will open the universe and eternity to us.

A. T. JONES.

April 29, 1897

**"The Two Sides in the Great Controversy" *The Present Truth* 13, 17 ,
p. 260.**

SELF-SACRIFICE OR SELF-DEFENCE

"SELF-PRESERVATION is the first law of nature."

But self-sacrifice is the first law of grace.

In order to self-preservation, self-defence is essential.

In order to self-sacrifice, self-surrender is essential.

In self-defense, the only thing that can be employed is force.

In self-surrender, the only thing that can be employed is love.

In self-preservation, by self-defence, through the employment of force, force meets force, and this means only war.

In self-sacrifice, by self-surrender, thru love, force is met by love, and this means only peace.

Self-preservation, then, means only war; while self-sacrifice means only peace.

But war means only death. Self-preservation, then, meaning only war, means only death; while self-sacrifice, meaning only peace, means only life.

Self-preservation being the first law of nature, nature then means only death; while self-sacrifice being the first law of grace, grace means only life.

But death only is the wages of sin; nature, then, meaning only death, it is so only because nature means sin; while life, being only the reward of righteousness; grace, meaning only life, it is so only because grace means righteousness.

Sin and righteousness, nature and grace, are directly opposite and antagonistic elements. They occupy realms absolutely distinct. Nature, self-preservation, self-defence, force, war, and death, occupy only the realm of sin; grace, self-sacrifice, self-surrender, love, peace, and life occupy only the realm of righteousness.

The realm of sin is the realm of Satan. The realm of grace is the realm of God. All the power of the domain of grace is devoted to saving men from the dominion of sin. This in order that, "as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign, thru righteousness, unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

On which side do you stand in this great controversy?

A. T. JONES.

June 24, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Catholic Church Established under Constantine" *The Present Truth* 13, 25 , pp. 385-388.

[The "falling away," predicted by the apostle Paul (2 Thess. ii.), very soon after the apostles' days resolved the great body of the professed church into warring factions. Through the second and third centuries rival bishoprics strove for the supremacy. At the opening of the fourth century the last great effort of the old Paganism to overthrow the now was made under Diocletian. The common resistance of this persecution restored a semblance of outward unity to the churches. Following Diocletian there was for eighteen years continuous discord in the Roman State. Rival emperors intrigued and fought one another to get sole control. It was in this struggle that Constantine, who was a pagan, conceived the idea of securing the support of the bishops and the church party. In return for this help he was to favour the churches. The worldly churches, bereft of the power of the Gospel, and ambitious for political power, hailed him as a Divine deliverer. By their help, and by his own ability and unscrupulous use of power, he soon his cause and became sole emperor. And, although guilty of every crime and treachery, even to the murder of his own wife and son, the bishops flattered him in life and deified him at his death, and he is set down in church history as the first Christian emperor.]

IF the mutual flattery of Constantine and the bishops had concerned only themselves, it would have been a matter of very slight importance indeed; but this was not so. Each side represented an important interest. Constantine represented the State, and the bishops the church; and their mutual flattery was only the covering of a deep-laid and far-reaching scheme which each party was determined to work to the utmost, for its own interests. "It was the aim of Constantine," says Draper, "to make theology a branch of politics; it was the hope of every bishop in the empire to make politics a branch of theology." Consequently, in their relations were involved the interests of both the Church and the State, and the welfare of human society for ages to come.

Therefore, "To the reign of Constantine the Great must be referred the commencement of those dark and dismal times which oppressed Europe for a thousand years. It is the true close of the Roman empire, the beginning of the Greek. The transition from one to the other is emphatically and abruptly marked by a new metropolis, a new religion, a new code, and, above all, a new policy. An ambitious man has attained to imperial power by personating the interests of a rapidly growing party. The unavoidable consequences were a union between the Church and the State, a diverting of the dangerous classes from civil to ecclesiastical paths, and the decay and materialisation of religion." ("Draper's Intellectual Development of Europe.")

WHAT CONSTANTINE EXPECTED

WHEN the alliance was formed between Constantine and what was represents to

386

him as Christianity, it was with the idea on his part that this religion formed a united body throughout the empire. This was true in a certain sense, because the persecution as carried on under the edicts of Diocletian, was against Christianity as a profession, without any distinction whatever as to its phases, and this caused all the different sects to stand together as one in defence of the principles that were common to all. Therefore the essential unity of all the professions of Christianity he supposed to be a fact; and from all his actions and writings afterward it is certain that representations had been made to him by the bishops in a stronger measure than was true, and in an infinitely stronger measure than he found it in practice to be. The alliance with Christianity on his part was wholly political, and merely a part of the political machinery by which he designed to bring together again the divided elements of the empire into one harmonious whole.

It had been easy enough for all the sects in which Christianity claimed at that time to be represented, to stand together against an effort of the imperial power to crush out of existence the very name, as well as the right to profess it. It was not so easy for these same denominations to stand together as one, representing the charity and unifying influence of Christianity, when imperial support, imperial influence, and imperial power, were the prizes to be gained.

THE STATE DECIDING RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES

THEREFORE, although the alliance was formed with what was supposed to be Christianity as a whole, without any respect to internal divisions, it was very soon discovered that each particular faction of the Christian profession was ambitious to be recognised as the one in which, above all others, Christianity was most certainly represented. The bishops were ready and willing to represent to Constantine that Christianity was one. They did so represent it to him. And although he entered the alliance with that understanding, the alliance had no sooner been well formed than it devolved upon him to decide among the conflicting factions and divisions just where that one was to be found.

An edict issued at Milan had ordered that the church property confiscated by the edicts of Diocletian, should be, restored to "*the whole body of Christians,*" without any distinction as to particular sects or names.

This was proper enough in itself. But Constantine and the bishops had formed an alliance for political purposes. The bishops had lent to Constantine their support, the fruit of which he was enjoying; and now they demanded that the expected return should be rendered. Accordingly, the restoration of the property of the Christians, under the Edict of Milan, had no sooner begun, than the contentions which had been raised before the late persecution, between the church of Rome and the churches of Africa, were not only made to assume new and political significance, but were made an issue upon which to secure the imperial recognition and the legal establishment of the Catholic Church. As the rule had already been established that all who did not agree with the bishops of the Catholic Church were necessarily heretics, and not Christians, it was now claimed by the Catholic Church that therefore none such could be partakers of the benefits of the edict restoring property to the Christians. The Catholic Church disputed the right of heretics to receive property or money under the Edict of Milan, by disputing their right to the title of Christians.

This forced an imperial decision upon the question as to who were Christians. The question was raised in Africa. To settle this question, Constantine issued an edict in which he declared: -

It is our will, that when thou shalt receive this epistle, if any of those things belonging to the Catholic Church of the Christians in the several cities or other places, are now possessed either by the decurious, or any others, these thou shalt cause immediately to be restored to their churches. Since we have previously determined, that whatsoever these same churches before possessed, shall be restored to their right.

By this it was made evident that the imperial favours were only for the Catholic Church. Nor was it enough that Constantine should decide that his favours were for the Catholic Church; he must next decide which was the Catholic Church. This was brought about by a division which was created in the church at Carthage, having its origin in the late persecution.

HOW RIVAL BISHOPS INTRIGUED FOR PATRONAGE

THE edict issued by Diocletian had commanded the magistrates everywhere to compel the Christians to deliver up the Scriptures. Some did so; others refused and suffered. When Constantine formed his alliance with the bishops, Mensurius was Bishop of Carthage, and some of his enemies had falsely accused him of being one of those who had delivered up the Scriptures rather than to suffer. They were supported by a certain Donatus, bishop of a city in Numidia, and they separated themselves from communion with Mensurius. When Mensurius died, as the "primacy of the African church was the object of ambition to these two parties," and as this primacy carried with it imperial patronage, there were several candidates. A certain Cecilianus was elected, however, "in spite of the cabals and intrigue of Botrus and Celesius, two chief presbyters who aspired to that dignity."

Botrus and Celesius were now joined by Donatus and his party, and these all were further joined and supported by a certain Lucilla, a woman of great qualities, wealth, and interest, and an avowed enemy to Cecilianus. This faction gathered together about seventy of the bishops of Numidia for the purpose of deposing Cecilianus as one having been illegally chosen. When they came together at Carthage, they found that the great majority of the people were in favor of Cecilianus; nevertheless they summoned him to the council. He refused to go, and it was well that he did so, because one of them had already said of him, "If he comes among us, instead of laying our hands on him by way of ordination, we ought to knock out his brains by way of penance." A council composed of men of this character, it is easy to believe, were readily susceptible to whatever influence might be brought to bear upon them to bring them to a decision. Lucilla, by the free use of money, succeeded in persuading them to declare the election of Cecilianus void, and the bishopric of Carthage vacant. They pronounced him and all who held with him separated from their communion, and proceeded to elect and ordain a certain Majorinus, who had formerly been one of Lucilla's servants, but was now a reader in the church.

Thus matters stood in the church in Africa when in March, A.D. 313, Constantine sent to the proconsul Anulinus the following edict declaring that, as it appeared that the exercise of the "legally adopted" religion afforded prosperity to the state, it was his will

that these men within the province entrusted to thee in the Catholic Church over which Cecilianus *presides*, who give their services to this holy religion, and whom they commonly call clergy, shall be held totally free and exempt from all public offices, to the end that they may not, by any error or sacrilegious deviation, be drawn away from the service due to the Divinity, but rather may devote

themselves to their proper law, without any molestation. So that, whilst they exhibit the greatest possible reverence to the Deity, it

appears the greatest good will be conferred on the State. -
(*Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History."*)

As will be seen later, this exemption was a most material benefit. And when the party of Majorinus saw themselves excluded from it, they claimed that they were the Catholic Church, and therefore really the ones who were entitled to it. Accordingly, they drew up a petition to the emperor, entitled, "The petition of the Catholic Church, containing the crimes of Cecilianus, by the party of Majorinus." This petition requested the emperor to refer to the bishops of Gaul the controversy between them and Cecilianus.

CHURCH COUNCILS CALLED

WHEN Constantine received the petition and the accompanying papers, he appointed three of the principal bishops of Gaul to meet with the Bishop of Rome to examine the matter. When the council met, there were nineteen members of it. Melchiodes, Bishop of Rome, presided in the council, and thus began to reap in imperial recognition and joint authority, the fruit of the offers which he made when in A.D. 311, he sent that letter and delegation of bishops to Constantine in Gaul, inviting him to the conquest of Rome and the deliverance of the church.

The council met in the apartments of the empress, in the Lateran Palace in Rome, Oct. 2, 313. Cecilianus appeared in person, and Donatus came as his accuser. The council decided that none of the charges were proved, pronounced Cecilianus innocent, and Donatus a slanderer. The Donatists appealed from the council to the emperor, demanding a larger council, on the plea that the bishops who composed this one were partial, prejudiced, and had acted hastily, and besides this, were too few in number properly to decide a matter of so great importance. Constantine ordered another council to be held at Arles, to be composed of "many bishops."

This council met according to appointment, August, A.D. 314, and was composed of the bishops from almost all the provinces of the western division of the empire. Sylvester, who was now bishop of Rome, was summoned to the council but declined on account of age, sending two presbyters and two deacons as his representatives. This council also declared Cecilianus innocent of the crimes laid against him by the Donatists. The council also decided that whoever should falsely accuse his brethren should be cut off from the communion of the church without hope of ever being received again, except at the point of death. It further decided that such bishops as had been ordained by the Donatists should officiate alternately with the Catholic bishops till one or the other should die.

LEGISLATING IN DISCIPLINE AND EXALTING THE ROMAN BISHOPRIC

BUT the council did not stop with the consideration of the question which it was summoned to consider. The bishops in council now took it upon themselves to legislate in matters of discipline for the world, and to bestow special preference and dignity upon the Bishop of Rome. They "ordained that Easter should be kept on the same day, and on a Sunday, by all the churches in the world" (Bower's

"History of the Popes"), and that the Bishop of Rome should announce to the churches the particular Sunday upon which it should be celebrated. Before adjourning, the council sent to the Bishop of Rome an account of their proceedings, with a copy of the decrees which they had adopted concerning the discipline of the churches, that he might publish them to all the churches.

The Donatists appealed again, not for a council, but to the emperor himself. Constantine held a consistory and heard their appeal, and in harmony with the council already held, pronounced in favor of Cecilianus and against the Donatists. Upon this the Donatists claimed that the emperor had been influenced by Hosius, one of his favourite bishops, and denied that he had any jurisdiction in the matter at all, because *it was not right for civil magistrates to have anything to do with religion!*

This claim was true enough, if they had made it at the beginning, and had refused from the first to allow their controversy to be touched upon in any way by the imperial authority. Then they would have stood upon proper ground; but when they themselves were the first to appeal to the civil authority, when they had asked the emperor to consider the matter again and again, with the hope of getting the imperial power on their side, and when they had carried to the last extreme their efforts in this direction, - when they had done all this in vain, and then turned about to protest, their protest was robbed of every shadow of force or merit.

The question as to which was the Catholic Church having now been decided, Constantine, in his next epistle, could add yet another distinguishing title.

SUCCESSIVE STEPS IN ESTABLISHING THE STATE RELIGION

AS we have seen, the Edict of Milan - March, A.D. 313 - ordered that the churches should be restored to the Christians - "the whole body of Christians" - without distinction. When the Catholic Church asserted its sole right to the designation "Christian," and backed its assertion with political reasons which were then peculiarly cogent, the imperial epistle ran - March, A.D. 313 - "to the *Catholic Church* of the Christians." When the emperor wrote to Melchiades appointing the first council under the imperial authority, his epistle ran - autumn, A.D. 313 - "the *holy Catholic Church*." When he wrote to Chrestus - summer, A.D. 314 - summoning him to the second council under imperial authority, he referred to the doctrine of the Catholic Church as embodying the "*most holy religion*." When it had been decided which was "the most holy Catholic religion," he addressed an epistle to Cecilianus - A.D. 316 - announcing imperial favours to "the *legitimate* and most holy Catholic religion," and empowering Cecilianus to assist the imperial officers in preventing any diversion from the most holy Catholic Church.

RESULT OF IMPERIAL PATRONAGE, IN CHURCH AND STATE

When the Donatists rejected the decision of the emperor himself, and denied his right to say anything in the controversy in which they had invited him and over

again to participate, as announced in the above letter to Cecilianus he carried against them - A.D. 316 - the interference which they had solicited, to the full extent to which it would undoubtedly have been carried against the Catholics if the Donatists had secured the decision in their favor. The Donatist bishops were driven out, and Constantine ordered that all their churches be delivered to the Catholic party.

As this was done in the interest, and by the direct counsel, of the Catholic party, through Hosius, the emperor's chief counselor, the imperial authority thus became wholly partisan, and to both parties was given a dignity which was far, far beyond any merit that was in the question at

388

issue. To the Catholic party it gave the dignity of an imperial alliance and the assurance of imperial favor. To the Donatist party it elevated to a dignity and clothed with an importance which placed it before the world as worthy of imperial antagonism. Into the Catholic party it infused more than ever the pride of place, power, and imperial favor. To the Donatist party it gave the dignity and fame of a persecuted people, and increased the evil which it attempted to destroy.

More than this, when the governmental authority, which should be for the protection of all alike from violence, became itself a party to the controversy, it forsook the place of impartial protector, and assumed that of a partisan. This deepened the sense of injury felt by the defeated party, and magnified the triumph of the victor; and the antagonism was only the more embittered. "The implacable faction darkened into a sanguinary feud. For the first time, human blood was shed in conflicts between followers of the Prince of Peace." (Milman's "History of Christianity.")

And the government, by becoming a partisan, had lost the power to keep the peace.

By becoming a party to *religious controversy* it had lost the power to prevent *civil violence* between religious factions. "Each party recriminated on the other, but neither denies the barbarous scenes of massacre and license which devastated the African cities. The Donatists boasted of their martyrs, and the cruelties of the Catholic party rest on their own admission; they deny not, they proudly vindicate, their barbarities: 'Is the vengeance of God to be defrauded of its victims?' and they appealed to the Old Testament to justify, by the examples of Moses, of Phineas, and of Elijah, the Christian duty of slaying by thousands the renegades and unbelievers." (Milman.) This, though a shameful perversion of Scripture, was but the practical working out of the theocratical theory of government, which was the basis of the whole system of the union of church and State which had been created by Constantine and the bishops.

Constantine issued an edict commanding peace, but it was all in vain. The tumult went on, constantly increasing in violence, until the only alternative was for the imperial authority either to enter upon the horrors of a protracted war with its own subjects, or openly refuse to go any further. The latter step was taken. In A.D. 321, upon the advice of the civil officers of Africa, Constantine "repealed the laws against the Donatists, and gave the African people full liberty to follow either of the contending parties, as they liked best." (Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical

History.")
A. T. JONES.

July 1, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. Character of the Church under Imperial Patronage" *The Present Truth* 13, 26 , pp. 404-406.

THE Donatist controversy, that strife for supremacy between church factions, each claiming to be the Catholic Church, touched no point of doctrine, but of discipline only, and was confined to the provinces of Africa. The result in this case, however, ought to have convinced Constantine that the best thing for the imperial authority to do was to return, and strictly adhere, to the principles announced in his Edict of Milan, namely to let religious questions and controversies entirely alone, and allow each individual "that privilege of choosing and professing his own religion." Yet, even if this thought had occurred to him, it would have been impossible for him to do so and attain the object of his ambition.

The principles of the Edict of Milan had no place in the compact entered into between Constantine and the bishops. As yet he possessed only half the empire; for Licinius still held the East, and Constantine's position was not yet so secure that he dared risk any break with the bishops. He had bargained to them his influence in religious things for theirs in politics. The contract had been entered into, he had sold himself to the church influence, and he could not go back even if he would. The empire was before him, but without the support of the church party it could not be his.

FRUITS OF CLERICAL PRIVILEGE

IT is necessary now to notice the material point in that edict issued in A.D. 313 (a portion of which was quoted last week), exempting from all public offices the clergy of the Catholic Church. As a benefit to society and that "the greatest good might be conferred on the State," the clergy of the Catholic Church were to "be held totally free and exempt from all public offices."

At this time the burdens and expenses of the principal offices of the State were so great that this exemption was of the greatest material benefit. The immediate effect of the edict, therefore, was to erect the clerical order into a distinct and privileged class. For instance, in the days of the systematic governing of the empire, the decurionate was the chief office of the State. "The decurions formed the Senates of the towns; they supplied the magistrates from their body, and had the right of electing them. Under the new financial system introduced by Diocletian, the decurions were made responsible for the full amount of taxation imposed by the cataster, or assessment on the town and district." (Milman's "History of Christianity.")

As the splendour and magnificence of the court display was increased, and as the imperial power became more absolute, the taxation became more and more burdensome. To such an extent indeed was this carried that tenants, and indeed proprietors of moderate means, were well-nigh bankrupted. Yet the imperial power demanded of the decurions the full amount of the taxes that were levied in their town or district. "The office itself grew into disrepute, and the law was obliged to force that upon the reluctant citizen of wealth or character which had before been an object of eager emulation and competition." (Milman.)

The exemption of the clerical order from all public offices opened the way for all who would escape these burdens, to become, by whatever means possible, members of that order. The effect was, therefore, to bring into the ministry of the church a crowd of men who had no other purpose in view than to be relieved from the burdensome duties that were laid upon the public by the imperial extravagance of Constantine. So promptly did this consequence follow from this edict, and "such numbers of persons, in order to secure this exemption, rushed into the clerical order," that "this manifest abuse demanded an immediate modification of the law." It was therefore ordered that "none were to be admitted into the sacred order except on the vacancy of a religious charge, and then those only whose poverty exempted them from the municipal functions." (Milman.)

Nor was this all. The order of the clergy itself found that it was required to pay for this exemption a tribute which it had not at all contemplated in the original bargain. Those already belonging to the clerical order who were sufficiently wealthy to exercise the office of decurion, were commanded to "abandon their religious profession" (Milman), in order that they might fill the office which had been deserted because of the exemption which had been granted to their particular order. This of course was counted by the clergy as a great hardship. But as they had willingly consented at the first to the interference of the authority of the State when it was exercised seemingly to their profit, they had thereby forfeited their right to protest against that same interference when it was exercised actually to the denial of their natural rights. Yet the resources of dishonest intrigue were still left to them, - especially the plea that their possessions belonged not to themselves but to the church, - and this subterfuge was employed to such an extent as virtually to defeat the purpose of this later law. Thus the evil consequences of the original law still flowed on, and "numbers, without any inward call to the spiritual office, and without any fitness for it whatever, now got themselves ordained as ecclesiastics, for the sake of enjoying this exemption, whereby many of the worst class came to the administration of the most sacred calling." (Neander's Church History.)

THE STATE MAKES IT EASY TO BE A "CHRISTIAN.

ANOTHER scheme adopted by Constantine was fraught with more evil in the same direction. As he had favoured the new religion only on account of its value to him as a political factor, he counted it to his advantage to have as many as possi-

ble to profess that religion. He therefore used all the means that could be employed by the State to effect this purpose. He made the principal positions about his palace and court a gift and reward to the professors of the new imperial religion; and "the hopes of wealth and honors, the example of an emperor, his exhortations, his irresistible smiles, diffused conviction among the venal and obsequious crowds which usually fill the apartments of a palace. . . . As the lower ranks of society are governed by imitation, the conversion of those who possessed any eminence of birth, of power, or of riches, was soon followed by dependent multitudes. The salvation of the common people was purchased at an easy rate, if it be true that in one year twelve thousand men were baptized at Rome, besides a proportionable number of women and children, and that a white garment, with twenty pieces of gold, had been promised by the emperor to every convert." (Gibbon's "Decline and Fall.")

It will be observed that in this statement Gibbon inserts the cautious clause, "if it be true," but such a precaution was scarcely necessary; because the whole history of the times bears witness that such was the system followed, whether this particular instance was a fact or not. This is proved by the next instance which we shall mention of Constantine's efforts in gaining converts to the new religion. He wrote letters offering rewards both political and financial to those cities which, as such, would forsake the heathen religion, and destroy or allow to be destroyed their heathen temples. "The cities which signalled a forward zeal by the voluntary destruction of their temples, were distinguished by municipal privileges, and rewarded with popular donatives." (Gibbon.)

In cities that would accept this offer, he would build churches at the public expense, and send there "a complete body of the clergy and a bishop" *when "there were as yet no Christians in the place."* Also upon such churches he bestowed "large sums for the support of the poor; so that the conversion of the heathen might be promoted by doing good to their bodies." (Neander.) And that this was simply the manifestation of his constant policy, is shown by the fact that at the Council of Nice, in giving instruction to the bishops as to how they should conduct themselves, he said: -

"In all ways unbelievers must be saved. It is not every one who will be converted by learning and reasoning. Some join us from desire of maintenance, some for preferment, some for presents; nothing is so rare as a real lover of truth. We must be like physicians, and accommodate our medicines to the diseases, our teaching to the different minds of all."

He further enacted "that money should be given in every city to orphans and widows, and to those who were consecrated to the divine service; and he fixed the amount of their annual allowance [of provisions] more according to the impulse of his own generosity, than to the exigencies of their condition." (Theodoret.) In view of these things it is evident that there is nothing at all extravagant in the statement that in a single year twelve thousand men, besides women and children, were baptized in Rome.

In addition to all this, he exempted all church property from taxation, which exemption, in the course of time, the church asserted as of divine right; and the

example there set is followed to this day, even among people who profess a separation of Church and State.

RESULT: THE CHURCH A MASS OF PAGANS

THE only result which could possibly come from such proceedings as these, was, *first*, that the great mass of the people, of the pagans, in the empire, with no change either of character or convictions, were drawn into the Catholic Church. Thus the State and the church became one and the same thing; and that one thing was simply the embodiment of the *second* result; namely, a solid mass of hypocrisy. "The vast numbers who, from external considerations, without any inward call, joined themselves to the Christian communities, served to introduce into the church all the corruptions of the heathen world. Pagan vices, pagan delusions, pagan superstition, took the garb and name of Christianity, and were thus enabled to exert a more corrupting influence of the Christian life. Such were those who, without any real interest whatever in the concerns of religion, living half in paganism and half in an outward show of Christianity, composed the crowds that thronged the churches on the festivals of the Christians, and the theatres on the festivals of the pagans. Such were those who accounted themselves Christians if they but attended church once or twice in a year; while, without a thought of any higher life, they abandoned themselves to every species of worldly pursuit and pleasure." (Neander.)

It could not be otherwise. The course pursued by Constantine in conformity with the political intrigues of the bishops, drew into the Catholic Church every hypocrite in the Roman Empire. And this for the simple reason that it could draw no other kind; because no man of principle, even though he were an outright pagan, would allow himself to be won by any such means. It was only to spread throughout all the empire the ambiguous mixture of paganism and apostate Christianity which we have seen so thoroughly exemplified in the life of Constantine himself, who was further inspired and flattered by the ambitious bishops.

There were some honest pagans who refused all the imperial bribes and kept aloof from the wicked system thereby established. There were some genuine Christians who not only kept aloof from the foul mass, but protested against every step that was taken in creating it. But speaking generally, the whole population of the empire was included in the system thus established. "By taking in the whole population of the Roman Empire, the church became, indeed, a church of the masses, a church of the people, but at the same time more or less a church of the world. Christianity became a matter of fashion. The number of hypocrites and formal professors rapidly increased; strict discipline, zeal, self-sacrifice, and brotherly love proportionally ebbed away; and many heathen customs and usages, under altered names, crept into the worship of God and the life of the Christian people. The Roman State had grown up under the influence of idolatry, and was not to be magically transformed at a stroke. With the secularising process, therefore, a paganising tendency went hand in hand." (Schaff's "History of the Christian Church.")

ALL POWER TO WITNESS FOR CHRISTIANITY LOST

THE effect of all this was further detrimental to true Christianity in that it argued that Christianity consists in the mere profession of the *name*, pertaining not to the essential character, nor implying any material change in the general conduct. Consequently those who had been by this means brought into the church acted worse, and really were worse, than those who remained aloof. When the bishops or clergy of the church undertook to exhort the heathen to become Christians, the pagans pointed to the hypocritical professors who were already members of the

406

church, and to the invitation replied: "We lead good lives already; what need have we of Christ? We commit no murder, theft, nor robbery; we covet no man's possessions; we are guilty of no breach of the matrimonial bond. Let something worthy of censure be found in our lives, and whoever can point it out may make us Christians.' Comparing himself with nominal Christians: 'Why would you persuade me to become a Christian? I have been defrauded by a Christian, I never defrauded any man; a Christian has broken his oath to me, I never broke my word to any man.'" (Neander.)

Not only was the church thus rendered powerless to influence those who were without, she was likewise powerless to influence for any good those who were within. When the vast majority in the church were unconverted, and had joined the church from worldly and selfish motives, living only lives of conscious hypocrisy, it was impossible that church discipline should be enforced by church authority.

The next step taken by the bishopric, therefore, was to secure edicts under which they could enforce church discipline. This, too, not only upon the members of the church, but likewise upon those who were not members. The church having, out of lust for worldly power and influence, forsaken the power of God, the civil power was the only resource that remained to her. Conscious of her loss of moral power, she seized upon the civil. The account of this further wickedness will be given in the next paper.

A. T. JONES.

July 8, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Church Uses Civil Power to Enforce Dogmas" *The Present Truth* 13, 27 , pp. 420-422.

THE church was fully conscious of her loss of the power of God before she sought the power of the State. Had she not been, she never would have made any overtures to the imperial authority, nor have received with favour any advances from it. There is a power that belongs with the Gospel of Christ, and is inseparable from the truth of the Gospel; that is, the power of God. In fact, the

Gospel is but the manifestation of that power; for the Gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. i. 16.

As long, therefore, as any order or organisation of people professing the Gospel of Christ maintains in sincerity the principle of that Gospel, so long the power of God will be with them, and they will have no need of any other power to make their influence felt for good wherever known. But just as soon as any person or association professing the Gospel loses the spirit of it, so soon the power is gone also. Then and only then, does such an organisation seek for another kind of power to supply the place of that which is lost.

Thus was it with the church at this time. She had fallen, deplorably fallen, from the *purity* and the *truth*, and therefore from the *power*, of the Gospel. And having lost the power of God and of godliness, she greedily grasped for the power of the State and of ungodliness. And to secure laws by which she might enforce her discipline and dogmas upon those whom she had lost the power either to convince or to persuade, was the definite purpose which the bishopric had in view when it struck that bargain with Constantine, and lent him the influence of the church in his imperial aspirations.

Jesus Christ had declared, "My kingdom is not of this world," but the bishops had conceived the idea of establishing the kingdom of the Lord on earth by alliance with the State. Thus they would have a government of God, or a theocracy. And now that they had secured the alliance of Church and State, they persuaded themselves that the kingdom of God was come. But they did not suppose for a moment that the Lord Himself would come and conduct the affairs of this kingdom in person. They themselves were to be the representatives of God upon the earth, and the theocracy thus established was to be ruled by the Lord through them.

The falsity of this theory of the bishops of the fourth century has been clearly seen by but one of the church historians, that is, Neander. And this, as well as the scheme which the bishops had in mind, has been better described by him than by all the others put together. The design of the bishops with respect to the civil power is seen in the following statement: -

"There had in fact arisen in the church . . . a false theocratical theory, . . . originating not in the essence of the Gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments, which . . . brought along with it an unchristian opposition of the spiritual to the secular power, and which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal State, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way."

That which they had in mind when they joined their interests to Constantine's, was to use the power which through him they would thus secure, to carry into effect in the State and by governmental authority their theocratical project. The State was not only to be subordinate to the church, but was to be *the servant* of the church to assist in bringing all the world into the

new kingdom of God. The bishops were the channel through which the will of God was to be made known to the State. Therefore the views of the bishops

were to be to the government the expression of the will of God, and whatever laws the bishopric might deem necessary to make the principles of their theocracy effective, it was their purpose to secure. Says Neander: -

"This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and . . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims."

MAKING PEOPLE RELIGIOUS

AS we saw in last week's paper, the church had become filled with a mass of people who had no respect for religious exercises, and now it became necessary to use the power of the State to assist in preserving respect for church discipline. As the church-members had not religion enough to lead them to do what they professed was their duty to do, the services of the State had to be enlisted to assist them in doing what they professed to believe it was right to do. In other words, as only worldly and selfish interests had been appealed to in bringing them to membership in the church, and as they therefore had no conscience in the matter, the services of the State were employed as aids to conscience, or rather to supply the lack of conscience.

Accordingly, one of the first, if not the very first, of the laws secured by the bishops in behalf of the church, was enacted, as it is supposed, about A.D. 314, ordering that on Friday and on Sunday "there should be a suspension of business at the courts and in other civil offices, so that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion." (Neander.)

To justify this, the specious plea was presented that when the courts and public offices were open and regularly conducted by the State on these church days, the members were hindered from attending to their religious exercises. It was further argued that if the State kept its offices open, and conducted the public business on those days, as the church-members could not conduct the public business and attend to church services both, they could not well hold public offices; and that, therefore, the State was in fact discriminating against the church, and was hindering rather than helping the progress of the kingdom of God.

This was simply to confess that their Christianity was altogether earthly, sensual, and selfish. It was to confess that there was not enough virtue in their profession of religion to pay them for professing it; and they must needs have the State pay them for professing it. This was in fact in harmony with the whole system of which they were a part. They had been paid by the State in the first place to become professors of the new religion, and it was but consistent for them to ask the State to continue to pay them for the continued profession of it. This was consistent with the system there established; but it was totally inconsistent with every idea of true religion. Any religion that is not of sufficient value in itself to pay men for professing it, is not worth professing, much less is it worth supporting by the State. In genuine Christianity there is a virtue and a

value which make it of more worth to him who professes it than all that the whole world can afford - yea, of more worth than life itself.

CONSTANTINE'S SUNDAY EDICT

THIS, however, was but the beginning. The State had become an instrument in the hands of the church, and she was determined to use it for all it was worth.

One of the first aims of the apostate church was the exaltation of Sunday as the chief sacred day. And no sooner had the Catholic Church made herself sure of the recognition and support of the State, than she secured from the emperor an edict setting apart Sunday especially to the purposes of devotion. As the sun was the chief deity of the pagans, and as the forms of sun-worship had been so fully adopted by the apostate church, it was an easy task to secure from the sun-loving and church-courting Constantine, a law establishing the observance of the day of the sun as a holy day. Accordingly, March 7, A.D. 321, Constantine issued his famous Sunday edict, which reads as follows: -

"Constantine, Emperor Augustus, to Helpidius: On the venerable day of the sun let the magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in agriculture may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain-sowing or for vine-planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations, the bounty of heaven should be lost. (Given the 7th day of March, Crispus and Constantine being consuls each of them for the second time.)

The title which is given to the day by Constantine in the edict, is *venerabili die solis* - venerable day of the Sunday. This was the pagan religious title of the day, and to every heathen was suggestive of the religious character which attached to the day as the one especially devoted to the sun and its worship.

It was by virtue of his office and authority as Pontifex Maximus, or supreme pontiff of the Roman religion, and not as emperor, that the day was set apart to this use; because it was the sole prerogative of the Pontifex Maximus to appoint holy days. As Duruy says in his "History of Rome:" -

A law of the year 321 ordered tribunals, shops, and workshops to be closed on the day of the sun, and he [Constantine] sent to the legions to be recited upon that day, a form of prayer which could have been employed by a worshipper of Mithra, of Serapis, or of Apollo, quite as well as by a Christian believer. This was the official sanction of the old custom of addressing a prayer to the rising sun. In determining what days should be regarded as holy, and in the composition of a prayer for national use, Constantine exercised one of the rights belonging to him as Pontifex Maximus; and it caused no surprise that he should do this.

The Council of Nice a few years later, in A.D. 325, gave another impetus to the Sunday movement. It decided that the Roman custom of celebrating Easter

on Sunday only should be followed through-out the whole empire. The council issued a letter to the churches, in which is the following passage on this subject: -

The question having been considered relative to the most holy day of Easter, it was determined by common consent that it would be proper that all should celebrate it on one and the same day everywhere. . . . And in the first place it seemed very unsuitable in the celebration of this sacred feast, that we should follow the custom of the Jews; a people who having imbrued their hands in a most heinous outrage, and thus polluted their souls, are deservedly blind. . . . Let us then have nothing in common with that most hostile people the Jews.

But to sum up matters briefly, it was determined by common consent that the most holy festival of Easter should be solemnised on one and the same day; for in such a hallowed solemnity any difference is unseemly, and it is more commendable to adopt that opinion in which there will be no intermixture of strange error, or deviation from what is right. These things therefore being time ordered, do you gladly receive this heavenly and truly Divine command: for whatever is done in the sacred assemblies of the bishops is referable to the Divine will.

This throws much light upon the next move that was made, as these things were

422

made the basis of further action by the church, as we shall see in further papers.

At every step in the course of the apostasy, at every step taken in adopting the forms of sun-worship, and against the adoption and the observance of Sunday itself, there had been constant protest by all real Christians. Those who remained faithful to Christ and to the truth of the pure word of God, observed the Sabbath of the Lord according to the commandment, and according to the word of God, which sets forth the Sabbath as the sign by which the Lord, the Creator of the heavens and the earth, is distinguished from all other gods. These accordingly protested against every phase and form of sun-worship. Others compromised, especially in the East, by observing both Sabbath and Sunday. But in the West, under Roman influences and under the leadership of the church and the bishopric of Rome, Sunday alone was adopted and observed. A. T. JONES.

July 15, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. Laying the Foundations of the Inquisition" *The Present Truth* 13, 28 , pp. 436-438.

LAST week we saw how quickly the enactment of Sunday laws followed the union of the churches with the imperial power. The Sunday was made the means of asserting the power of the clergy over the lives of the people, and over the Word of God.

EARLY PROTESTANTS

AGAINST this Church and State intrigue throughout, there had been also as against every other step in the course of the apostasy, earnest protest by all real Christians. But when it came to the point where the church would enforce by the power of the State the observance of Sunday, this protest became stronger than ever.

And additional strength was given to the protest at this point by the fact that it was urged in the words of the very arguments which the Catholic Church had used when she was antagonised, rather than courted, by the imperial authority, the argument that God alone is sovereign of the conscience, and that religion, being a matter of the heart and conscience cannot of right be within the realm of the civil ruler.

This, with the strength of the argument upon the merit of the question as to the day which should be observed, greatly weakened the force of the Sunday law. But when, in addition to these considerations, the exemption was so broad, and when those who observed the Sabbath positively refused to obey the Sunday law, its effect was virtually nullified.

In order, therefore, to the accomplishment of her original purpose, it now became necessary for the church to secure legislation extinguishing all exemption, and prohibiting the observance of the Sabbath so as to quench that powerful protest. And now, coupled with the necessity of the situation, the "truly divine command" of Constantine and the Council of Nice that "nothing" should be held "in common with the Jews," was made the basis and the authority for legislation utterly to crush out the observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, and to establish the observance of Sunday only in its stead.

SABBATH-KEEPING ANATHEMATISED

ACCORDINGLY, the Council of Laodicea enacted the following canon: -

CANON 29. Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday, but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honor, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ. ²¹

The report of the proceedings of the Council of Laodicea is not dated. A variety of dates has been suggested, of which A.D. 364 seems to have been the most favored. Hefele allows that it may have been as late as 380. But whatever the date, before A.D. 380, in the political condition of the empire, this could not be made effective by imperial law. In A.D. 364 Valens and Valentinian became emperors, the former of the East, and the latter of the West. For six years Valens was indifferent to all parties; but in A.D.

437

370 he became a zealous Arian, and so far as in him lay, established the Arian doctrine throughout his dominion.

Valentinian, though a Catholic, kept himself aloof from all the differences or controversies among church parties. This continued till 375, when Valentinian died, and was succeeded by his two sons, one aged sixteen, the other four, years. In 378 the reign of Valens ended, and Theodosius, a Spanish soldier, was appointed emperor of the East. In 380 he was baptized into the Catholic Church, and immediately an edict was issued in the name of the three emperors, commanding all subjects of the empire, of whatever party or name, to adopt the faith of the Catholic Church, and assume the name of "Catholic Christians."

As now "the State itself recognized the church as such, and endeavoured to uphold her in the prosecution of her principles and the attainment of her ends" (Neander); and as Theodosius had already ordered that all his subjects "should steadfastly adhere to the religion which was taught by St. Peter to the Romans, which faithful tradition" had preserved, and which was then "professed by the pontiff Damasus" of Rome; and that they should all "assume the title of Catholic Christians;" it was easy to bring the imperial power to the support of the decrees of the church, and make the Laodicean Canon effective.

THE SUNDAY LAW MADE GENERAL

NOW was given the opportunity for which the church had waited so long, and she made use of it. At the earliest possible moment she secured the desired law; for, says the historian Neander: -

"By a law of the year 386, those older changes effected by the emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced; and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered, in fact, as guilty of sacrilege."

As the direct result of this law, there soon appeared an evil which, under the circumstances and in the logic of the case, called for further legislation in the same direction. The law forbade all work. But as the people had not such religion as would cause them to devote the day to pious and moral exercises, the effect of the law was only to enforce idleness. Enforced idleness only multiplied opportunity for dissipation. The natural consequence was that the circuses and the theatres throughout the empire were crowded every Sunday.

But the object of the Sunday law, from the first one that was issued, was that the day might be used for the purposes of devotion, and that the people might go to church. But they had not sufficient religion to lead them to church when there was opportunity for amusement. Therefore, as given by Neander, the record is: -

Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hindrance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart."

Assuredly! An open circus or theatre will always prove a great hindrance to the devotion of those Christians whose Christianity is the least an affair of the life and of the heart. In other words, an open circus or theater will always be a great hindrance to the devotion of those who have not religion enough to keep them from going to it, but who only want to use the profession of religion to maintain their popularity, and to promote their selfish interests.

On the other hand, to the devotion of those whose Christianity is really an affair of the life and of the heart, an open circus or theatre will never be a particle of hindrance, whether open at church time or all the time. With the people there, however, if the circus and theatre were open at the same time as the church, the church-members, as well as others, not being able to go to both places at once, would go to the circus or the theatres instead of to the church.

TRYING TO LEGISLATE PEOPLE INTO CHURCH

BUT this was not what the bishops wanted. This was not that for which all work had been forbidden. All work had been forbidden in order that the people might go to church; but instead of that, they crowded to the circus and the theatre, and *the audiences of the bishops were rather slim*. This was not at all satisfying to their pride; and they took care to let it be known. Neander says: -

Church teachers . . . were, in truth, often forced to complain that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church."

And the church was now in a condition in which she could not bear competition. She must have a monopoly. Therefore, the next step to be taken, the logical one, too, was to have the circuses and theaters closed on Sundays and other special church days, so that the churches and the theatres should not be open at the same time.

There was another feature of the case which gave the bishops the opportunity to make their new demands appear plausible, by urging in another form the selfish and sophistical plea upon which they had asked for the first edict respecting church days. In the circuses and the theatres large numbers of men were employed, among whom many were church-members. But, rather than give up their places, the church-members would work on Sunday. The bishops complained that these were "compelled to work," and were "prohibited to worship;" they pronounced it "persecution," and demanded more Sunday laws for "protection."

"PROTECTING" THE DAY

As a consequence, therefore, and in the logic of the situation, at a council held at Carthage in June, A.D. 401, the following canon was enacted: -

CANON 5. On Sundays and feast-days, no plays may be performed.

That this canon might be made effective, the bishops in the same council passed a resolution, and sent up a petition to the emperor Honorius, praying -

That the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday and from feast-days, to some other days of the week.

The reason given in support of the petition was not only, as above, that those who worked in government offices and employments at such times, were persecuted, but that -

The people congregate more to the circus than to the church.

The church-members had not enough religion or love of right to do what they professed to believe was right; therefore the State was asked to take away from them all opportunity to do wrong; then they would all be Christians! The devil himself could be made that kind of Christian in that way - and he would be the devil still!

The petition of the Council of Carthage could not be granted at once, but in 425 the desired law was secured; and to this also there was attached the reason that was given for the first Sunday law that ever was made; namely, -

In order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance.

It must constantly be borne in mind, however, that the only way in which "the devotion of the faithful" was "disturbed"

438

by these things was that when the circus or theater was open at the same time that the church was open, the "faithful" would go to the circus or the theater instead of to church, and therefore their "devotion" was "disturbed." And of course the only way in which the "devotion" of such "faithful" ones could be freed from all disturbance, was to close the circuses and the theaters at church time.

THE LOGIC OF RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION

IN the logic of this theory, there was one more step to be taken. To see how logically it came about, let us glance at the steps taken from the first one up to this point.

First, the church had all work on Sunday forbidden, in order that the people might attend to things divine; work was forbidden, that the people might worship. But the people would not worship; they went to the circus and the theater instead of to church.

Then the church had laws enacted closing the circuses and the theaters, in order that the people might attend church. But even then the people would not be devoted, nor attend church; for they had no real religion.

The next step to be taken, therefore, in the logic of the situation, was to compel them to be devoted - to compel them to attend to things divine. This was the next step logically to be taken, and it was taken.

The theocratical bishops were equal to the occasion. They were ready with a theory that exactly met the demands of the case; and one of the greatest of the Catholic Church Fathers and Catholic saints was the father of this Catholic saintly theory. Augustine wrote: -

It is, indeed, better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment or by pain. But because the

former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. . . . Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain the highest grade of religious development.

Of this theory, the author who of all the church historians has best exposed the evil workings of this false theocracy, justly observes: -

It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism of intolerance and persecution which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition.

The history of the Inquisition is only the history of this infamous theory of Augustine's. But this theory is only the logical sequence of the theory upon which the whole series of Sunday laws was founded.

In closing his history of this particular subject, the same author says: -

In this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends.

This statement is correct. Constantine did many things to favor the bishops. He gave them money and political preference. He made their decisions in disputed cases final, as the decision of Jesus Christ. But in nothing that he did for them did he give them *power over those who did not belong to the church*, to compel them to act as though they did, except in the one thing of the Sunday law.

HOW THE CHURCH SECURED CONTROL

IN the Sunday law, power was given to the church to compel those who did not belong to the church, and who were not subject to the jurisdiction of the church, to obey the commands of the church. In the Sunday law there was given to the church control of the civil power, so that by it she could compel those who did not belong to the church to act as though they did. The history of Constantine's time may be searched through and through, and it will be found that in nothing did he give to the church any such power, except in this one thing - the Sunday law. Neander's statement is literally correct, that it was "in this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

That this may be set before the reader in as clear a light as possible, we shall here summarise the facts stated by Neander in their direct bearing. He says of the carrying into effect of the theocratical theory of the apostate bishops that they made themselves dependent upon Constantine by their disputes, and "by their determination to use the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims." Then he mentions the first and second Sunday laws of Constantine, the Sunday law of A.D. 386, the Carthaginian council, resolution, and petition, of 401; and the law of 425 in response to this petition; and then, without a break, and with direct reference to these Sunday laws, he says: "*In this way* the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

She started out with the determination to do it; she did it; and "*in this way*" she did it. And when she had secured control of the power of the State, she used it for the furtherance of her own aims, and that in her own despotic way, as

announced in the inquisitorial theory of Augustine. The first step logically led to the last. And the theocratical leaders in the movement had the cruel courage to follow the first step unto the last, as framed in the words of Augustine and illustrated in the horrors of the Inquisition during the fearful record of the dreary ages in which the bishopric of Rome was supreme over kings and nations.

The lesson in all this for this time is plain. Again, in Protestant lands, there is a disposition among religious leaders to secure control of the State in the interests of religion. They say they want to bring the kingdom of heaven upon earth. The Sunday is the rallying point in the crusade, and the churches are calling for stricter Sunday laws. They are going over the same path, and the logic of their false theory must lead them to the same end.

A. T. JONES.

July 22, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Great Trinitarian Controversy" *The Present Truth* 13, 29 , pp. 453-455.

THE Donatist dispute had developed the decision, and established the fact, that it was "the Catholic Church of the Christians" in which was embodied the "Christianity" which was to be recognized as the imperial religion. Constantine had allied himself with the church only for political advantage. The only use he had for the church was in a political way. Its value for this purpose lay entirely in its unity. If the church should be all broken up and divided into separate bodies, its value as a political factor would be gone.

The Catholic Church, on her part, had long asserted the necessity of unity with the bishopric, a unity in which the bishopric should be possessed of authority to prohibit, as well as power to prevent, heresy. The church had supported and aided Constantine in the overthrow of Maxentius and the conquest of Rome. She again supported, and materially aided, him in the overthrow of Licinius and the complete conquest of the whole empire. She had received a rich reward for her assistance in the first political move; and she now, in the second and final one.

The Catholic Church demanded assistance in her ambitious aim to make her power and authority absolute over all; and for Constantine's purposes it was essential that the church should be a unit. These two considerations combined to produce results, both immediate and remote, that proved a curse to the time then present and to ages to follow. The immediate result was that Constantine had no sooner compassed the destruction of Licinius in A.D. 323, than he issued an edict against the Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, Cataphrygians, and "all who devised and supported heresies by means of private assemblies," denouncing them and their heresies, and commanding them all to enter the Catholic Church.

The edict runs as follows: -

Let those of you, therefore, who are desirous of embracing the true and pure religion, take far better course of entering the Catholic Church, and uniting with it in holy fellowship, whereby you will be enabled to arrive at the knowledge of the truth. In any case the delusions of your perverted understandings must entirely cease to mingle with, and mar the felicity of, our present times. . . . And in order that this remedy may be applied with effectual power, we have commanded (as before said) that you be positively deprived of every gathering point for your superstitious meetings; I mean all the houses of prayer (if such be worthy of the name) which belong to heretics, and that these be made over without delay to the Catholic Church; that any other places be confiscated to the public service, and no facility whatever be left for any future gathering, in order that from this day forward none of your unlawful assemblies may presume to appear in any public or private place. Let this edict be made public.

Some of the penal regulations of this edict "were copied from the edicts of Diocletian; and this method of conversion was applauded by the same bishops who had felt the hand of oppression, and had pleaded for the rights of humanity."

The Donatist dispute had resulted in the establishment of the Catholic Church. Yet that dispute involved no question of doctrine, but of discipline only. Just at this time, however, there sprang into prominence the famous Trinitarian controversy, which involved, and under the circumstances demanded, an imperial decision as to what was the Catholic Church in point of *doctrine* - what was the Catholic Church in deed and in truth, and which plunged the empire into a sea of tumult and violence that continued as long as the empire itself

454

continued, and afflicted other nations after the empire had perished.

WARNING ABOUT HUMAN DEFINITIONS

A CERTAIN Alexander was bishop of Alexandria. Arius was a presbyter in charge of a parish church in the same city. Alexander attempted to explain "the unity of the Holy Trinity." Arius dissented from the views set forth by Alexander. A sort of synod of the presbyters of the city was called, and the question was discussed. Both sides claimed the victory, and the controversy spread. Then Alexander convened a council of a hundred bishops, by the majority of which the views of Alexander were endorsed. Upon this, Arius was commanded to abandon his own opinions, and adopt Alexander's. Arius refused; and Alexander excommunicated him and all who held with him in opinion, of whom there were a considerable number of bishops and other clergy, and many of the people.

The partisans of Arius wrote to many bishops a statement of their views, with a request that if those views were considered correct, they would use their influence to have Alexander receive them to communion again, but that if they thought the views to be wrong in any particular, they would signify it, and show them what were the correct opinions on the question. Arius for himself wrote a

book entitled "Thalia," - Song of Joy, - a collection of songs in which he set forth his views. This expedient took well, for in the excited state of the parties, his doctrinal songs were hummed everywhere. Alexander on his part, likewise, sent circular letters to the principal bishops round about. The controversy spread everywhere, and as it spread, it deepened.

One of the chief reasons for the rapid and wide-spread interest in the controversy was that nobody could comprehend or understand the question at issue. "It was the excess of dogmatism founded on the most abstract words in the most abstract region of human thought." (Stanley's "Eastern Church"). There was no dispute about the fact of there being a Trinity, it was about the nature of the Trinity. Both parties believed in precisely the same Trinity; but they differed upon the precise relationship which the Son bears to the Father.

With the exception of a single point, the two views were identical, only being stated in different ways. Alexander held that the Son was begotten of the *very essence* of the Father, and is therefore of the *same* substance with the Father; while Arius held that the Son was begotten by the Father, not from His own essence, but from nothing; but that when He was thus begotten, He was, and is, of precisely the *like substance* with the Father.

Whether the Son of God, therefore, is of the same substance, or only of like substance, with the Father, was the question in dispute. The controversy was carried on in Greek, and as expressed in Greek the whole question turned upon a single letter. The word which expressed Alexander's belief, is *Homoousion*. The word which expressed the belief of Arius, is *Homoiousion*. One of the words has two "I's" in it, and the other has but one; but why the word should not have that additional "i," neither party could ever exactly determine. Even Athanasius himself, who succeeded Alexander in the bishopric of Alexandria, and transcended him in every other quality, "has candidly confessed that whenever he forced his understanding to meditate upon the divinity of the Logos, his toilsome and unavailing efforts recoiled on themselves; that the more he thought, the less he comprehended; and the more he wrote, the less capable was he of expressing his thoughts." (Gibbon.)

TRYING TO PUT GOD INTO A FORMULA

IT could not possibly be otherwise, because it was an attempt of the finite to measure, to analyse, and even to dissect, the Infinite. It was an attempt to make the human superior to the Divine. God is infinite. No finite mind can comprehend Him as He actually is. Christ is the Word - the expression of the thought - of God; and none but He knows the depth of the meaning of that Word. "He had a name written, that *no man knew but He himself*; . . . and His name is called the Word of God." Rev. xix. 12, 13.

Neither the nature, nor the relationship, of the Father and Son can ever be measured by the mind of man. "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." This revelation of the Father by the Son can not be complete in this

world. It will require the eternal ages for man to understand "the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness toward us through Christ Jesus." Eph. ii. 7.

Therefore, no man's conception of God can ever be fixed as the true conception of God. God will still be infinitely beyond the broadest comprehension that the mind of man can measure. The true conception of God can be attained only through "the Spirit of revelation in the knowledge of Him." Eph. i. 17. Therefore the only thing for men to do to find out the Almighty to perfection, is, by true faith in Jesus Christ, to receive the abiding presence of this "Spirit of revelation," and then quietly and joyfully wait for the eternal ages to reveal "the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God."

An ecclesiastical historian who lived near the time, and was well acquainted with the whole matter, Socrates, has well remarked that the discussion

seemed not unlike a contest in the dark; for neither party appeared to understand distinctly the grounds on which they calumniated one another. . . . In consequence of these misunderstandings, each of them wrote volumes, as if contending against adversaries; and although it was admitted on both sides that the Son of God has a distinct person and existence, and all acknowledged that there is one God in a Trinity of persons, yet, from what cause I am unable to divine, they could not agree among themselves, and therefore were never at peace.

That which puzzled Socrates need not puzzle us. Although he could not divine why they should not agree when they believed the same thing, we may very readily do so, with no fear of mistake. The difficulty was that each disputant required that all the others should not only believe what he believed, but they should believe this precisely as he believed it, whereas just how he believed it, he himself could not define. And that which made them so determined in this respect was that the strife was not merely for a doctrinal statement, but for supremacy and for political power.

STRIFE INCREASES AND A COUNCIL IS CALLED

The controversy spread farther and farther, and raged more fiercely as it spread. "All classes took part in it, and almost all took part with equal energy. . . . So violent were the discussions that they were parodied in the pagan theatres; and the emperor's statues were broken in the public squares in the conflicts that took place. . . . Sailors, millers, and travellers sang the disputed doctrines at their occupations or on their journeys. Every corner, every alley of the city [this was said afterward of Constantinople, but must have been still more true of Alexandria], was full of these discussions - the streets, the market-places, the drapers, the money-changers, the victuallers. Ask a man 'how many *oboli*?' he answers by dogmatising on generated

455

and ungenerated being. Inquire the price of bread, and you are told, 'The Son is subordinate to the Father.' Ask if the bath is ready, and you are told, 'The Son arose out of nothing.'" (Stanley.)

Constantine's golden dream of a united Christendom was again grievously disturbed. The bow of *promise* - of the bishops - which had so brilliantly irradiated all the political prospect when his alliance was formed with the church party, was rudely dissipated by the dark cloud of ecclesiastical ambition, and the angry storm of sectarian strife. He wrote a letter to Alexander and Arius, stating to them his mission of uniting the world under one head, and his anxious desire that there should be unity among all, and exhorted them to lay aside their contentions, forgive one another, use their efforts for the restoration of peace, and so give back to him his quiet days and tranquil nights.

This letter he sent by the hand of Hosius, whom he made his ambassador to reconcile the disputants. But both the letter and the mission of Hosius were in vain; and yet the more so by the very fact that the parties were now assured that the controversy had attracted the interested attention of the imperial authority. As imperial favour, imperial patronage, and imperial power were the chief objects of the contest, and as this effort of the emperor showed that the reward was almost within the grasp of whichever party might prove successful, the contention was deepened rather than abated.

It had already been decided that the imperial favor and patronage were for the Catholic Church. Each of these parties claimed to be the orthodox and only Catholic Church. The case of the Donatists had been referred to a council of bishops for adjudication. It was but natural that this question should be treated in the same way. But whereas the case of the Donatists affected only a very small portion of the empire, this question directly involved the whole East, and greatly concerned much of the West. More than this, the Catholic religion was now the religion of the empire. This dispute was upon the question as to what is the truth of the Catholic religion. Therefore if the question was to be settled, it must be settled for the whole empire. These considerations demanded a general council. Therefore a general council was called, A.D. 325, which met at the city of Nice, the latter part of May or the first part of June, in that year.

A. T. JONES.

July 29, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Council of Nice" *The Present Truth* 13, 30 , pp. 469-471.

THE number of bishops that composed the council was three hundred and eighteen, while the number of "the presbyters and deacons in their train, and the crowd of acolytes and other attendants, was altogether beyond computation" (Eusebius), all of whom travelled, and were entertained to and from the council and while there, at the public expense. "They came as fast as they could run," says Stanley; ³ 1 "in almost a frenzy of excitement and enthusiasm; the actual crowd must have been enough to have metamorphosed the place." And "shrill above all other voices, vehement above all other disputants, 'brandishing their arguments like spears against those who sat under the same

roof and ate off the same tables as themselves,' were the combatants from Alexandria."

The emperor did not arrive at Nice for several days after the others had reached that place; but when he came, "he had no sooner taken up his quarters in the palace of Nicea, than he found showered in upon him a number of parchment rolls, or letters, containing complaints and petitions against each other from the larger part of the assembled bishops. . . . We are expressly told both Eusebius and Sozomen that one motive which had drawn many to the council was the hope of settling their own private concerns, and promoting their own private interests. . . . There, too, were the pent-up grudges and quarrels of years, which now for the first time had an opportunity of making themselves heard. Never before had these remote, often obscure, ministers of a persecuted sect come within the range of imperial power. . . . Still after all due allowance, it is impossible not to share in the emperor's astonishment that this should have been the first act of the first Ecumenical Assembly of the Christian Church."⁴²

OPENING OF THE COUNCIL

THE council met in a large hall in the palace of the emperor, which had been arranged for the purpose. In the centre of the room, on a kind of throne, was placed a copy of the gospels; at one end of the hall was placed a richly carved throne, which was to be occupied by Constantine. The day came for the formal opening of the assembly. The bishops were all assembled with their accompanying presbyters and deacons; but as it was an imperial council, it could not be opened but by the emperor himself; and they waited in silence for him to come.

"He entered. His towering stature, his strong-built frame, his broad shoulders, his handsome features, were worthy of his grand position. There was a brightness in his look and mingled expression of fierceness and gentleness in his lion-like eye, which well became one who, as Augustus before him, had fancied, and perhaps still fancied, himself to be the favourite of the sun-god Apollo. The bishops were further struck by the dazzling, perhaps barbaric magnificence of his dress. Always careful of his appearance, he was so on this occasion in an eminent degree. His long hair, false or real, was crowned with the imperial diadem of pearls. His purple or scarlet robe blazed with precious stones and gold embroidery. He was shod, no doubt, in the scarlet shoes then confined to emperors, now perpetuated in the pope and cardinals."

He paraded thus up the whole length of the hall to where the seat of wrought gold had been set for him; then he turned, facing the assembly, and pretended to be so abashed by the presence of so much holiness, that he would not take his seat until the bishops had signaled to him to do so; then he sat down, and the others followed suit. Then Eusebius arose and delivered an oration in honor of the emperor, closing with a hymn of thanksgiving to God for Constantine's final

victory over Licinius. Constantine then delivered to the assembly an address exhorting them to remove all grounds of difference.

Thus the council was formally opened, and then the emperor signified to the judges of the assembly to go on with the proceedings. "From this moment the flood-gates of debate were opened wide; and from side to side recriminations and accusations were bandied to and fro, without regard to the imperial presence. He remained unmoved amid the clatter of angry voices, turning from one side of the hall to the other, giving his whole attention to the questions proposed, bringing together the violent partisans."

To end their personal spites, and turn their whole attention to the question which was to come properly before the assembly, he took from the folds of his mantle the whole bundle of their complaints and recriminations against one another. Then, after stating that he had not read one of them, he ordered a brazier to be brought in, and at once burned them in the presence of the whole assembly, declaring that the bishops sat as gods, and should neglect these common matters.

And as the libels vanished into ashes, he urged them, "Never to let the faults of men in their consecrated offices be publicly known to the scandal and temptation of the multitude." "Nay," he added, doubtless spreading out the folds of his

470

imperial mantle as he spoke, "even though I were with mine own eyes to see a bishop in the act of gross sin, I would throw my purple robe over him, that no one might suffer from the sight of such a crime."

THE FRAMING OF THE CREED

THEN the great question that had caused the calling of the council was taken up. There were three parties in the council - those who sided with Alexander, those who sided with Arius, and those who were non-committal. The party of Alexander and Athanasius (Alexander's chief advocate) soon discovered that they could depend upon the majority of the council.

The draft of a creed was brought in, signed by eighteen bishops of the party of Arius; but it was not suffered to exist long enough for anybody ever to obtain a copy. Their opponents broke into a wild uproar, tore the document to pieces, and expelled Arius from the assembly.

Next, Eusebius of Cesarea, - Constantine's panegyrist - thought to bring the parties together by presenting a creed that had been largely in use before this dispute ever arose. He stated that this confession of faith was one which he had learned in his childhood, from the bishop of Cesarea, and one which he accepted at his baptism, and which he had taught through his whole career, both as a presbyter and as a bishop. As an additional argument, and one which he intended to be of great weight in the council, he declared that "it had been approved by the emperor, the beloved of heaven, who had already seen it."

As soon as this was read in the council, the party of Arius all signified their willingness to subscribe to it. But this did not suit the party of Alexander and Athanasius; it was rather the very thing that they did not want, for "they were determined to find some form of words which no Arian could receive." They hunted about, therefore, for some point or some word, upon which they could reject it. It will be noticed that this creed says nothing about the substance of the Son of God, while that was the very question which had brought the council together. Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, was chief of the Arians who held seats in the council. At this point a letter was brought forth, which he had formerly written, in which he had stated that "to assert the Son to be uncreated, would be to say that He was 'of one substance' - *Homoousion* - with the Father, and to say that 'He was of one substance' was a proposition evidently absurd."

"The letter produced a violent excitement. There was the very test of which they were in search; the letter was torn in pieces to mark their indignation, and the phrase which he had pledged himself to reject, became the phrase which they pledged themselves to adopt."

THE EMPEROR SUPPORTS THE MOST POWERFUL

AS Constantine had approved the creed already read by Eusebius, the question of the party of Alexander now was whether he would approve it with the addition of this word; and the hopes of both parties now hung trembling upon the emperor. Hosius and his associates, having the last consultation with him, brought him over to their side. At the next meeting of the assembly, he again presented the creed of Eusebius, approved it, and called upon all to adopt it. Seeing, however, that the majority would not accept the creed of Eusebius as it was, Constantine decided to "gain the assent of *the orthodox*, that is, *the most powerful*, part of the assembly," by inserting the disputed word.

The party of Alexander and Athanasius, now assured of the authority of the emperor, required the addition of other phrases to the same purpose, so that when the creed was finally written out in full, it read as follows: -

We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things both visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is to say, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things in earth; who for us man, and for our salvation, came down, and was made flesh, and was made men, suffered, and rose again on the third day went up into the heavens, and is to come again to judge the quick and dead.

And in the Holy Ghost.

But those that say, "There was when He was not," and "Before He was begotten, He was not," and that "He came into existence from what was not," or who profess that the Son of God is of a

different "person" or "substance," or that He is created, or changeable, or variable, are anathematized by the Catholic Church.

Thus came the original Nicene Creed. Constantine's influence carried with it many in the council, but seventeen bishops refused to subscribe to the creed. The emperor then commanded all to sign it under penalty of banishment. This brought to terms all of them but five, and further imperial persuasion and explanation and threats reduced the number to two. These absolutely refused from first to last to sign the creed, and they were banished. As for Arius, he seems to have departed from Nice soon after he was expelled from the council. Sentence of banishment was pronounced against him with the others. But as he was the chief expositor of the condemned doctrines, Constantine published against him an edict commanding the destruction of all his books on pain of death. The decree banishing Arius was shortly so modified as simply to prohibit his returning to Alexandria.

When the council finally closed its labours, Constantine gave, in honour of the bishops, the grand banquet before mentioned, in which it was pretended that the kingdom of God was come, and at which he loaded them with presents. He then exhorted them to unity and forbearance, and dismissed them to return to their respective places.

It was intended that the decision of this council, in the creed adopted, should put an end forever to all religious differences. "It is certain that the Creed of Nicea was meant to be an end of theological controversy." Constantine published it as the inspiration of God.

"From this period," says Milman, "we may date the introduction of rigorous articles of belief, which required the submissive assent of the mind to every word and letter of an established creed, and which raised the slightest heresy of opinion into a more fatal offence against God, and a more odious crime in the estimation of man, than the worst moral delinquency or the most flagrant deviation from the spirit of Christianity."

MAJORITIES CANNOT DECIDE THE TRUTH

IN the unanimity of opinion attained by the council, however, the idea of inspiration from any source other than Constantine, is a myth, and even that was a vanishing quantity; because a considerable number of those who subscribed to the creed did so against their honest convictions, and with the settled determination to secure a revision or a reversal just as soon as it could possibly be brought about; and to bring it about they would devote every waking moment of their lives.

Yet more than this, this theory proceeds upon the assumption that religious truth and doctrine are subject to the decision of the majority, than which nothing could possibly be further from the truth. Even though the decision of the Council of Nicea had been absolutely, and from honest conviction spontaneously, unanimous, it never could rest with the slightest degree of obligation or authority upon any soul who had not arrived at the same conclusion from honest

conviction derived from the free exercise of his own power of thought. There is no organisation nor tribunal on earth that has any right to decide for any-

471

body what is the truth upon any religious question. "The head of every man is Christ." 1 Cor. xi. 3. "One is your Master, even Christ." Matt. xxiii. 8. "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Rom. xiv. 4, 12.

In the quest for truth every man is free to search, to believe, and to decide, for himself alone. And his assent to any form of belief or doctrine, to be true, must spring from his own personal conviction that such is the truth. "The truth itself," Neander well says, "forced on man otherwise than by its own inward power, becomes falsehood." And he who suffers anything to be so forced upon him, utters a lie against himself and against God.

The realm of thought is the realm of God. Whosoever would attempt to restrict or coerce the free exercise of the thought of another, usurps the dominion of God, and exercises that of the devil. This is what Constantine did at the Council of Nice. This is what the majority of the Council of Nice itself did. In carrying out the purpose for which it was met, this is the only thing that it could do, no matter which side of the controversy should prove victorious. What Constantine and the Council of Nice did, was to open the way and set the wicked precedent for that despotism over thought which continued for more than fourteen hundred dreary years, and which was carried to such horrible lengths when the pope succeeded to the place of Constantine as head over both Church and State.

To say that the Holy Spirit had any part whatever in the council, either in discussing or deciding the question, or in any other way, is but to argue that the Holy Spirit of God is but the subject and tool of the unholy passions of ambitious and wicked men.

A. T. JONES.

August 5, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Warring of the Creeds" *The Present Truth* 13, 31 , pp. 484-486.

HOW AN "INFALLIBLE" COUNCIL'S CREED WAS REVERSED

AS before remarked, those who against their will had subscribed to the creed of the Council of Nice, were determined to redeem themselves as soon as possible, and by whatever means it could be accomplished. *And they did accomplish it.* The story is curious, and the lessons which it teaches are valuable.

Shortly after the dismissal of the Council of Nice, Alexander died, and Athanasius succeeded to the episcopal seat of Alexandria. He, much more than Alexander, had been the life and soul of the controversy with Arius. And now when, at the age of thirty years, he became clothed with the power and the prerogatives of the archbishopric of Alexandria, the controversy received a new

impulse from both sides. The Arians at once began to apply themselves diligently to win over Constantine to their side, or at least to turn him against Athanasius.

In A.D. 327 died Constantine's sister, Constantia. She had held with the Arian party, having an Arian presbyter as her spiritual adviser. In response to her dying Constantine recalled Arius from banishment, and about the same time restored to favour the other two leading Arians, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Ptolemais, the two who had refused to sign the creed made at Nice. "They returned in triumph to their dioceses, and ejected the bishops who had been appointed to their place." (Milman's "History of Christianity.")

In A.D. 328 Constantine made a journey to Jerusalem to dedicate the church that he had built there, and Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis both accompanied him. The Bishop of Antioch was a Catholic. In their journey, Eusebius and Theognis passed through Antioch, and set on foot a scheme to displace him; and when they returned, a council was hastily called, and upon charges of immorality and heresy,

Eustathius was deposed, and banished by the imperial edict, to Thrace. . . . The city was divided into two fierce and hostile factions. They were on the verge of a civil war; and Antioch, where the Christians had first formed themselves into a Christian community, but for the vigorous interference of civil power and the timely appearance of an imperial commissioner, might have witnessed the first blood shed, at least in the East, in a Christian quarrel. (Milman.)

Next the Arian prelates tried to induce Athanasius to admit Arius against to membership in the church, but he steadily refused. Then they secured from the emperor a command that Athanasius should receive Arius and all his friends who wished to be received, to the fellowship of the church of Alexandria, declaring that unless he did so, he should be deposed and exiled. Athanasius refused; and Constantine neither deposed him nor exiled him. Then the Arians invented against him many charges, even to the intent of murder, but he cleared himself, until at last, when he came to Constantinople and appealed to the Emperor for trial, all previous charges were abandoned, and he was accused of threatening to force Constantine to support him, by stopping the supplies of grain from the port of Alexandria. Whether Constantine really believed this charge or not, it accomplished its purpose. Athanasius was again condemned, and banished to Treves, in Gaul, February, A.D. 336.

The return of Arius to Alexandria was the cause of continued tumult, and he was called to Constantinople. At the request of the emperor, Arius presented a new

485

confession of faith, which proved satisfactory, and Constantine commanded the bishop of Constantinople to receive Arius to the fellowship of the church on a day of public worship - "it happened to be a Sabbath (Saturday) - on which day, as well as Sunday, public worship was held at Constantinople." (Neander.) The bishop absolutely refused to admit him. The Arians, under the authority of the emperor, threatened that the next day, Sunday, they would force their way into

the church, and compel the admission of Arius to full membership in good and regular standing. Upon this the Athanasian party took refuge in "prayer;" the bishop prayed earnestly that, rather than the church should be so disgraced, Arius might die; and naturally enough, Arius died on the evening of the same day.

In Constantinople, where men were familiar with Asiatic crimes, there was more than a suspicion of poison. But when Alexander's party proclaimed that his prayer had been answered, they forgot what then that prayer must have been, and that the difference is little between praying for the death of a man and compassing it. (Draper's "Intellectual Development of Europe.")

Petition after petition was presented to Constantine for the return of Athanasius to his place in Alexandria; but the emperor steadily denounced him as proud, turbulent, obstinate, and intractable, and refused all petitions. In 337, in the presence of death, Constantine was baptized by an Arian bishop; and thus closed the life of him upon whom a grateful church has bestowed the title of "the Great," though, "tested by character, indeed, he stands among the lowest of all those to whom the epithet has in ancient or modern times been applied." ("Encyclopedia Britannica.")

AFTER CONSTANTINE

CONSTANTINE was succeeded by his three sons, who apportioned the empire among themselves. Constantine II had Constantinople and some portions of the West, with pre-eminence of rank; Constantius obtained Thrace, Egypt, and all the East; and Constans held the greater part of the West. Constantius was a zealous Arian, Constantine and Constans were no less zealous Catholics. The religious parties now had another element added to their strifes - they could use the religious differences of the emperors in their own interests. Athanasius being an exile at Treves, was in the dominions of Constans, his "fiery defender;" while the place of his bishopric was in the dominions of Constantius, his fiery antagonist. The Athanasian party, through Constantine II, succeeded in persuading Constantius to allow the return of Athanasius and all the other bishops who had been banished.

The return of these bishops again set all the East ablaze. The leaders of the Arian party addressed letters to the emperors, denouncing Athanasius. They held another council at Tyre, A.D. 340, in which they brought against him new charges, and condemned him upon them all. Immediately afterward a rival council was held at Alexandria, which acquitted Athanasius of all things in which the other council had condemned him. In this same year Constantine II was killed in a war with his brother Constans. This left the empire and the religion to the two brothers - Constantius in Constantinople and the East, Constans in the West.

RELIGIOUS WARS AND RIOTS

IN the dominions of Constans all Arians were heretics; in the dominions of Constantius all Catholics were heretics. The religious war continued, and

increased in violence. In A.D. 341 another council, consisting of ninety bishops, was held at Antioch, in the presence of the emperor Constantius. Athanasius was condemned; and they appointed in his place a bishop of their own party, named Gregory.

With an escort of five thousand heavy-armed soldiers, Gregory proceeded to Alexandria to take possession of his bishopric. It was evening when he arrived at the church at which Athanasius officiated, and the people were engaged in the evening service. The troops were posted in order of battle about the church; but Athanasius slipped out, and escaped to Rome, and Gregory was duly and officially installed in his place. The Athanasians, enraged at such proceedings, set the church afire; "scenes of savage conflict ensued, the churches were taken, as it were, by storm," and "every atrocity was perpetrated by unbridled multitudes, embittered by every shade of religious faction." (Milman.)

Similar scenes were soon after enacted in Constantinople, A.D. 342. In 338 occurred the death of Alexander, the bishop of Constantinople, who had prayed Arius to death. The Arians favoured Macedonius, the Athanasians favored Paul, for the vacant bishopric. Paul succeeded. This was while Constantius was absent from the city; and as soon as he returned, he removed Paul, and made Eusebius of Nicomedia Bishop of Constantinople. Eusebius died in 342. The candidacy of Paul and Macedonius was at once revived. "The dispute spread from the church into the streets, from the clergy to the populace; blood was shed; the whole city was in arms on one part or the other." (Milman.)

The Emperor ordered Hermogenes, commander of the cavalry, to go with his troops and expel Paul. In the attempt to do so, Hermogenes was met by such a desperate attack, that his soldiers were scattered, and he was forced to take refuge in a house. The house was immediately set on fire. Hermogenes was seized and dragged by the feet through the streets of the city till he was torn to pieces, and then his mangled body was cast into the sea. As soon as this news reached Constantius, he went to Constantinople and expelled Paul, without confirming the election of Macedonius, and returned to Antioch.

Paul went to Rome and the Bishop of Rome, glad of the opportunity to exert the authority thus recognised in him, declared Paul reinstated. Paul returned to Constantinople and resumed his place. As soon as Constantius learned of it, he commanded Philip, the praetorian prefect, to drive out Paul again, and establish Macedonius in his place. The prefect, bearing in mind the fate of Hermogenes, got Paul away by strategy, and then, surrounded by a strong body of guards with drawn swords, with Macedonius at his side in full pontifical dress, started from the palace to the church to perform the ceremony of consecration. By this time the rumour had spread throughout the city, and in a wild tumult both parties rushed to the church. "The soldiers were obliged to hew their way through the dense and resisting crowd to the altar," and over the dead bodies of three thousand one hundred and fifty people, "Macedonius passed to the episcopal throne of Constantinople." (Milman.)

MORE WARRING COUNCILS

When Athanasius reached Rome, after having fled from Alexandria, the Bishop of Rome espoused his cause, and two councils were held in his favour. Then a general council was called to meet at Sardica, but there was a split before it was opened, and the bishops of the West, favouring Athanasius and the Creed of Nice met at Sardica, while the bishops of the East, favouring Arianism, met at Philippopolis, and, as Dean Milman says,

In these two cities sat the rival councils, each asserting itself the genuine representative of Christendom, issuing decrees, and anathematising their adversaries. (Milman.)

The council in the West, at Sardica, having it all their own way, enacted canons bestowing special dignity upon the Bishop of Rome, giving him power to judge in

486

episcopal causes. The effect of this was only to multiply and intensify differences and disputes among bishops, and infinitely to magnify the power of the bishop of Rome.

Athanasius, though fully supported by the council, preferred to remain under the protection of Constans, rather than risk the displeasure of Constantius by returning to Alexandria. He remained two years in the West, during which time he was often the guest of the emperor Constans, and made such use of these opportunities that in A.D. 349 Constans "signified, by a concise and peremptory epistle to his brother Constantius, that unless he consented to the immediate restoration of Athanasius, he himself, with a fleet and army, would seat the archbishop on the throne of Alexandria." (Gibbon.) Constantius was just at this time threatened with war with Persia, and fearing the result if war should be made upon him at the same time by his brother, and Athanasius returned in triumph.

THE CIVIL POWER AGAIN DECIDES ORTHODOXY

In February, A.D. 350, Constans was murdered by the usurper Magnentius; and in 353 Constantius became sole emperor by the final defeat and death of the usurper. Constantius no sooner felt himself assured of the sole imperial authority, than he determined to execute vengeance upon Athanasius, and make the Arian doctrine the religion of the whole empire. Yet he proposed to accomplish this only in orthodox fashion, through a general council. As it was thus that his father had established the Athanasian doctrine, which was held by all the Catholics to be strictly orthodox, to establish the Arian doctrine by a like process, assuredly could be no less orthodox.

Liberius, who became bishop of Rome May 22, A.D. 352, had already petitioned Constantius for a general council. Constantius summoned the council to meet at Arles, A.D. 353. Liberius was not present in person, but he sent as his representatives. It was found that the Arian bishops were in the majority; and they insisted first of all upon the condemnation of Athanasius. The Catholic bishops argued the question of the faith ought to be discussed before they should be required to condemn him; but the Arians insisted upon their point.

Constantius came to the support of the Arians with an edict sentencing to banishment all who would not sign the condemnation of Athanasius. Finding that there was no escape, the representatives of Liberius, and all the other Athanasian bishops but one, signed the document. Liberius refused to confirm the action of his representatives, and utterly rejected the action of the council, and called for another. Constantius granted his request, and appointed a council to meet at Milan, in the beginning of the year 355. This council was but a repetition on a larger scale, of that at Arles. Constantius insisted, without any qualification, that the bishops should sign the condemnation of Athanasius. He took a personal interest in all the proceedings. Like his father at the Council of Nice, he had the meetings of the council held in the imperial palace, and presided over them himself.

Constantius not only demanded that the Catholic bishops should sign the condemnation of Athanasius, but that they should also sign an Arian formula of faith. They pleaded that the accusers of Athanasius were unreliable. Constantius replied, "I myself am now the accuser of Athanasius, and on my word, Valens and the others [the accusers] must be believed." They argued that this was against the canon of the church. Constantius replied, "My will is the canon," and appealed to the Eastern bishops, who all assented that this was correct. He then declared that whoever did not sign might expect banishment. At this the orthodox bishops lifted up their hands beseechingly toward heaven, and prayed the emperor

to fear God, who had given him the dominion, that it might not be taken from him; also to fear the day of judgment, and *not to confound the secular power with the law of the church*, nor to introduce into the church the Arian heresy. (Hefele's "History of the Councils.")

They forgot that they themselves, many of them at least, had approved in Constantine at the Council of Nice the identical course which now they condemned in Constantius at the Council of Milan. In their approval of the action of Constantine in forcing upon others what they themselves believed, they robbed themselves of the right to protest when Constantius or anybody else should choose to force upon them what somebody else believed. They ought not to have thought it strange that they should reap what they had sown.

Constantius, yet further to imitate his father, claimed to have had a vision, and that thus by direct inspiration from heaven, he was commissioned "to restore peace to the afflicted church." At last, by the "inspiration" of "flatteries, persuasions, bribes, menaces, penalties, exiles" (Milman), the Council of Milan was brought to a greater unanimity of faith than even the Council of Nice had been. For there, out of the three hundred and eighteen bishops, five were banished; while here, out of a greater number, only five were banished. Surely if a general council is of any authority, the Council of Milan must take precedence of the Council of Nice, and Arianism be more orthodox than Athanasianism.

A. T. JONES.

August 12, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. Arianism Triumphant" *The Present Truth* 13, 32 , pp. 500-503.

**HOW CATHOLICS SUFFERED FROM THE SWORD THEY HAD INVOKED
AGAINST ARIAN HERESY**

LAST week we saw how the Council of Milan established Arianism, as the Council of Nice had condemned it, and with even greater unanimity. And now, after the five dissenting bishops had been banished, it was determined that all the Western bishops not present at the council should be made to accept the orthodoxy established by council and law.

Liberius, Bishop of Rome, rejected the decisions of the council, and still defended Athanasius. Constantius sent one of his chief ministers with presents to bribe, and a letter to threaten, him. Liberius rejected the bribes and disregarded the threats; and in return cursed all Arian heretics, and excommunicated Constantius. Next he was brought to Milan by force.

Constantius told him that he must either sign or go into exile, and that he would give him three days to decide. Liberius answered that he had already decided, and that he should not change his mind in three days nor in three months; therefore, the emperor might as well send him that minute to whatever place he wanted him to go. Nevertheless, Constantius gave him the three days, but before they were past, sent for him again, hoping to persuade him to yield. Liberius stood fast, and the emperor pronounced sentence of banishment, and sent him to Berea, in Thrace. Before Liberius was gone out of the palace, the emperor sent him a present of five hundred pieces of gold, as he said, to pay his expenses. Liberius sent it back, saying he had better keep it to pay his soldiers.

ARIANISM IN POWER PERSECUTES

As soon as it was known in Rome that Liberius was banished, the people assembled, and bound themselves by an oath not to acknowledge any other bishop as long as Liberius lived. The Arian party, however, were determined to have a bishop in Rome. They selected a deacon of that church, Felix by name, who was willing to be bishop of Rome. The clergy would not receive him, and the people collected in mutinous crowds, and refused to allow the Arians to enter any of the churches. The imperial palace in Rome was chosen as the place of ordination. Three of the emperor's eunuchs were appointed to represent the people, and they duly elected

501

Felix. Three bishops of the court were appointed to represent the clergy, and they ordained the new bishop. "The intrusion of Felix," says Bower, "created a great sedition, in which many lost their lives."

Another bishop, whose endorsement of the creed of Milan was scarcely less important than that of Liberius himself, was Hosius of Cordova, who had been

one of the chief factors in forming the union of Church and State. He was one of the bishops who visited Constantine in Gaul in A.D. 311, to invite him to the conquest of Rome, and was one of Constantine's chief advisers afterward in all his course, until after the Council of Nice. He was summoned to Milan, but steadfastly refused to sign and was allowed to return. Later he was banished. Imprisonment followed; he was cruelly beaten, and finally put to the rack and most inhumanly tortured. Under these fearful torments, the aged bishop yielded, A.D. 356.

"The case of Hosius deserves," says Bower, "without all doubt, to be greatly pitied; but it would be still more worthy of our pity and compassion had he been himself an enemy to all persecution. But it must be observed that he was the author and promoter of the first Christian persecution; for it was he who first stirred up Constantine against the Donatists, many of whom were sent into exile, and some even sentenced to death; nay, and led to the place of execution." The surrender of Hosius was counted as the most signal of victories; it was published throughout the whole East, and caused the greatest rejoicing among the Arians everywhere.

ATHANASIUS AGAIN OUTLAWED

THE next step was for Constantius to remove Athanasius from the archbishopric of Alexandria. All who held public office were commanded wholly to abandon the cause of Athanasius, and to communicate with the Arians only. Messengers were sent into the provinces bearing the emperor's authority, to compel the bishops to communicate with the Arians, or to go into exile. Now he sent two of his secretaries and some other officials of the palace to Alexandria, to banish Athanasius. These officers, with the governor of Egypt and the prefect, commanded Athanasius to leave the city. He demanded that they produce the written authority of the emperor; but Constantius had sent no written order. Athanasius, supported by the people, refused to obey any verbal order.

A truce was agreed upon, until an embassy could be sent to Constantius to bring a written command; but on the part of the officers, this truce was granted merely for the purpose of disarming the vigilance of the supporters of Athanasius. The officers immediately began with the greatest possible secrecy to gather the necessary troops into the city. When twenty-three days had thus been spent, a force of five thousand troops held possession of the most important parts of the city. The night before a solemn festival day of the church, Athanasius was conducting the services in the church of St. Theonas. Suddenly, at midnight, there was all about the church the sound of trumpets, the rushing of horses, and the clash of arms; the doors were burst open, and with the discharge of a cloud of arrows, the soldiers, with drawn swords, poured in to arrest Athanasius.

The cries of the wounded, the groans of those who were trampled down in attempting to force their way out through the soldiery, the shouts of the assailants, mingled in wild and melancholy uproar. (Milman.)

In the tumult, Athanasius again escaped.

"SAINT" GEORGE OF ENGLAND

ATHANASIUS was gone. The next thing was to install an Arian bishop in his place. Their choice fell on George of Cappadocia, who was more savage and cruel than Gregory, the Arian bishop who had been appointed to this place before. George's original occupation was that of "a parasite," by which means he secured the contract for supplying the army with bacon. "His employment was mean; he rendered it infamous. He accumulated wealth by the basest arts of fraud and corruption," which finally became so notorious that he had to flee from justice. The Arian bishop of Antioch made him a priest and a church-member at the same time. Surrounded by armed troops, George was now placed on the episcopal throne, "and during at least four months, Alexandria was exposed to the insults of a licentious army, stimulated by the ecclesiastics of a hostile faction." Every kind of violence was committed. "And the same scenes of violence and scandal which had been exhibited in the capital, were repeated in more than ninety episcopal cities of Egypt. The entrance of the new archbishop was that of a barbarian conqueror; and each moment of his reign was polluted by cruelty and avarice." (Gibbon.)

November 30, A.D. 361, he was murdered by the pagans. In the fifth century - A.D. 494 - Pope Gelasius made him a martyr. In the sixth century he was worshipped as a Catholic saint; and since the Crusades, he has been "the renowned Saint Gregory of England, patron of arms, of chivalry, and of the Garter."

HOW PATRONAGE WAS DISPENSED

In A.D. 357 Constantius visited Rome and celebrated a triumph. The leading women of the church determined to take advantage of the opportunity thus offered to present a petition for the recall of Liberius. "Having adorned themselves in the most splendid attire, that their rank might be evident from their appearance" they proceeded to the imperial palace, and declared that Felix was detested and avoided by all, and that none would attend service so long as Liberius was absent. Constantius smiled, and said, "If so, you must have Liberius again: I shall without delay despatch the proper orders for his return."

The next day the edict of recall was read in the circus; but it provided that the two new bishops should rule jointly. It happened to be the most interesting and decisive moment of a horse-race, but the excited feelings of the multitude were turned in an instant to the more absorbing question of the orthodox faith. Some cried in ridicule that the edict was just, because there were two factions in the circus, and now each one could have its own bishop. Others shouted, "What, because we have two factions in the circus, are we to have two factions in the church?" Then the whole multitude set up one universal yell, "There is but one God, one Christ, one bishop!" Upon which Theodoret devoutly remarks, "Some time after this Christian people had uttered these pious and just acclamations, the holy Liberius returned, and Felix retired to another city."

It is true that Liberius returned soon after this, but Constantius had made it the condition of his return that he should sign the decisions of the Council of Milan. Two years' sojourn in cold and barbarous Thrace, while a rival bishop was enjoying the splendors of the episcopal office in Rome, exerted a strong tendency to convince Liberius that Athanasius was rightly condemned, and that the Arian doctrine might be true. He therefore signed both the condemnation of Athanasius and the Arian creed of Milan. But as in the meantime the emperor had changed his views and adopted the Semi-Arian doctrine, he would not allow Liberius to return to

502

Rome unless he would first subscribe to the same. Liberius signed this also, and was allowed to go on his way to Rome. The people poured out through the gates to meet him, and escorted him in triumph to the episcopal palace, Aug. 2, 358. "The adherents of Felix were inhumanly murdered in the streets, in the public places, in the baths, and even in the churches; and the face of Rome, upon the return of a Christian bishop, renewed the horrid image of the massacres of Marius and the proscriptions of Sylla."

TINKERING THE CREED AGAIN

As stated above, Constantius had again changed his opinion as to the nature of Christ, adopting the Semi-Arian view. The Semi-Arian party was a third one that had grown up between the strictly Arian and the Athanasian, based upon a third mental abstraction as elusive as either of the others. The three doctrines now stood thus: -

The Athanasians declared the Son of God to be of the same substance, the same existence, and the same essence, with the Father.

The strict Arians declared the Son to be like the Father, but rather by grace than by nature, - as like as a creature could be to the Creator.

The Semi-Arians declared the Son to be like the Father in nature, in existence, in essence, in substance, and in everything else.

In furtherance of his "visionary" commission to give peace to the church, Constantius determined to call a general council, and have the Semi-Arian doctrine adopted and made orthodox by a council. Two councils were appointed, one at Seleucia for the East, and one at Rimini, in Italy, for the West, to make it more convenient for all to attend. Civil officers were instructed to see that all bishops attended onr or the other.

The council was first appointed to meet at Nicomedia, A.D. 358, but while the bishops were on the way there, an earthquake destroyed that city. The appointment was then changed to Nice in early summer, 359. But before that time arrived, he decided to have two councils instead of one, that all might more easily attend. The bishops of the East were to meet at Seleucia, in Isauria; those of the West at Rimini on the Adriatic Sea in Italy.

The bishops therefore set out from all parts; the public carriages, roads, and houses were everywhere crowded with them, which gave great offence to the catechumens, and no small

diversion to the pagans, who thought it equally strange and ridiculous that men who had been brought up from their infancy in the Christian religion, and whose business it was to instruct others in that belief, should be constantly hurrying in their old age, from one place to another, to know what they themselves should believe. (Bower.)

In the summer of A.D. 359, more than four hundred bishops assembled at Rimini, of whom eighty were Arians. One hundred and sixty assembled at Seleucia, of whom one hundred and five were Semi-Arians; about forty were Arians, while the Catholics were still fewer in number. A civil officer of high rank was appointed to represent the emperor at each council, and the one appointed to Rimini was directed not to allow any bishop to go home until all "had come to one mind concerning the faith." That there might be as little difficulty as possible in coming to one mind, a creed was drawn up and sent to the council to be signed.

But at Rimini the Catholics took everything into their own hands. They unanimously approved the Nicene Creed, and then declared heretical the creed which had come from the Emperor. They next took up the doctrine of Arianism, and pronounced a curse upon each particular point; denounced by name the bishops who had come from the emperor as "ignorant and deceitful men, imposters, and heretics; and declared them deposed."

All this they put in writing; every one of them signed it July 21, A.D. 359, and sent it by the ten deputies to the emperor, accompanied by a request that he would allow them to return to their churches. At the same time the Arians of the council also sent ten deputies to Constantius, who reached the emperor before the others, and made their report. When the others arrived, Constantius refused even to see them so much as to receive their report; but sent an officer to receive it, and under the pretext of being overwhelmed with public business, kept them waiting. After waiting long they were sent to Adrianople to await the emperor's pleasure; and at the same time he sent a letter to the bishops at Rimini, commanding them to await there the return of their deputies.

SECURING THE "UNITY OF THE FAITH"

SHORTLY afterward the deputies were ordered to go to a small town called Nice, not many miles from Adrianople. This was a trick of the Arians and Semi-Arians, by which they proposed to have their creed signed there, and then pass it off upon the uninitiated as the original creed of the Council of Nice in Bithynia, in Asia. The deputies were finally forced to sign, and to reverse all the acts and proceedings of the Council of Rimini.

The emperor was highly pleased at this result, and calling it a good omen of like success with the whole council, gave the ten deputies leave to return to Rimini. At the same time he sent letters to the prefect, commanding him anew not to allow a single bishop to leave until all had signed; and to exile whoever should persist in a refusal, provided the number did not exceed fifteen.

The bishops were

eager to return to their sees; the emperor was inflexible; Taurus took care to render the place both inconvenient and disagreeable to them. Some therefore fell off, others followed their example, the rest began to waver, and being so far got the better of, yielded soon after, and went over to the Arian party in such crowds that in a very short time the number of the orthodox bishops who continued steady, was reduced to twenty. (Bower.)

At the head of these twenty was a certain Phebadius, and they determined invincibly to hold their position. Nevertheless they were caught by a trick that the veriest tyro ought to have seen. Two bishops in particular, Ursacius and Valens, had charge of the creed; and they pretended in the interests of peace to be willing to make a concession.

They came together, and began to reconstruct the creed: first were inserted some curses against the Arian heresy, then an addition, declaring the Son to be "equal to the Father, without beginning, and before all things." When this was written, Valens proposed that in order to leave no room whatever for any new disputes or any question upon this point, there should be added a clause declaring that "the Son of God is not a creature like other creatures." To this the twenty bishops assented, blindly overlooking the fact that in admitting that the Son was not a creature like other creatures, they did indeed place him among the creatures, and admitted the very point upon which the Arians had all the time insisted. Thus all were brought to "the unity of the faith." The council broke up, and the bishops departed to their homes.

The council was past, and no sooner did the Arians find themselves secure, than they loudly proclaimed the victory which they had gained. Upon examination of the creed, the twenty bishops were obliged to confess that they had been entrapped. They renounced the creed, and publicly retracted "all they had said, done, or signed, repugnant to the truths of the Catholic Church."

ARIANISM ESTABLISHED AS CATHOLIC

THE companion council which was called at Seleucia, met Sept. 27, 359, but as there were three distinct parties, besides individuals who differed from all, there was among them such utter confusion, tumult, and bitterness, that after four days of angry debate, in which the prospect became worse and worse, the imperial officer declared that he would have nothing more to do with the council, and told them they could go to the church if they wanted to, and "indulge in this vain babbling there

503

as much as they pleased." The parties then met separately, denounced, condemned, and excommunicated one another, and sent their deputies to Constantius, who spent a whole day and the greater part of the night, December 31, 359, in securing their signatures to the confession of faith which he had approved. The emperor's confession was then published throughout the whole empire, and all bishops were commanded to sign it, under penalty of exile upon all who refused. "This order was executed with the utmost rigor in all the

provinces of the empire, and very few were found who did not sign with their hands what they condemned in their hearts. Many who till then had been thought invincible were overcome, and complied with the times: and such as did not, were driven without distinction from their sees into exile, and others appointed in their room, the signing of that confession being a qualification indispensably requisite both in obtaining and keeping the episcopal dignity. Thus were all the sees throughout the empire filled with Arians, insomuch that in the whole East not an orthodox bishop was left, and in the West but one; namely, Gregory, bishop of Elvira, in Andalusia, and he, in all likelihood, obliged to absent himself from his flock and lie concealed." (Bower.)

Thus Constantius had succeeded much more fully than had his father in establishing "the unity of the faith." That faith was the original Arian. And Arianism was now as entirely orthodox, and, if the accommodated sense of the word be used, as entirely *Catholic*, as Athanasianism had ever been.

Having, like his father, by the aid of the bishops, united the world "under one head," and brought the opinions respecting the Deity to a condition of "settled uniformity," the emperor Constantius died the following year, A.D. 361.

A. T. JONES.

August 19, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Catholic Faith Re-established" *The Present Truth* 13, 33 , pp. 516-518.

THE Emperor Constantius was succeeded by Julian, who restored paganism as the religion of the emperor and the empire, and exerted his influence, though not his power, in favour of its restoration as the religion of the people.

A PAGAN BRINGS TOLERATION

JULIAN refused to take any part whatever in the strifes of the church parties, "saying that as he was not so well acquainted with the nature of their disputes as a just and impartial judge ought to be, he hoped they would excuse him, lest he should be guilty of some injustice." (Bower.) He therefore directed them to settle their differences among themselves. To this end he issued an edict of toleration to all classes of Christians, and recalled from banishment all the bishops and clergy who had been banished by Constantius.

Thus there was restored to the afflicted empire a condition of peace and quietness such as had not been for fifty years. And because of his refusal to allow himself and his authority to be made the tool of the riotous and bigoted church parties - to this more than to any other one thing, is to be attributed the spiteful epithet of "the apostate," which ever since has been affixed to his name. Pagan though he was, if he had, like Constantine, assumed the hypocritical mask, and had played into the hands of the dominant church party, there is no

room for doubt that he would, like Constantine, have been an orthodox emperor, with the title of "the great."

Under the circumstances, it would be almost surprising if Julian had been anything else than what he was. His own father, an uncle, and seven of his cousins, were the victims of a murder instigated by the dying Constantine and faithfully carried out by Constantius. Julian himself, though only six years of age, by the care of some friends barely escaped the same fate. Constantius was his cousin, and, as emperor, assumed the place of his guardian. "His place of education had been a prison, and his subsequent liberty was watched with suspicious vigilance." He had seen the streets of the chief cities of the empire run with blood, in the savage strifes of church parties. Over the bodies of slaughtered people he had seen bishops placed upon thrones of episcopal ambition. Such impressions forced upon his young mind, confirmed by more than twenty years' observation of the violent and unchristian lives of Constantius, and hundreds of ecclesiastics, and multitudes of the populace, all professing to be living depositaries of the Christian faith, - all this was not the best calculated to convince him of the virtues of the imperial religion.

It is indeed charged that in issuing the edict of toleration, and the recall of the exiled ecclesiastics, Julian's motive was to vent his spite against Christianity, by having the church parties destroy one another in their contentions. Even if this is true, if he was to be guided by the experience and observations of his whole life, he is hardly to be blamed for thinking that there was some prospect of such a result. No such result followed, however, because when the prospect of imperial favor and patronage and power was gone, the church parties had nothing to contend for; because, as Neander says: -

party passions among the Christians would, undoubtedly, never have risen to so high a pitch, had

517

it not been for the interference of the State. As this disturbing and circumscribing influence of a foreign power now fell away of itself, and the church was left to follow out naturally its own development from within itself, the right relations were everywhere more easily restored.

NEW EMPERORS AND STRIFE RENEWED

JULIAN died June 26, A.D. 363, beyond the river Tigris, of a wound received in a war with Persia, after a reign of one year, eight months, and twenty-three days. Upon his death, the army in the field elected Jovian emperor, and returned to Antioch. The Emperor was no sooner arrived at Antioch than the ecclesiastical commotion was again renewed. The leaders of the church parties endeavored to outdo one another in their eager haste to secure his support; "for the heads of each party assiduously paid their court to the emperor, with a view of obtaining not only protection for themselves, but also *power against their opponents.*" (Socrates.)

Among the first of these came the party of Macedonius of Constantinople, with a petition that the emperor would expel all the Arians from their churches, and allow them to take their places. To this petition Jovian replied, "I abominate contentiousness; but I love and honor those who exert themselves to promote unanimity." This somewhat checked the factious zeal. Another attempt was made, but Jovian declared "that he would not molest any one on account of his religious sentiments, and that he should love and highly esteem such as would zealously promote the unity of the church." A pagan philosopher in an oration in honor of the Emperor, rebuked these parties with the observation that such persons worshipped the purple and not the Deity, and resembled the uncertain waves of the sea, sometimes rolling in one direction and again in the very opposite way; and praised the Emperor for his liberality in permitting every one freely to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Jovian, though guaranteeing a general toleration, himself professed the Nicene Creed, and a particular preference for Athanasius, who at his invitation visited Antioch, and after having settled the faith of the emperor, and promised him "a long and peaceful reign," returned to his episcopal seat at Alexandria. The long and peaceful reign assured by the zealous ecclesiastic continued only about two months from this time, and ended in the death of Jovian, February 17, A.D. 364, after a total reign of seven months and twenty-one days from the death of Julian.

Ten days after the death of Jovian, Valentinian was chosen emperor; and thirty days after this, he bestowed upon his brother Valens an equal share in the imperial dignity. Valens assumed the jurisdiction of the whole East, with his capital at Constantinople. Valentinian retained the dominion of the West, with his capital at Milan. Both of these emperors pursued the tolerant policy of Jovian, so far as paganism and the church parties were concerned; but they let loose a cruel persecution upon the profession of "magic," and under the accusations of sorcery and witchcraft, an infinite number and variety of individual spites and animosities were let loose, and it seemed as though the horrors of the days of Tiberius and Domitian were returned.

In 370 Valens cast his influence decidedly in favor of the Arian faith, by receiving baptism at the hands of the Arian bishop of Constantinople. The tumults of the religious parties again began, and "every episcopal vacancy was the occasion of a popular tumult."

THE PENDULUM SWINGING BACK

In 373 Athanasius died, and the emperor Valens commanded the prefect of Egypt to install in the vacant bishopric an Arian prelate by the name of Lucius, which was done; but not without the accompaniment of riot and bloodshed, which was now hardly more than a part of the regular ceremony of induction into office in the principal bishoprics of the empire.

In the West, after the death of Constantius, the bishops returned to the faith established by the Council of Nice, which so largely prevailed there that the differences springing from the Arian side caused no material difficulty. As before

stated, Valentinian suffered all religious parties, even the pagan, to continue unmolested; yet he himself was always a Catholic. About the year 367 he greatly increased the dignity and authority of the bishop of Rome by publishing a law empowering him to examine, and sit as judge upon, the cases of other bishops. In 375 Valentinian died, and was succeeded by his two sons, Gratian, aged sixteen years, and Valentinian II, aged four years.

Gratian was but the tool of the bishops. Ambrose was at that time bishop of Milan, and never was episcopal ambition more arrogantly asserted than in that insolent prelate. Soon the mind of the bishop asserted the supremacy over that of the boy emperor, and Ambrose "wielded at his will the weak and irresolute Gratian." (Milman.) But above all things else that Gratian did, that which redounded most to the glory of the Catholic Church was his choice of Theodosius as associate emperor. Valens was killed in a battle with the Goths, A.D. 378. A stronger hand than that of a youth of nineteen was required to hold the reins of government in the East.

In the establishment of the Catholic Church, the place of Theodosius is second only to that of Constantine. About the beginning of A.D. 380 he was baptized by the Catholic bishop of Thessalonica, and immediately afterward he issued the following edict: -

It is our pleasure that the nations which are governed by our clemency and moderation, should steadfastly adhere to the religion which was taught by St. Peter to the Romans, which faithful tradition has preserved, and which is now professed by the pontiff Damasus, and by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic holiness. According to the discipline of the apostles, and the doctrine of the gospel, let us believe the sole deity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, under an equal majesty, and a pious Trinity. We authorize the followers of this doctrine to assume the title of Catholic Christians, and as we judge that all others are extravagant madmen, we brand them with the infamous name of "heretics," and declare that their conventicles shall no longer usurp the respectable appellation of churches. Besides the condemnation of divine justice, they must expect to suffer the severe penalties which our authority, guided by heavenly wisdom, shall think proper to inflict upon them.

This law was issued in the names of the three emperors, Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius. "Thus the religion of the whole Roman world was enacted by two feeble boys and a rude Spanish soldier." (Milman.)

In Constantinople the Catholics were so few that at the accession of Theodosius they had no regular place of meeting, nor had they any pastor. No sooner was the new emperor proclaimed, however, than they called to their aid Gregory, bishop and native of Nazianzum, and hence called Gregory Nazianzen. A room in a private house was fitted up as the place of meeting, and Gregory began his ministry in the imperial city. The quarrel between the religious parties again broke out into open riot. A great crowd, led on by monks and women, with clubs, stones, and firebrands, attacked the meeting-place of the Catholics, broke

down the doors, and ravaged the place inside and outside. Blood was shed, lives were lost, and Gregory was accused before the magistrate; but upon the strength of the imperial edict establish-

518

ing the Catholic religion, he secured his acquittal.

THE CATHOLICS ORGANISE AFTER THE PATTERN OF THE STATE

AND now the contentions began among the Catholics themselves. The occasion of it was this: As soon as Constantine had become sole emperor by the murder of Licinius, he proceeded to complete the organization of the government of the empire which had been planned, and in a manner begun, by Diocletian. He divided the empire into prefectures, dioceses, and provinces. Of the provinces there were one hundred and sixteen; of the dioceses, thirteen; of the prefectures, four.

The heads of the prefectures were entitled prefects. The heads of the dioceses were entitled vicars, or vice-prefects. The heads of the provinces were designated by different titles, of which the term "governor" will be sufficiently exact.

The governors were subject to the jurisdiction of the vicars, or vice-prefects; the vicars, or vice-prefects, were subject to the jurisdiction of the prefects; and the prefects were subject to the immediate jurisdiction of the emperor himself.

Now when the church and State became one, the organization of the church was made to conform as precisely as possible to that of the empire. In fact, so far as the provinces and the dioceses, the organization of the church was identical with that of the empire. There was a gradation in the order and dignity of the bishoprics according to the political divisions thus formed.

The dignity of the chief bishop in a province or diocese was regulated by the chief city. The bishop of the chief city in a province was the principal bishop of that province, and all the other bishops in the province were subject to his jurisdiction; to him pertained the ordination to vacant bishoprics and all other matters. The bishop of the principal city in the diocese was chief bishop of that diocese, and all other bishops within said diocese were subject to his jurisdiction.

The chief bishop of the province was called "Metropolitan," from the metropolis or chief city, or "primate" from *primus*, first. The chief bishop of a diocese was called "exarch." Above these were four bishops corresponding to the four prefects, and were called "patriarchs," yet these were not apportioned according to the lines of the prefectures, but were bishops of the four chief cities of the empire, - Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople.

This was the general plan of the organization of the church, though through the mutual ambitions and jealousies of the whole hierarchy there were many exceptions; and as time went on, titles and jurisdictions overran the limits defined in this general plan.

THE IMPERIAL SWORD AGAIN

The bishopric of Alexandria had always been held as second only to that of Rome in dignity, since Alexandria was the second city of the empire. Constantinople was now an imperial city, and its bishopric was fast assuming an importance which rivaled that of Alexandria for second place. To this the archbishop of Alexandria did not propose to assent. That Peter, bishop of Alexandria, whom the edict of Theodosius had advertised and endorsed as a man of apostolic holiness, asserted his episcopal jurisdiction over Constantinople. He sent up seven Alexandrians, who ordained a certain Maximus to be bishop of Constantinople. A tumult was raised, and Maximus was driven out by the party of Gregory. He fled to Theodosius, but his claim was rejected by the emperor also.

Theodosius soon came to Constantinople, and immediately on his arrival, summoned to his palace Damophilus, the Arian bishop of the city, and commanded him to subscribe to the Nicene Creed, or else surrender to the Catholics the episcopal palace, the cathedral, and all the churches of the city, which amounted to fully a hundred. Damophilus refused, and November 24, A.D. 380, an edict was issued expelling all the Arians from all their houses of worship, and forfeiting the same to the Catholics, who in fact were barely able to fill the single house of worship which they already owned.

Damophilus was exiled, and Gregory, accompanied by the emperor and surrounded by armed troops, was conducted to the cathedral, which was already occupied by a body of imperial guards, where he was regularly installed in the office of bishop of Constantinople. "He beheld the innumerable multitude of either sex and of every age, who crowded the streets, the windows, and the roofs of the houses; he heard the tumultuous voice of rage, grief, astonishment, and despair; and Gregory fairly confesses that on the memorable day of his installation, the capital of the East wore the appearance of a city taken by storm, in the hands of a barbarian conqueror." (Gibbon.)

At the beginning of the year 381, Theodosius issued an edict expelling from all the churches within his dominions, all the bishops and other ecclesiastics who should refuse to subscribe to the creed of Nice. By a commissioned officer with a military force, the edict was executed in all the provinces of the East. Having thus established his religion throughout the empire, the next thing to do was to have a general council endorse his action, compose the disputes which disturbed the Catholic party itself, and again "settle" the faith of the Catholic Church. To this end a general council was called to meet at Constantinople this same year, A.D. 381.

A. T. JONES.

August 26, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Empire 'Converted'" *The Present Truth* 13, 34 , pp. 533, 534.

AS we saw last week, Theodosius, Emperor of the East, had declared against Arianism and for the creed of the Council of Nice, and now called a general council at Constantinople to compose the quarrels in the Catholic party and again "settle" the faith of the Catholic Church.

"A NEST OF WASPS.

THE Council met in the year 381, and was composed of one hundred and eighty-six bishops, of whom one hundred and fifty were Catholics. First it decided a quarrel as to who was Bishop of Constantinople, deciding in favour of Gregory Nazianzen, who had been installed in the bishop's office by armed troops. Next they attempted to heal the schism which existed in the Catholic party in Syria, the quarrel as usual being between two factions who had rival candidates for the bishopric, this time the bishopric of Antioch.

While this was being considered Gregory Nazianzen succeeded to the presidency of the council. A way opened by the death of one of the rival bishops to allow the matter to drop, and Gregory did his best to persuade the council to let it do so. He was joined by other members of the council, but the vast majority loved discussion more than they loved anything else than power, and as disputes and schisms were the way to power, they could not bear to let slip such an opportunity to show that the East was not subject to the West - especially as the Western bishops, with the Bishop of Rome at their head, had already assumed the authority to dictate in the matter. They therefore took action which was sure only to aggravate the difficulty and prolong it.

Gregory Nazianzen, having done all he could to prevent this act of the council, and knowing that what they had done could only strengthen the contentions already rife, resigned his bishopric, and left both the council and the city of Constantinople. He likened a church council to a nest of wasps, or a flock of magpies, cranes, or geese; declared that no good ever came of one, and refused evermore to have anything to do with them. Had a few other men been as wise as Gregory Nazianzen showed himself to be in this case, what miseries the world might have escaped! how different history would have been! As Gregory has been, for ages, a Catholic saint, even the Catholic Church ought not to blame any one for adopting his estimate of the value of church councils.

Gregory's resignation made it necessary to elect a new Bishop of Constantinople. The choice fell upon Nectarius, a senator and pretor of the city, who had never yet been baptized. He was first elected bishop, next baptized into membership of the church, and then by the bishops of the council was installed in his new office.

A CREED AGAIN ADOPTED

HAVING "settled" these things, the council proceeded to "settle" the Catholic faith again. The same question which had been so long discussed as to the nature of Christ was now up in regard to the nature of the Holy Spirit. Now, the question was whether the Holy Spirit is *Homoousion* with the Father and the Son.

The Macedonians held that He is not. The council decided that He is. The Macedonians left the assembly, and the remaining hundred and fifty bishops framed the following creed: -

We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all times [ages], Light from Light, very God from very God, begotten, not created, of the same substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; who was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again with glory to judge both the living and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets. And in one Holy Catholic and apostolic church. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. We look for a resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

They also established seven canons, in one of which they attempted to settle the question of dignity between the Bishops of Alexandria and Constantinople by ordaining as follows: -

CANON 3. The bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank after the bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome.

This, however, like every other attempt to settle their ecclesiastical disputes, only bred new and more violent contentions. For, by a trick in words, and a casuistical interpretation, this canon was afterward made the ground upon which was claimed by the Bishopric of Constantinople, superiority over that of Rome. It was argued that the words "the first rank after the Bishop of Rome," did not mean the second in actual rank, but the *first*, and really carried precedence over Old Rome; that the real meaning was that hitherto Rome had held the first rank, but now Constantinople should hold the first rank, *i.e.*, *after* Rome *had* held it!

COUNCIL AFTER COUNCIL

While the Council of Constantinople was sitting, the emperor Gratian called a council at Aquileia in Italy. The object of this council was, in unison with the Council of Constantinople, to establish the unity of the faith throughout the whole world. There happened to be three bishops in all the West who were accused of being Arians. They would not acknowledge that they were such; but the accusation of heresy was sufficient foundation upon which to call a council. They were deposed, and the council asked the civil

power to see that the condemned bishops were not allowed any "further to disturb the peace of the church or to travel about from one town to another." (Hefele.) The council also disagreed with the decision of the Council of Constantinople in the matter of the disputed bishopric and the rivalry of parties to which it has given rise, and they called for another general council, to meet at Alexandria, in Egypt.

The condemned bishops complained that they were misrepresented in the letters of the council, and protested against being confounded with the Arians. They likewise demanded another council, to be held at Rome. When these letters reached Theodosius, the Council of Constantinople was over, and the bishops had gone home. But instead of calling the council to meet in Alexandria, he recalled the bishops to Constantinople. He sent two special invitations to Gregory Nazianzen to attend the council, but Gregory, still retaining the wisdom he had acquired at the preceding council, positively refused, with the words, "I never yet saw a council of bishops come to a good end. I salute them from afar off, since I know how troublesome they are."

By the time the bishops were again got together at Constantinople, it was early in the summer of 382. They there received another letter from a council which had just been held under the presidency of Ambrose, at Milan, asking them to attend a general council at Rome. The bishops remained at Constantinople; but sent three of their number as their representatives, and also a letter affirming their strict adherence to the Nicene Creed. Lack of time and space alike forbid that the proceedings of these councils should be followed in detail. Council after council followed; another one at Constantinople in 383, at Bordeaux in 384, at Treves in 385, at Rome in 386, at Antioch in 388, at Carthage in 389, Rome again in 390, Carthage again in 390, Capua in 391, at Hippo in 393, at Nimes in 394, and at Constantinople again in 394.

TRYING TO ESTABLISH UNIFORMNITY

ON his part Theodosius was all this time doing all he could to second the efforts of the church to secure unanimity of faith, and to blot out all heresy. "In the space of fifteen years he promulgated at least fifteen severe edicts against the heretics, more especially against those who rejected the doctrine of the Trinity." (Gibbon.) In these edicts it was enacted that any of the heretics who should usurp the title of bishop or presbyter, should suffer the penalty of exile and confiscation of goods, if they attempted either to preach the doctrine or practise the rites of their "accursed" sects. A fine of about £4,000 was pronounced upon every person who should dare to confer, or receive, or promote, the ordination of a heretic. Any religious meetings of the heretics, whether public or private, whether by day or by night, in city or country, were absolutely prohibited; and if any such meeting was held, the building, or even the ground which should be used for the purpose, was declared confiscated. The Manichean heretics were to be punished with death, as were also the heretics "who should dare to perpetrate the atrocious crime" of celebrating Easter on a day not appointed by the Catholic Church.

FRUIT OF CHURCH AND STATE UNION DEATH TO "HERETICS"

THAT these laws might not be vain, the office of "inquisitor of the faith" was instituted, and it was not long before capital punishment was inflicted upon "heresy," though not exactly under Theodosius himself. Gratian was killed in A.D. 383, by command of a certain Maximus, who had been declared emperor by the troops in Britain, and acknowledged by the troops in Gaul. A treaty of peace was formed between him and Theodosius, and the new Emperor Maximus stepped into the place both in church and State which had been occupied by Gratian.

A certain Priscillian and his followers were condemned as heretics by the Council of Bordeaux in A.D. 384. Priscillian himself, two presbyters, two deacons, Latronian, a poet, and Euchrocia, the widow of an orator of Bordeaux, - seven in all, - were beheaded, while others were banished.

Thus the union of Church and State, the clothing of the church with civil power, bore its inevitable fruit. It is true that there were some bishops who condemned the execution of the Priscillianists; but the others fully justified it. Those who condemned it, however, did so more at the sight of actual bloodshed than for any other reason; because they fully justified, and in fact demanded, every penalty short of actual death. And those who persecuted the Priscillianists, and who advocated and secured and justified their execution, were never condemned by the church nor by any council. In fact, their course was actually endorsed by a council. Even the disagreement as to whether it was right or not was silenced when, twenty years afterward, Augustine set forth his principles, asserting the righteousness of whatever penalty would bring the incorrigible to the highest grade of religious development; and the matter was fully set at rest for all time when, in A.D. 447, Leo, bishop of Rome, justified the execution of Priscillian and his associate heretics, and declared the righteousness of the penalty of death for heresy.

ROME PAGAN MADE ROME PAPAL

IN re-establishing the unity of the Catholic faith, Theodosius did not confine his attention to professors of Christianity only. In his original edict, it will be remembered that *all his subjects* should be Catholic Christians. A good many of his subjects were pagans, and still conformed to the pagan ceremonies and worship. In 382 Gratian, at the instance of Ambrose, had struck a blow at the pagan religion by rejecting the dignity of Pontifex Maximus, which had been borne by every one of his predecessors; and had also commanded that the statue and altar of Victory should be thrown down. Maximus was killed in 388, and on account of the youth of Valentinian II, Theodosius, as his guardian, became virtually ruler of the whole empire; and at Rome the same year, he assembled the Senate and put to them the question whether the old or the new religion should be that of the Empire.

By the imperial influence, the majority of the Senate, as in the church councils, adopted the will of the emperor, and "the same laws which had been

originally published in the provinces of the East, were applied, after the defeat of Maximus, to the whole extent of the Western Empire A special commission was granted to Cynegius, the praetorian prefect of the East, and afterward to the counts Jovius and Gaudentius, two officers of distinguished rank in the West, by which they were directed to shut the temples, to seize or destroy the instruments of idolatry, to abolish the privileges of the priests, and to confiscate the consecrated property for the benefit of the emperor, of the church, or of the army." (Gibbon.)

Thus was the Catholic faith finally established as that of the Roman Empire; thus was that empire "converted;" and thus was Pagan Rome made Papal Rome.

A. T. JONES.

September 2, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. After Four Centuries of Apostasy" *The Present Truth* 13, 35 , pp. 549, 550.

BY the pious zeal of Theodosius, "the unity of the faith" had been supposedly secured, since by imperial decree and inquisitorial repression, the empire had been made Catholic. As all his efforts in this direction had been put forth to secure the peace of the church it might be supposed that this result should have been assured. But peace was just as far from the church now as it ever had been.

EPISCOPAL RIVALRY

BY this time, among the chief bishoprics of the empire, the desire for supremacy had become so all-absorbing that each one was exerting every possible influence to bring the others into subjection to himself. The rivalry, however, was most bitter between the bishopric of Alexandria and that of Constantinople. Of the great sees of the empire, Alexandria had always held the second place. Now, however, Constantinople was the chief imperial city; and the Council of Constantinople had ordained that the bishop of Constantinople should hold the first rank after the bishop of Rome. The Alexandrian party argued that this dignity was merely honorary, and carried with it no jurisdiction. Rome, seeing to what the canon might lead, sided with Alexandria. Constantinople, however, steadily insisted that the canon bestowed jurisdiction to the full extent of the honour. The Bishop of Constantinople therefore aspired to the complete occupancy of the second place, and Alexandria was supremely jealous of that aspiration.

Theodosius died A.D. 395, and was succeeded by his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, by whom the empire was permanently divided. John surnamed Chrysostom - the golden-mouthed - became bishop of Constantinople. He "exposed with unsparing indignation the vices and venality of the clergy, and

involved them all in one indiscriminate charge of simony and licentiousness." (Milman.) He declared his free opinion "that the number of bishops who might be saved, bore a very small proportion to those who would be damned." (Gibbon.) In addition to this, and with much more danger to himself, he incurred the enmity of the monks, who now existed in swarms throughout the East, by declaring with evident truth that they were "the disgrace of their holy profession."

These measures set the whole ecclesiastical order against him, and they began to intrigue for his overthrow. This opened the way for the bishop of Alexandria again to assert his authority.

Theophilus, a violent and unscrupulous prelate, was now Bishop of Alexandria, and he immediately espoused the cause of the malcontents, who proudly accepted him as their leader. The contest waged gave now one side and then the other the advantage. One one occasion the partisans of Theophilus were slaughtered without mercy by the populace in the streets of Constantinople. At last Chrysostom was exiled by the Emperor, because of his denunciation of the vices of the court. His banishment was attended with bloodshed, as the soldiers subdued his party, and his friends, on the day that he was finally sent out of the city, set fire to the church of Santa Sophia.

The Bishop of Rome, to whom Chrysostom appealed, sided with him against Alexandria. The war with Chrysostom was ended, yet the roots of bitterness and seeds of strife still remained between Alexandria and Constantinople. And though the two men who were now bishops of these two cities were in harmony so far as the confusion about Chrysostom was concerned, the same jealousy as to the dignity of their respective sees still existed, and soon broke out more violently than ever before. The subject of the next dispute was a question of doctrine, and like that over the *Homoousion*, was so illusive, and the disputants believed so nearly alike and yet were so determined not to believe alike, and the men who led in it were so arrogant and cruel, that from the beginning the contention was more violent than any that had yet been.

ANOTHER CATHOLIC SAINT

In. A.D. 412, Cyril, the nephew of Theophilus, became Bishop of Alexandria. He was one of the very worst men of his time. He began his episcopacy by shutting up the churches of the Novatians, "the most innocent and harmless of the sectaries," and taking possession of all their ecclesiastical ornaments and consecrated vessels, and stripping their bishop of all his possessions. Nor was Cyril content with the exercise of such strictly episcopal functions as these: he aspired to absolute authority, civil as well as ecclesiastical.

He drove out the Jews, forty thousand in number, destroyed their synagogues, and allowed his followers to strip them of all their possessions. Orestes, the prefect of Egypt, displeased at the loss of such a large number of wealthy and industrious people, entered a protest, and sent up a report to the Emperor. Cyril likewise wrote to the Emperor. No answer came from the court, and the people urged Cyril to come to a reconciliation with the prefect, but his

advances were made in such a way that the prefect would not receive them. The monks poured in from the desert to the number of about five hundred, to champion the cause of Cyril.

Orestes was passing through the streets in his chariot. The monks flocked around him, insulted him, and denounced him as a heathen and an idolater. Orestes, thinking that perhaps they thought this was so, and knowing his life to be in danger, called out that he was a Christian, and had been baptized by Atticus, bishop of Constantinople. His defence was in vain. In answer, one of the monks threw a big stone which struck him on the head, and wounded him so that his face was covered with blood. At this all his guards fled for their lives; but the populace came to the

550

rescue, and drove off the monks, and captured the one who threw the stone. His name was Ammonius, and the prefect punished him so severely that shortly afterward he died. "Cyril commanded his body to be taken up; the honors of a Christian martyr were prostituted on this insolent ruffian, his panegyric was pronounced in the church, and he was named Thaumasius - the wonderful." (Milman.)

But the party of Cyril proceeded to yet greater violence than this. At that time there was in Alexandria a teacher of philosophy, a woman, Hypatia by name. she gave public lectures which were so largely attended by the chief people of the city, that Cyril grew jealous that more people went to hear her lecture than came to hear him preach. She was a friend of Orestes, and it was also charged that she, more than any other, was the cause why Orestes would not be reconciled to Cyril. One day as Hypatia was passing through the street in a chariot, she was attacked by a crowd of Cyril's partisans, whose ring-leader was Peter the Reader.

She was torn from her chariot, stripped naked in the street, dragged into a church, and there beaten to death with a club, by Peter the Reader. Then they tore her limb, and with shells scraped the flesh from her bones, and threw the remnants into the fire, March, A.D. 414. This was Cyril, - now Saint Cyril, - Bishop of Alexandria.

ANOTHER FAMOUS CONTROVERSY BEGUN

In 428, there was appointed to the bishopric of Constantinople a monk of Antioch, Nestorius by name, who in wickedness of disposition was only second to Cyril of Alexandria. In his ordination sermon before the great crowd of people, he personally addressed to the emperor these words: -

Give me, my prince, the earth purged of heretics, and I will give you heaven as a recompense. Assist me in destroying heretics, and I will assist you in vanquishing the Persians.

The fifth day afterward, in accordance with this proposition, Nestorius began his part in purging the earth of heretics. Arians and Novatians suffered, but specially the Quarto-Decimans, who refused to celebrate Easter on the Catholic Sunday, and multitudes perished in the tumults which he stirred up.

And now these two desperate men, Nestorius and Cyril, became the respective champions of the two sides of a controversy touching the faith of the Catholic Church, as to whether Mary was the mother of God or not. In the long contention and the fine-spun distinctions as to whether the Son of God is of the same substance, or only of *like* substance with the Father, Christ had been removed entirely beyond the comprehension of the people. And owing to the desperate character and cruel disposition of the men who carried on the controversy as the representatives of Christ, the members of the Church were made afraid of Him. And now, instead of Jesus standing forth as the mediator between men and God, He was removed so far away and was clothed with such a forbidding aspect, that it became necessary to have a mediator between men and Christ. *And into this place the Virgin Mary was put.*

This gave rise to the question as to what was the exact relationship of Mary to Christ. Was she actually the mother of the divinity of Christ, and therefore the mother of God? or was she only the mother of the humanity of Christ? For a considerable time already the question had been agitated, and among a people whose ancestors for ages had been devout worshipers of the mother goddesses - Diana and Cybele - the title "Mother of God" was gladly welcomed and strenuously maintained. This party spoke of Mary as "God-bearer;" the opposite party called her only "man-bearer;" while a third party coming between tried to have all speak of her as "Christ-bearer."

As before stated, this question had already been agitated considerably, but when two such characters as Cyril and Nestorius took it up, it speedily became the one all-important question, and the all-absorbing topic. Nestorius started it in his very first sermon after becoming bishop of Constantinople. He denied that Mary could properly be called the mother of God. Some of his priests immediately withdrew from his communion, and began to preach against his heresy, and the monks rushed in also. Nestorius denounced them all as miserable men, called in the police, and had some of them flogged and imprisoned, especially several monks who had accused him to the Emperor. From this the controversy spread rapidly, and Cyril, urged on by both natural and inherited jealousy, came to the rescue in defence of the title, "Mother of God."

COUNCILS AGAIN CALLED FOR

IT is not necessary to put into this book the blasphemous arguments of either side. It is enough to say that in this controversy, as in that regarding the *Homoousion*, the whole dispute was one about words and terms only. Each determined that the other should express the disputed doctrine in his own words and ideas, while he himself could not clearly express his ideas in words different from the others. Says Milman: -

Never was there a case in which the contending parties approximated so closely. Both subscribed, both appealed, to the Nicene Creed; both admitted the pre-existence, the impassibility, of the Eternal Word; but the fatal duty . . . of considering the detection

of heresy the first of religious obligations, mingled, as it now was, with human passions and interests, made the breach irreparable.

Cyril demanded of Nestorius that he should confess Mary to be the mother of God, without any distinction, explanation, or qualification. And because Nestorius would not comply, Cyril denounced him everywhere as a heretic, stirred up the people of Constantinople against him, and sent letters to the Emperor, the empress, and to Pulcheria, to prove to them that the Virgin Mary "ought to be called" the Mother of God. He sought to have the court take his side at once against Nestorius. But Nestorius had the advantage with respect to the court, because he was present in Constantinople.

Fierce letters also passed between Cyril and Nestorius, and both sent off letters to Celestine, Bishop of Rome. Celestine called a council in Rome, A.D. 430. The letters and papers of both Cyril and Nestorius were read, after which Celestine made a long speech to prove that "the Virgin Mary was truly the mother of God."

The council declared that Nestorius was "the author of a new and very dangerous heresy," praised Cyril for opposing it, declared the doctrine of Cyril strictly orthodox, and condemned to deposition all ecclesiastics who should refuse to adopt it. Nestorius refused to recant. Both parties were calling for a general council, and so to "settle" the faith again the joint emperors ordered a general council to meet at Ephesus in 431.

A. T. JONES.

September 9, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. Mary Is Made the 'Mother of God'" *The Present Truth* 13, 36 , pp. 564-566.

THE council called to settle the controversy about the nature of Mary, met, as we stated last week, in the year 431, at Ephesus.

Of all places in the world, Ephesus was the very one where it would be the nearest to an impossibility to obtain anything like a fair examination of the question. Like Diana of old, the Virgin Mary was now the patroness of Ephesus; and the worse than heathen Catholics were more fanatically devoted to her than even the heathen Ephesians had been to Diana. But a fair examination of the question, or in fact any real examination, was not intended by Celestine and Cyril. Their only intention was either the unconditional surrender or the condemnation of Nestorius. Cyril was appointed by Celestine to preside at the council.

Neither of the emperors was present at the council, but they jointly appointed Count Candidian, captain of the imperial bodyguard, as the "Protector of the Council." Nestorius came with sixteen bishops, accompanied by an armed guard composed of bathmen of Constantinople and a horde of peasants. In addition to this, by the special favour of the Emperor, an officer, Ireneus, with a body of soldiers, was appointed to protect him.

Cyril came with fifty Egyptian bishops, and a number of bathmen, and "a multitude of women" from Alexandria, and such sailors in his fleet as he could depend upon. Arrived at Ephesus, he was joined by Memnon, bishop of that city, with fifty-two bishops, and a crowd of peasants whom he had drawn into the city. All told, 198 bishops were present at the opening of the council.

The council was to have met June 7, 431, but owing to delays on the part of the bishops of Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and Antioch, it did not open until June 22, and even then the bishops of Antioch had not arrived. But all the time was spent in preliminary disputes, winning partisans, and working up the populace. As Cyril had the great majority of the bishops on his side, and as the city was already devoted to the "Mother of God," Nestorius was at great disadvantage, and his enemies did not hesitate to let him know it, and to make him feel it. Cyril preached a sermon in which he paid the following idolatrous tribute to Mary: -

Blessed be thou, O Mother of God! Thou rich treasure of the world, inextinguishable lamp, crown of virginity, scepter of true doctrine, imperishable temple, habitation of Him whom no space can contain, mother and virgin, through whom He is, who comes in the name of the Lord. Blessed be thou, O Mary, . . . through whom the precious cross is adored throughout the world, through whom heaven rejoices and angels and archangels are glad, through whom the devil is disarmed and banished, through whom the fallen creature is restored to heaven, through whom every believing soul is saved.

GETTING TO BUSINESS

Cyril and his party urged that the council should be opened without any more delay. As the emperor had particularly required the presence of John of Antioch, Nestorius insisted on waiting till he came; and Candidian sustained Nestorius. Cyril refused, and he and his partisans assembled in the church of the Virgin Mary to proceed with the council. As soon as Count Candidian learned of this, he hastened to the church to forbid it, and there he fell into an ecclesiastical trap. He declared that they were acting in defiance of the imperial rescript which was to guide the council. They answered that as they had not seen the rescript, they did not know what it required of them. The Count read it to them.

565

This was just what they wanted. They declared that *the reading of the rescript legalised their meeting!* They greeted it with "loud and loyal clamours," pronounced the council begun, and commanded the count to withdraw from an assembly in which he had no longer any legal place.

Candidian protested against the unfairness of the proceedings; and then, he himself says, they "injuriously and ignominiously ejected" him. They next expelled all the bishops, sixty-eight in number, who were known to favor Nestorius, "and then commenced their proceedings as the legitimate Senate of Christendom."

One of Cyril's presbyters was secretary, and he formally opened the business of the council by reading a statement of the dispute that had brought them

together. Then the Emperor's letter calling the council was read. They sent four bishops to notify Nestorius to appear. He courteously refused to acknowledge the legality of their assembly, and the council, after further attempts to get him before it, went on without him. His propositions in opposition to Cyril's views were condemned with curses. Then when the list was completed, they all arose, and with one mighty roar that made the arches of the great church echo and re-echo, they bawled, "*Anathema! Anathema! The whole world unites in the excommunication! Anathema on him who holds communion with Nestorius!*"

All signed the sentence, depriving Nestorius of office, and then it was sent to him addressed "To Nestorius, a second Judas." All these proceedings, from the visit and protest of Candidian to the notice to Nestorius, were carried through in a single day and one prolonged sitting.

TORCH-LIGHT CELEBRATION OF THEIR WORK

IT was now right. Cries were sent all through the city to post up the decrees of the council, and to announce the joyful news that Mary was indeed the Mother of God. Everywhere they were met with loudest shouts of joy. The multitude rushed into the streets and poured toward the church. With lighted torches they escorted the bishops to their abodes, the women marching before and burning incense. The whole city was illuminated, and the songs and exultations continued far into the night. The demonstrations far outdid that of their lineal ancestors, who, when they tried to kill the apostle Paul, "all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out, Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

FIGHTING IT OUT

Fdays afterward John of Antioch with his bishops, arrived, and was greatly surprised to learn that the council was over. He got together about fifty bishops, who unanimously condemned the doctrines of Cyril and the proceedings of the council, and declared accursed all the bishops who had taken part in it. Cyril and Memnon answered with counter-curses.

Cyril's council sent messengers with overtures to John, who refused to see them. Then the council declared annulled all the acts of John's council, and deposed and excommunicated him and all the bishops of his party. John threatened to elect a new bishop of Ephesus in the place of Memnon, whom his council had deposed. A party tried to force their way into the cathedral; but finding it defended by Memnon with a strong garrison, they retreated. Memnon's forces made a strong sally, and drove them through the streets with clubs and stones, dangerously wounding many.

On learning that the council had been held, and Nestorius deposed before the arrival of John of Antioch, a letter had been sent down from the court, but was not received till this point in the contest. This letter annulled all the proceedings of the council, and commanded a reconsideration of the question by the whole assembly of the bishops now present. The letter also announced the

appointment of another imperial officer, one of the highest officials of the State, to assist Count Candidian.

The court had not made known in Constantinople the proceedings of the council, and the deposition of Nestorius. Cyril sent away a secret message to the monks of Constantinople, announcing that Nestorius had been deposed and excommunicated. The object of this was by stirring up those fanatics to influence the court. The weak-minded Theodosius II stood in great awe of the holiness of the monks. "His palace was so regulated that it differed little from a monastery." In 422 there died one of these who was noted for that kind of holiness that attaches to a monk, and Theodosius secured "his cassock of sackcloth of hair, which, although it was excessively filthy, he wore as a cloak, hoping that thus he should become a partaker, in some degree, of the sanctity of the deceased." (Socrates.) And now, on receipt of Cyril's message, a certain Dalmatius, who was famous for his filthy sanctity, left his cell, and put himself at the head of the whole herd of monks and archimandrites in and about Constantinople. They marched solemnly through the streets, and about everywhere as they passed, the populace burst into curses against Nestorius. They marched to the palace and lounged about the gates; but the chief influence at court was yet favorable to Nestorius, and their demonstrations had no immediate effect.

THE PUGILISTIC BISHOPS ALL ORTHODOX

BY this time the reports of both parties had reached the court. Theodosius, after examining both accounts, approved both, and pronounced Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon, all three deposed. As for their faith, he pronounced them "all three alike orthodox," but deposed them as a punishment which he said they all three alike deserved as being the chief authors of continual disturbances.

The new imperial commissioner was sent down to Ephesus with the letter announcing the Emperor's decision. As soon as he arrived, he summoned the bishops before him. Memnon refused to appear. Those who did come, however, had no sooner arrived than each party began to denounce the other. Cyril and his party pronounced the presence of Nestorius unendurable, and demanded that he be driven out. The party of Nestorius and John of Antioch, just as sternly demanded that Cyril should be expelled.

As neither party could have its way, they began to fight. The imperial commissioner had to command his soldiers to separate the pugilistic bishops, and stop the fight. When order had thus been enforced, the imperial letters were read. As soon as the sentence of deposition against Cyril and Memnon was read, the uproar began again, and another fight was prevented only by the arrest of the three chiefs. Nestorius and John of Antioch submitted, Memnon was hunted up, and also taken into custody, but Cyril escaped, and with his body-guard of bathmen, women, and sailors, sailed away to Alexandria.

The Emperor next commanded that eight bishops of each party should appear in his presence at Constantinople. They were sent, but, on account of the

desperate temper of the monks of Constantinople, it was counted unsafe for them to enter the city,

566

and therefore they were stopped at Chalcedon, on the opposite side of the Bosphorus. There the Emperor met them.

CYRIL BRIBES THE COURT AND WINE

HE appeared so decidedly to favor the party of Nestorius, that they thought the victory was already won. So certain were they of this that they even sent off letters to their party at Ephesus, instructing them to send up a message of thanks to him for his kindness. But at the fifth meeting all their brilliant prospects were blasted. Cyril, from his post in Alexandria, had sent up thousands of pounds of gold, with instructions to Maximian, Bishop of Constantinople, to add to it, not only the wealth of that Church, but his utmost personal effort to arouse "the languid zeal of the princess Pulcheria in the cause of Cyril, to propitiate all the courtiers, and, if possible, to satisfy their rapacity." (Milman.)

As avarice was one of the ruling passions of the eunuchs and women who ruled Theodosius II, as Gibbon says: -

Every avenue of the throne was assaulted with gold. Under the decent names of eulogies and benedictions, the courtiers of both sexes were bribed according to the measure of their rapaciousness. But their incessant demands despoiled the sanctuaries of Constantinople and Alexandria; and the authority of the patriarch was unable to silence the just murmur of his clergy, that a debt of sixty thousand pounds had already been contracted to support the expense of this scandalous corruption.

The efforts of Cyril were at last effective. The eunuch Scholasticus, one of the chief ministers of the emperor and the supporter of the cause of Nestorius at court, was bought; and it was this that caused the sudden revolution in the Emperor's conduct toward the party of Nestorius. In the fifth and last audience that he gave the deputies, the emperor told them at once that they had better abandon Nestorius, and admit both Cyril and Memnon to their communion. They remonstrated, but he would listen to nothing.

Shortly afterward an imperial edict was issued declaring Nestorius justly deposed, reinstating Cyril and Memnon in their respective sees, pronouncing all the other bishops alike orthodox, and giving them all leave to return to their homes. This dissolved the council.

Even before the dissolution of the council the emperor had sent an order to Nestorius, commanding him to leave Ephesus and return to the monastery whence he had been called to the archbishopric of Constantinople. By the persistent efforts of Celestine, bishop of Rome, and others, the emperor was induced - A.D. 436 - to banish him and two of his friends to Petra in Arabia. July 30, in the same year, an imperial edict was issued, commanding all who believed with Nestorius, to be called Simonians; that all the books by Nestorius should be sought for and publicly burnt; forbidding the Nestorius to hold any meetings anywhere, in city, in village, or in field; and if any such meeting was held, then the

place where it was held should be confiscated, as also the estates of all who should attend the meeting. Nestorius was not allowed to remain long at Petra. He was taken from there to a place away in the desert between Egypt and Libya, and from there dragged about from place to place till he died of the hardships inflicted, at what date is not certainly known, but about A.D. 440.

Such was the cause and such the conduct of the first Council of Ephesus, the third general council of the Catholic Church. And thus was established the Catholic doctrine that the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God.

The controversy went on, however, nor did it ever logically stop until December 8, A.D. 1854, when Pope Pius IX. established the actual divinity of the Virgin Mary, by announcing the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which reads as follows: -

By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, as well as by our own, we declare, promulgate, and define that the doctrine which teaches that the most blessed Virgin Mary, at the very instant of her conception, was kept free from every stain of original sin solely by the grace and prerogative of the omnipotent God, in consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was revealed by God, and must on that account be believed firmly and continually by all the faithful ones.

A. T. JONES.

September 16, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. Another Historic War of Words Begun" *The Present Truth* 13, 37 , pp. 580-582.

IT been decided that the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God, out of that decision there now arose another question involving the nature of Christ. That question was: How was the divine nature related to the human so that Mary could truly be called the mother of God? That is, Did the Divine nature become human? Or was the divine nature only joined to the human? In other words: Were there two natures in Christ? or was there but one?

PROMOTERS OF THE EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSY

IT was now A.D. 448, and the Eutychian controversy began. For a clear understanding of the case, it will be best formally to introduce the leading characters.

Theodosius II. was still emperor of the East; Valentinian III. was emperor of the West.

Eutyches was the abbot, or superior, of a monastery close to Constantinople. He had been the chief leader of the monks in the contest against Nestorius. "At his bidding the swarms of monks had thronged into the streets, defied the civil

power, terrified the emperor, and contributed, more than any other cause, to the final overthrow of Nestorius. He had grown old in the war against heresy." (Milman.)

Flavianus was now the occupant of the episcopal seat of Constantinople.

Chrysaphius was another eunuch, who had risen to the place of chief minister of Theodosius II., and was also the godson of Eutyches. He hoped also to place Eutyches on the episcopal throne of Constantinople. The accession of Flavianus to that dignity had prevented this design for the time being, but he still held it in mind. When Flavianus was installed in the bishopric, Chrysaphius demanded that he should make to the emperor the offering of gold that was customary on such occasions. Instead of bringing gold, Flavianus brought only three loaves of consecrated bread. This, Chrysaphius so employed as to prejudice the emperor against the archbishop.

Dioscorus was now archbishop of Alexandria. In this place it will be sufficient description of him simply to remark that he was a second Cyril, and leave it to the progress of the narrative to reveal him exactly as he was.

Leo I., "the Great," was bishop of Rome and regarded Dioscorus as "a prelate adorned with many virtues, and enriched with the gifts of the Holy Ghost."

Eusebius was bishop of Dorylaeum, to which office he had been appointed from a civil office in the household of Pulcheria. He also had been an early, ardent, and persistent adversary of Nestorius. This Eusebius now stood forth as the accuser of Eutyches.

At a small synod which had been called for another purpose at Constantinople, November 8, A.D. 448, Eusebius presented a written complaint against Eutyches, and asked that it be read. The complaint was to the effect that Eutyches had accused of Nestorianism orthodox teachers - even Eusebius himself. To the complaint was appended a demand that Eutyches should be summoned before the present synod to answer.

As for Eusebius himself, he announced that he was ready to prove that Eutyches had "no right to the name of Catholic," and that he was "far from the true faith."

The synod met again, November 12, and Eusebius renewed his complaint, with the addition that by conversations and discussions, Eutyches had misled many others.

581

He then suggested that the synod should give expression to the faith on the question that had been raised. Flavianus produced a letter which Cyril had written to Nestorius at the beginning of the controversy between them; the act of the Council of Ephesus which approved this letter; and another letter, which Cyril had written, about the close of that controversy. He required the bishops present to assent to the statements therein contained.

This they all signed, and then at the suggestion of suggestion of Eusebius it was sent to those who were absent for them to sign.

The next session of the synod was held November 15, and the deputies who had been sent to Eutyches reported that he had refused to come, for the reason that when he became a monk, he resolved never to leave the monastery to go to

any place whatever. Besides, he told them that the synod ought to know that Eusebius had long been his enemy, and that it was only out of malice that he now accused him. He said he was ready to affirm and subscribe the declarations of the Councils of Nice and Ephesus. The synod summoned him again, and again he refused to come. Then Eusebius declared, "The guilty have ever ways of escaping; Eutyches must now be brought here, even against his will." The synod then summoned him a third time.

At the next meeting a messenger came from Eutyches, saying that he was sick. Flavianus told him the synod would wait until Eutyches got well, but that then he must come. At the next meeting, the deputies who had been sent with the third summons, reported that Eutyches had told them he had sent his messenger to the archbishop and the synod that he might in his name give his assent to the declarations of the Councils of Nice and Ephesus, "and to all that Cyril had uttered." At this Eusebius broke in with the declaration, "Even if Eutyches will now assent, because some have told him that he must yield to necessity and subscribe, yet *I am not therefore in the wrong, for it is with reference, not to the future, but to the past, that I have accused him.*" The deputies then closed with the information that he would come to the synod on the next Monday.

STILL "SETTLING" THE FAITH

At the appointed time, Eutyches came; but he did not come alone. He came accompanied by a messenger of the emperor's privy council, and escorted by a great crowd composed of soldiers, and servants of the pretorian prefect, and "a rout of turbulent monks." The emperor's representative bore a letter to the synod, in which the emperor said: -

I wish the peace of the Church and the maintenance of the orthodox faith, which was asserted by the Fathers at Nicea and Ephesus; and because I know that the patrician Florentius is orthodox, and proved in the faith, therefore it is my will that he be present at the sessions of the synod, as the faith is in question.

At this the bishops cried out: -

Many years to the emperor, his faith is great! Many years to the pious, orthodox, high-priestly emperor!

Then the emperor's commissioner took his place, and Eusebius and Eutyches, the accuser and the accused, placed themselves in the midst. The first thing was to read the proceedings from the beginning up to this point, the vital part of which was the declarations to which they had demanded that Eutyches should give his assent. The reader read the Nicene Creed, and there was no dissent. He read the first of Cyril's letters, yet there was no dissent. He read the decision of the Council of Ephesus, and still there was no dissent. Then he began the second of Cyril's letters.

At this point Eusebius broke in. Seeing the reading was nearly finished with no sign of dissent, he was afraid that Eutyches would actually approve all the declarations, which doubtless he would have done. He therefore interrupted the

reading, with the exclamation, "Certainly such is not confessed by this man here; he has never believed this, but the contrary, and so he has taught every one who has come to him!" Florentius asked that Eutyches might be given a chance to say for himself "whether he agreed with what had been read." To this Eusebius vehemently objected, for the reason, said he, "*If Eutyches agrees to it, then I must appear as having been lightly a slanderer, and shall LOSE MY OFFICE*"!!

Florentius renewed his request that Eutyches might be allowed to answer; but Eusebius strenuously objected. And he only consented at the last, on the express condition that no prejudice should lodge against him, even though Eutyches should confess all that was required. Flavianus confirmed this condition, with the assurance that not the slightest disadvantage should come to Eusebius. But even then Eutyches was not allowed to answer in his own way, because the predicament in which Eusebius had found himself, involved in a measure the whole synod also, as they had given full credit to the charges of Eusebius, and had refused all the assurances of Eutyches that he agreed to all the documents which they had cited. Flavianus and Eusebius, therefore, in order to save themselves from defeat and perhaps deposition, if the matter should come to a general council, determined if possible to entrap Eutyches in some statement which they could condemn.

A SPECIMEN OF FIFTH-CENTURY CONTROVERSIALISM

The proceedings then were as follows: -

Flavianus, Florentius, and Basil of Seleucia. - "If thou dost acknowledge that Mary is of one substance with us, and that Christ has taken His manhood from her, then it follows of itself that He, according to His manhood, is also of one substance with us."

Eutyches. - "Consider well, I say not that the body of man has become the body of God, but I speak of a human body of God, and say that the Lord was made flesh of the Virgin. If you wish me to add further that His body is of one substance with ours, then I do this; but I do not understand this as though I denied that He is the Son of God. Formerly I did not generally speak of a unity of substance, but now I will do so, because your Holiness thus requires it."

Flavianus. - "Thou doest it then only of compulsion, and not because it is thy faith?"

Eutyches. - "I have not hitherto so spoken, but will do so now in accordance with the will of the synod."

Florentius. - "Dost thou believe that our Lord, who was born of the Virgin, is of one substance with us, and that after the incarnation He is of two natures or not?"

Eutyches. - "I confess that before the union he was of two natures, but after the union I confess only one nature."

At this "the whole council was in an uproar, and nothing was heard but anathemas and curses, each bishop there present striving to distinguish himself

above the rest by being the foremost in uttering the most bitter and severe his zeal could suggest." (Bower.) When the noise had ceased, Flavianus, in the name of the synod, demanded of Eutyches a public declaration of his faith in, and curse upon every view that did not accept, the doctrines which had been set forth by the synod.

Eutyches. - "I will now indeed, since the synod so requires, accept the manner of speech in question; but I find it neither in Holy Scripture nor in the Father collectively, and therefore can not pronounce a

582

curse upon the non-acceptance of the question, because that would be cursing the Fathers."

All together (springing to their feet). - "Let him be accursed!"

Flavianus. - "What does this man deserve who does not confess the right faith, but persists in his perverseness?"

Eutyches. - "I will now indeed accept the required manner of speaking in accordance with the will of the synod, but can not pronounce the curse."

Florentius. - "Dost thou confess two natures in Christ, and His unity of substance with us?"

Eutyches. - "I read in the writings of St. Cyril and St. Athanasius: before the union they speak of two natures, but after the union only of one."

Florentius. - "Dost thou confess two natures even after the union? If not, then wilt thou be condemned."

Eutyches. - "Let the writings of Cyril and Athanasius be read."

Basil of Seleucia. - "If thou dost not acknowledge two natures after the union also, then thou acceptest a mingling and confusion."

Florentius. - "He who does not say 'of two natures,' and who does not acknowledge two natures, has not the right faith."

All together. - "And he who accepts anything only by compulsion does not believe in it. Long live the emperors!"

Flavianus, announcing the sentence. - "Eutyches, a priest and archimandrite, has, by previous statements, and even now by his own confessions, shown himself to be entangled in the perversity of Valentinus and Apollinaris, without allowing himself to be won back to the genuine dogmas by our exhortation and instruction; therefore we, bewailing his complete perversity, have decreed, for the sake of Christ whom He has reviled, that he be deposed from every priestly office, expelled from our communion, and deprived of his headship over the convent. And all who henceforth hold communion with him, and have recourse to him, must know that they too are liable to the penalty of excommunication."⁵¹

The sentence was subscribed by all the synod, about thirty in number, and the synod was dissolved, November 22, A.D. 448.

It is not necessary to follow the particulars any farther; as in every other controversy, the dispute speedily spread far and wide. The decree of the synod was sent by Flavianus to all the other bishops for their indorsement. As soon as the action of the synod had been announced, Dioscorus, with all his powers, espoused the cause of Eutyches. Through Chrysaphius the Eunuch, Eutyches was already powerful at court, and added to this the disfavour in which Flavianus was already held by the emperor, the war assumed powerful proportions at the start.

The next step was, of course, for both parties to appeal to Leo, bishop of Rome. Eutyches felt perfectly safe in appealing to the because he had the words of Julius, bishop of Rome, saying, "It must not be said that there are two natures in Christ after their union; for as the body and soul form but one nature in man, so the divinity and humanity form but one nature in Christ." This being precisely the view of Eutyches, he felt perfectly confident in his appeal to Leo, for he could not suppose that Leo would contradict Julius. He shortly found that such a hope was altogether vain.

All hoping to win by a council, pressed the Emperor of the East to call one. But Theodosius, after his experience with the council at Ephesus, dreaded to have anything to do with another one, and sought to ward off another calamity of the kind. But there was no remedy; the thing had to come. Accordingly the two emperors announced that "doubts and controversies" had arisen respecting "the right faith," and appointed a general council to meet at Ephesus, August 1, 449 - to decide again what they believed. A. T. JONES.

September 23, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Second General Council of Ephesus" *The Present Truth* 13, 38 , pp. 597, 598.

THE emperors summoned the bishops to meet in Ephesus in August, 449, in order to settle the Eutychian controversy. Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, was appointed to preside in the council.

Leo, the Bishop of Rome was specially invited; and a certain Barsumas, a priest and superior of a monastery in Syria, was called as the representative of the monks.

Not willing to wait for the decision of the question by the coming general council, Leo took occasion to assert his authority as Roman Bishop over all. He sent a letter to Flavianus, Bishop of Constantinople, in which he indorsed the action of the Synod of Constantinople as far as it went, but reproved the synod for treating the matter so mildly as it had done, and himself took the strongest ground against Eutyches. In answer to the request of the emperor that he should attend the general council, Leo declined to attend in person, but promised to be present by *Legates a Latere*.

THE COUNCIL OPENED

THE council, composed of one hundred and forty-nine members, met in the church of the Virgin Mary at Ephesus, and was formally opened August 8, A.D. 449. Dioscorus, the president, was seated upon a high throne. Two imperial commissioners, Elpidius and Eulogius, were in attendance, with a strong body of troops to keep order in the council, and preserve peace in the city. The council was opened with the announcement by the secretary, that "the God-fearing emperors have from zeal for religion, convoked this assembly."

The emperor's instructions to the two imperial commissioners, ran as follows:

-

But lately the holy Synod of Ephesus has been engaged with the affairs of the impious Nestorius, and has pronounced a righteous sentence on him. Because, however, new controversies of faith have arisen, we have summoned a second synod to Ephesus, in order to destroy the evil to the roots. We have therefore selected Elpidius and Eulogius for the service of the faith in order to fulfill our commands in reference to the Synod of Ephesus. In particular, they must allow no disturbances, and they must arrest every one who arouses such, and inform the emperor of him; they must take care that everything is done in order, must be present at the decisions, and take care that the synod examine the matter quickly and carefully, and give information of the same to the emperor. Those bishops who previously sat in judgment on Eutyches (at Constantinople) are to be present at the proceedings at Ephesus, but are not to vote, since their own previous sentence must be examined anew. Further, no other question is to be brought forward at the synod, and especially no question of money, before the settlement of the question of faith. By a letter to the proconsul, we have required support for the commissioners from the civil and military authorities, so that they may be able to fulfill our commissions, which are as far above other business as divine above human things.

Following this was read a letter from the emperor to the council itself, in which he said: -

The emperor has adjudged it necessary to call this assembly of bishops, that they might cut off this controversy and all its diabolical roots, exclude the adherents of Nestorius from the Church, and preserve the orthodox faith firm and unshaken; since the whole hope of the emperor and the power of the empire, depend on the right faith in God and the holy prayers of the synod.

The council was now formally opened, and according to the instructions of the emperor they proceeded first to consider the faith. But upon this a dispute at once arose as to what was meant by the faith. Some insisted that this meant that the council should first declare its faith; but Dioscorus interpreted it to mean not that the faith should first be declared, for this the former council had already

done, but rather that they were to consider which of the parties agreed with what the true faith explains. And then he cried out: "*Or will you alter the faith of the holy Fathers!*" In answer to this there were cries, "*Accursed be he who makes alterations in it; accursed be he who ventures to discuss the faith.*"

Next Dioscorus took a turn by which he covertly announced what was expected of the council. He said: "At Nicea and at Ephesus the true faith has already been proclaimed; but although there have been two synods, the faith is but one." In response to this there were loud shouts from the assembly, "*No one dare add anything or take anything away. A great guardian of the faith is Dioscorus. Accursed be he who still discusses the faith; the Holy Ghost speaks by Dioscorus.*"

EUTYCHES PRONOUNCED ORTHODOX

EUTYCHES was now introduced to the council, that he might explain his faith. He first commended himself to the holy Trinity, and censured the Synod of Constantinople. He then handed to the secretary a written confession, in which he repeated the Nicene Creed, indorsed the acts of the Council of Ephesus and the doctrine of the Holy Father Cyril, and cursed all heretics from Nestorius clear back to Simon Magus, who had been rebuked by the apostle Peter. He then gave an account of the proceedings against himself. When this had been read, Flavianus demanded that Eusebius should be heard; but the imperial commissioners stopped him with the statement that they were not called together to judge Eutyches anew, but to judge those who had judged him, and that therefore the only legitimate business of the council was to examine the acts of the Synod of Constantinople.

Accordingly the proceedings of that synod were taken up. All went smoothly enough until the reader came to the point where the synod had demanded of Eutyches that he should acknowledge two natures in Christ *after* the incarnation. When this was read, there was an uproar against it in the council, as there had been against the statement of Eutyches in the synod; only the uproar here was as much greater than there, as the council was greater than the synod. The council cried with one voice, "*Away with Eusebius! banish Eusebius! let him be burned alive! As he cuts asunder the two natures in Christ, so be he cut asunder!*"

Dioscorus asked: "Is the doctrine that there are two natures after the incarnation to be tolerated?" Aloud the council re-

598

plied: "*Accursed be he who says so.*" Again Dioscorus cried: "I have your voices, I must have your hands. He that can not cry loud enough to be heard, let him lift up his hands." Then with uplifted hands the council unanimously bellowed: "*Whoever admits the two natures, let him be accursed; let him be driven out, torn in pieces, massacred!*"

Eutyches was then unanimously pronounced orthodox and declared restored to the communion of the Church, to the government of his monastery, and to all his former privileges; and he was exalted as a hero for "his courage in daring to

teach, and his firmness in daring to defend, the true and genuine doctrine of the Fathers. And on this occasion, those distinguished themselves the most by their panegyrics, who had most distinguished themselves by their invectives before." (Bower.)

SECURING "UNITY" WITH THE HELP OF TROOPS

DIOSCORUS having everything in his own power, now determined to visit vengeance upon the archbishop of Constantinople. Under pretence that it was for the instruction of his colleagues, he directed that the acts of the previous Council of Ephesus concerning the Nicene Creed, etc., should be read. As soon as the reading was finished, he said: "You have now heard that the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who teaches otherwise than the Nicene Creed, or makes alterations in it, and raises new or further questions. Every one must now give his opinion in writing as to whether those who, in their theological inquiries, go beyond the Nicene Creed, are to be punished or not."

This was aimed directly at Flavianus and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, as they had expressed the wish that the expression "two natures" might be inserted in the Nicene Creed. To the statement of Dioscorus, several bishops responded at once: "Whoever goes beyond the Nicene Creed is not to be received as a Catholic." Then Dioscorus continued: "As then the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who alters anything in the Nicene faith, it follows that Flavianus of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylaeum must be deposed from their ecclesiastical dignity. I pronounce, therefore, their deposition, and every one of those present shall communicate his view of this matter. Moreover everything will be brought to the knowledge of the emperor."

Flavianus replied: "*I except against you,*" and, to take time by the forelock, placed a written appeal in the hands of the legates of Leo. Several of the friends of Flavianus left their seats, and prostrating themselves before the throne of Dioscorus, begged him not to inflict such a sentence, and above all that he would not ask them to sign it. He replied, "*Though my tongue were to be cut out, I would not alter a single syllable of it.*" Trembling for their own fate if they should refuse to subscribe, the pleading bishops now embraced his knees, and entreated him to spare them; but he angrily exclaimed: "*What! do you think to raise a tumult? Where are the counts?*"

At this the counts ordered the doors to be thrown open and the proconsul of Asia entered with a strong body of armed troops, followed by a confused multitude of furious monks, armed with chains, and clubs, and stones. Then there was a general scramble of the "holy bishops" to find a refuge. Some took shelter behind the throne of Dioscorus, others crawled under the benches - all concealed themselves as best they could. Dioscorus declared: "*The sentence must be signed. If any one objects to it, let him take care; for it is with me he has to deal.*" The bishops, when they found that they were not to be massacred at once, crept out from under the benches and from other places of concealment, and returned trembling to their seats.

PEACE IS DECLARED RESTORED

THEN Dioscorus took a blank paper, and accompanied by the Bishop of Jerusalem, and attended by an armed guard, passed through the assembly and had each bishop in succession to sign it. All signed but the legates of the bishop of Rome. Then the blank was filled up by Dioscorus with a charge of heresy against Flavianus, and with the sentence which he had just pronounced upon Flavianus and Eusebius. When the sentence was written, Flavianus again said: "I except against you;" upon which Dioscorus with some other bishops rushed upon him, and with Barsumas crying out, "Strike him! strike him dead!" they beat him and banged him about, and then threw him down and kicked him and tramped upon him until he was nearly dead; then sent him off immediately to prison, and the next morning ordered him into exile. At the end of the second day's journey he died of the ill usage he had received in the council.

All these proceedings, up to the murder of Flavianus, were carried out on the first day. The council continued three days longer, during which Dioscorus secured the condemnation and deposition of Domnus of Antioch, and several other principal bishops, although they had signed his blank paper, for having formerly opposed Cyril and Eutyches. He then put an end to the council, and returned to Alexandria.

The Emperor Theodosius, whom Leo had praised as having the heart of a priest, issued an edict in which he approved and confirmed the decrees of the council, and commanded that all the bishops of the empire should immediately subscribe to the Nicene Creed. He involved in the heresy of Nestorius, all who were opposed to Eutyches, and commanded that no adherent of Nestorius or Flavianus should ever be raised to a bishopric. "By the same edict, persons of all ranks and conditions were forbidden, on pain of perpetual banishment, to harbor or conceal any who taught, held, or favored, the tenets of Nestorius, Flavianus, and the deposed bishops; and the books, comments, homilies, and other works, written by them or passing under their names, were ordered to be publicly burnt." He then wrote to Valentinian III., that by the deposition of the turbulent prelate Flavianus, "peace had in the end been happily restored to all the churches in his dominions."

As the doctrine which the council had established was contrary to that which Leo had published in his letter, he denounced the council as a "synod of robbers," refused to recognise it at all, and called for another general council. But in every respect this council was just as legitimate and as orthodox as any other one that had been held from the Council of Nice to that day. It was regularly called; it was regularly opened; *the proceedings were all perfectly regular*; and when it was over, the proceedings were regularly approved and confirmed by the imperial authority. In short, there is no element lacking to make the second Council of Ephesus as thoroughly regular and orthodox as was the first Council of Ephesus, which is held by the Church of Rome to be entirely orthodox; or even as orthodox as was the Council of Nice itself.

A. T. JONES.

September 30, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. Steps by Which the Bishops of Rome Secured Their Papal Supremacy" *The Present Truth* 13, 39 , pp. 613-615.

LEO, Bishop of Rome, called "the Great," persisted in his refusal to recognise the validity of the acts of the second Council of Ephesus, and insisted that another general council should be called.

As it was the will of Leo alone that made, or could now make, the late council anything else than strictly regular and orthodox according to the Catholic system of discipline and doctrine, it is evident that if another general council were called, it would have to be subject to the will of Leo; and its decision upon questions of the faith would be but the expression of the will of Leo. This is precisely what Leo aimed at, and nothing less than this would satisfy him.

Leo had now been bishop of Rome eleven years. He was a full-blooded Roman in all that that term implies. "All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone." (Milman.)

Yet Leo was not the first one in whom this spirit was manifested. His aspirations were but the culmination of the arrogance of the bishopric of Rome which had been constantly growing. To trace the subtle, silent, often violent, yet always constant, growth of this spirit of supremacy and encroachment of absolute authority, is one of the most curious studies in all history. Not only was there never an opportunity lost, but opportunities were created, for the bishop of Rome to assert authority and to magnify his power. Supremacy in discipline and in jurisdiction was asserted by Victor and Stephen; but it was not until the union of Church and State that the field was fully opened to the arrogance of the bishopric of Rome. A glance at the successive bishops from the union of Church and State to the accession of Leo, will give a better understanding of the position and pretensions of Leo than could be obtained in any other way.

MELCHIADES

was bishop of Rome from July 2, A.D. 311, to December, 314, and therefore, as already related, was in the papal chair when the union of Church and State was formed, and took a leading part in that evil intrigue. And soon the bishopric of Rome began to receive its reward in imperial favours. Melchiades was succeeded by -

SYLVESTER, A.D. 314-336

In the very year of his accession, the Council of Arles bestowed upon the bishopric of Rome the distinction and the office of notifying all the churches of the proper time to celebrate Easter. And in 325 the general Council of Nice recognized the bishop of Rome the first bishop of the empire. Under him the organisation of the Church was formed upon the model of the organization of the State. He was succeeded by -

MARK, A.D. 336

whose term continued only from January till October, and was therefore so short that nothing occurred worthy of record in this connection. He was succeeded by -

JULIUS, 336-352

under whom the Council of Sardica - 347 - made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal, upon which "single precedent" the bishopric of Rome built "a universal right." Julius was succeeded by -

LIBERIUS, 352-366

who excommunicated Athanasius and then approved his doctrine, and carried on the contest with Constantius, in which he incurred banishment for the Catholic faith; and then became Arian, then Semi-Arian, and then Catholic again. He was succeeded by -

DAMASUS, 366-384

In his episcopate, Valentinian I. enacted a law making the bishop of Rome the judge of other bishops. A council in Rome, A.D. 378, enlarged his powers of judging, and petitioned the emperor Gratian to exempt the bishop of Rome from all civil jurisdiction except that of the emperor alone; to order that he be judged by none except a council, or the emperor direct; and that the imperial power should be exerted to compel obedience to the judgment of the bishop of Rome concerning other bishops. Gratian granted part of their request. and it was made to count for all. Damasus was succeeded by -

SIRICIUS, 384-389

who issued the first decretal. A decretal is "an answer sent by the pope to applications to him as head of the Church, for guidance in cases involving points of doctrine or discipline." The directions of Siricius in this decretal were to be strictly observed under penalty of excommunication. It was dated February 11, A.D. 385. He convened a council in Rome, which decreed that "no one should presume to ordain a bishop without the knowledge of the apostolic see." (Bower.) He was succeeded by -

ANASTASIUS I, 389-402

who, though very zealous to maintain all that his predecessors had asserted or claimed, added nothing in particular himself. He condemned as a heretic, Origen, who had been dead one hundred and fifty years, and who is now a Catholic saint. He was succeeded by -

INNOCENT I, 402-417

Innocent was an indefatigable disciplinarian, and kept up a constant cor-
614
respondence with all the West, as well as with the principal bishoprics of the East, establishing rules, dictating to councils, and issuing decretals upon all the affairs of the church.

Hitherto the dignity of the bishopric of Rome had been derived from the dignity of the city of Rome. Innocent now asserted that the superior dignity of the bishopric of Rome was derived from Peter, whom he designated the Prince of the Apostles; and that in this respect it took precedence of that of Antioch because that in Rome Peter had accomplished what he had only begun in Antioch. He demanded the absolute obedience of all churches in the West, because, as he declared, Peter was the only apostle that ever preached in the West; and that all the churches in the West had been founded by Peter, or by some successor of his. This was all false, and he knew it, but that made no difference to him; he unblushingly asserted it, and then, upon that, asserted that all ecclesiastical matters throughout the world are, by *Divine right*, to be referred to the apostolic see, before they are finally decided in the provinces.

At the invasion of Alaric and his siege of Rome, Innocent headed an embassy to the Emperor Honorius to mediate for a treaty of peace between Alaric and the emperor. "Upon the mind of Innocent appears first distinctly to have dawned the vast conception of Rome's universal ecclesiastical supremacy, dim as yet, and shadowy, yet full and comprehensive in its outline." (Milman.) He was succeeded by -

ZOSIMUS, 417-418

who asserted with all the arrogance of Innocent, all that Innocent had claimed. He not only boasted with Innocent that to him belonged the power to judge all causes, but that the judgment "is irrevocable;" and accordingly established the use of the dictatorial expression, "For so it has pleased the apostolic see," as sufficient authority for all things that he might choose to command. And upon this assumption, those canons of the Council of Sardica which made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal, he passed off upon the bishops of Africa as the canons of the Council of Nice, in which he was actually followed by Leo, and put tradition upon a level with the Scriptures. He was succeeded by -

BONIFACE I., 419-422

who added nothing to the power or authority of the bishopric of Rome, but diligently and "conscientiously" maintained all that his predecessors had asserted, in behalf of what he called "the just rights of the see," in which he had been placed. He was succeeded by -

CELESTINE I., 422-432

who in a letter written A.D. 438, plainly declared: -

As I am appointed by God to watch over His church, it is incumbent upon me everywhere to root out evil practices, and introduce good ones in their room, for my pastoral vigilance is restrained by no bounds, but extends to all places where Christ is known and adored.

It was he who appointed the terrible Cyril his vicegerent to condemn Nestorius, and to establish the doctrine that Mary was the mother of God. He was succeeded by -

SIXTUS III., 432-440

who, as others before, added nothing specially to the papal claims, yet yielded not an iota of the claims already made. He was succeeded by -

LEO I, "THE GREAT," A.D. 440-461

Such was the heritage bequeathed to Leo by his predecessors, and the arrogance of his own native disposition, with the grand opportunities which offered during his long rule, added to it a thousandfold. At the very moment of his election he was absent in Gaul on a mission as mediator to reconcile a dispute between two of the principal men of the empire. He succeeded in his mission, and was hailed as "the Angel of Peace," and the "Deliverer of the Empire." In a sermon, he showed what his ambition embraced. He portrayed the powers and glories of the former Rome as they were reproduced in Catholic Rome. The conquests and universal sway of heathen Rome were but the promise of the conquests and universal sway of Catholic Rome. Romulus and Remus were but the precursors of Peter and Paul. Rome of former days had by her armies conquered the earth and sea: now again, by the see of the holy blessed Peter as head of the world, Rome through her divine religion would dominate the earth. ⁶¹

LEO CAINS THE SUMMIT OF PAPAL AMBITION

IN A.D. 445, "at the avowed instance of Leo" and at the dictation, if not in the actual writing of Leo, Valentinian III. issued a "perpetual edict" "commanding all bishops to pay an entire obedience and submission to the orders of the apostolic

see;" "to observe, as law, whatever it should please the bishop of Rome to command;" "that the bishop of Rome had a right to command what he pleased;" and "whoever refused to obey the citation of the Roman pontiff should be compelled to do so by the moderator of the province" in which the recalcitrant bishop might dwell.

This made his authority absolute over all the West, and now he determined to extend it over the East, and so make it universal. As soon as he learned of the decision of the Council of Ephesus, he called a council in Rome, and by it rejected all that had been done by the council at Ephesus, and wrote to the emperor, Theodosius II., "entreating him in the name of the holy Trinity to declare null what had been done there," and so let the matter remain until a general council could be held in Italy. Leo also wrote to Pulcheria, sist of Theodosius, appointing her a legate of St. Peter, and entreating her to use her influence in his favour.

As soon as it was learned in the East what strenuous efforts Leo was making to have another general council called, many of the bishops who had condemned Flavianus began to make overtures to the party of Leo, so that if another council should be called, they might escape condemnation. Dioscorus, of Alexandria, who had presided at the council that approved Eutches, learning this, called a synod of ten bishops in Alexandria, and solemnly excommunicated Leo, bishop of Rome, for presuming to judge anew, and annul what had already been judged and finally determined by a general council.

Leo finally sent four legates to the court of Theodosius, to urge upon him the necessity of another general council, but before they reached Constantinople, Theodosius was dead; and having left no heir to his throne, Pulcheria, Leo's legate, became empress. As there was no precedent in Roman history to sanction the rule of a woman alone, she married a senator by the name of Marcian, and invested him with the imperial robes, while she retained and exercised the imperial authority. The first thing they did was to burn Chrysaphius, the minister of Theodosius, who had championed Eutyches. The new authority received Leo's legates with great respect, and returned answer that they had nothing so much at heart as the unity of the church and the extirpation of heresies, and that therefore they would call a general council. Not long after-

615

ward they wrote to Leo, inviting him to assist in person at the proposed council.

No sooner was it known that Theodosius was dead, and Pulcheria and Marcian in power, than the bishops who had indorsed and praised Eutyches, changed their opinions and condemned him and all who held with him. Anatolius, an ardent defender of Eutyches, who had succeeded Flavianus as archbishop of Constantinople, and had been ordained by Dioscorus himself,

assembled in great haste all the bishops, abbots, presbyters, and deacons, who were then in Constantinople, and in their presence not only received and signed the famous letter of Leo to Flavianus, concerning the incarnation, but at the same time anathematised Nestorius and Eutyches, their doctrine, and all their

followers, declaring that he professed no other faith but what was held and professed by the Roman Church and by Leo. (Bower.)

The example of Anatolius was followed by other bishops who had favored Eutyches, and by most of those who had acted in the late council,

and nothing was heard but anathemas against Eutyches, whom most of those who uttered them, had but a few months before, honored as new apostle, and as the true interpreter of the doctrine of the Church and the Fathers. (Bower.)

By an imperial message dated May 17, A.D. 451, a general council was summoned to meet at Nice in Bithynia, the first of September. The council met there accordingly, but an invasion of the Huns from Illyricum made it necessary for Marcian to remain in the capital; and therefore the council was removed from Nice to Chalcedon. Accordingly at Chalcedon there assembled the largest council ever yet held, the number of bishops being six hundred and thirty.

A. T. JONES.

October 7, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Pope Made Author of the Faith" *The Present Truth* 13, 40 , pp. 626-628.

HOW THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON WAS MANAGED

THE six hundred and thirty bishops met in the first session of the Council of Chalcedon October 8, A.D. 451. Marcian, the emperor of the East, was represented by commissioners, and Leo, Bishop of Rome, who had got the council summoned in order to undo the work of the Council of Ephesus, was represented by legates.

As soon as the council opened the legates demanded the withdrawal of Dioscorus, Archbishop of Alexandria, and the presiding bishop in the preceding council which had approved Eutyches. The commissioners argued against the demand, but by threats of leaving the council the legates of Rome overbore the emperor's representatives. Dioscorus took his place among the accused, and a long list of charges against him was read by Eusebius, the original accuser of Eutyches.

A FRIGHTFUL STORM

THE late council at Ephesus had excommunicated Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus. Theodoret had appealed to Leo. Leo had re-instated him, and the emperor Marcian had specially summoned him to this council. Theodoret had arrived, and at this point in the proceedings, the imperial commissioners directed that he should be admitted to the council. "The actual introduction of Theodoret caused a frightful storm." (Hefele.) A faint estimate of this frightful storm may be

formed from the following account of it, which is copied bodily from the report of the council: -

And when the most reverend bishop Theodoret entered, the most reverend the bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine (the party of Dioscorus) shouted out, "Mercy upon us! the faith is destroyed. The canons of the Church excommunicate him. Turn him out! turn out the teacher of Nestorius."

On the other hand, the most reverend the bishops of the East, of Thrace, of Pontus, and of Asia, shouted out, "We were compelled (at the former council) to subscribe our names to blank papers; we were scourged into submission. Turn out the Manicheans! Turn out the enemies of Flavian; turn out the adversaries of the faith!"

Dioscorus, the most reverend bishop of Alexandria, said, "Why is Cyril to be turned out? It is he whom Theodoret has condemned."

The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, "Turn out the murderer Dioscorus. Who knows not the deeds of Dioscorus?"

The most reverend the bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine shouted out, "Long life to the empress!"

The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, "Turn out the murderers!"

The most reverend the bishops of Egypt shouted out, "The empress turned out Nestorius; long life to the Catholic empress! The orthodox synod refuses to admit Theodoret."

Here there was a "momentary" lull in the storm, of which Theodoret instantly took advantage, and stepped forward to the commissioners with "a petition to the emperors," which was really a complaint against Dioscorus, and asked that it be read. The commissioners said that the regular business should be proceeded with, but that Theodoret should be admitted to a seat in the council, because the bishop of Antioch had vouched for his orthodoxy. Then the storm again raged. Some shouted that he was worthy, others called, "Turn him out!"

At this stage the commissioners were enabled by a special exertion of their authority to allay the storm. They plainly told the loudmouthed bishops, "Such vulgar shouts are not becoming in bishops, and can do no good to either party."

When the tumult had been subdued, the council proceeded to business. First

627

there were read all the proceedings from the beginning of the Synod of Constantinople against Eutyches clear down to the end of the late Council of Ephesus; during which there was much shouting and counter-shouting after the manner of that over the introduction of Theodoret, but which need not be repeated.

This session ran into the night, which was made hideous by the cries of the bishops. In the end Dioscorus was condemned. Many of his party now forsook him and asked for pardon, confessing their error, and the council condemned only Dioscorus to deposition.

THE SECOND SESSION, OCTOBER 10

As soon as the council had been opened, the direction was given by -

The imperial commissioners: - "Let the synod now declare what the true faith is, so that the erring may be brought back to the right way."

The bishops protested that no new formula could be drawn up, but that already laid down (at Nice, Constantinople, and the first of Ephesus,) was to be held fast. These were read and approved, and Leo's letter setting forth his disapproval of Eutyches.

This was acclaimed as the voice of Peter, and the true faith. As there were some points in Leo's letter, however, which one or two doubted, the council was adjourned.

As the council was about to be dismissed, some bishops entered a request that the bishops who had taken a leading part in the late council of Ephesus, should be forgiven!

This led to another great uproar, similar to that over the introduction of Theodoret. In the midst of this uproar, the imperial commissioners put an end to the session. The recess continued only two days.

THE THIRD SESSION, OCTOBER 13

The first step taken at this session was by Eusebius of Doryleum, who proudly stepped forward to secure by the council his vindication as the champion of orthodoxy, and prayed for punishment.

Following this, Dioscorus was charged with enormous crimes, with lewdness and debauchery to the great scandal of his flock; with styling himself the king of Egypt, and attempting to usurp the sovereignty. Dioscorus was not present, and after being summoned three times without appearing, Leo's legates gave a recapitulation of the crimes charged against him, and then pronounced the following sentence: -

Leo, Archbishop of the great and ancient Rome, by us and the present synod, with the authority of St. Peter, on whom the Catholic Church and orthodox faith are founded, divests Dioscorus of the episcopal dignity, and declares him henceforth incapable of exercising any sacerdotal or episcopal functions.

FOURTH SESSION, OCTOBER 17

At this session, the discussion of the faith was resumed.

The commissioners. - "What has the reverend synod now decreed concerning the faith?"

The papal legate. - "The holy synod holds fast the rule of faith which was ratified by the Fathers at Nicea and by those at Constantinople. Moreover, in the second place, it acknowledges that exposition of this creed which was given by Cyril at Ephesus. In the third place, *the letter of the most holy man Leo*, archbishop of

all churches, who condemned the heresy of Nestorius and Eutyches, *shows quite clearly what is the true faith, and this faith the synod also holds, and allows nothing to be added to it or taken from it.*

All thereupon voted to abide by the creeds of Nice and Constantinople and to believe "as Leo does." The five bishops who had been associated with Dioscorus were formally received back into the council. As they took their place, the council cried,

God has done this! Many years to the emperors, to the Senate, to the commissioners! The union is complete, and peace given to the churches!

The commissioners next announced that the day before, a number of Egyptian bishops had handed in a confession of faith to the emperor, who wished that it should be read to the council. The bishops were called in and took their places, and their confession was read. It was seen that the confession did not curse Eutyches by name, and the council demanded that the Egyptian bishops should subscribe to Leo's letter and pronounce the curse. The Egyptians asked for time, as they were under the Archbishop of Alexandria and wished to confer with him. They feared for their lives if they return to Egypt after cursing Eutyches. Leo's legates and the council insisted on their immediate assent.

The Egyptians. - "We shall be killed, we shall be killed, if we do it. We will rather be made away with here by you than there. Let an archbishop for Egypt be here appointed, and then we will subscribe and assent. Have mercy on our gray hairs! Anatolius of Constantinople knows that in Egypt all the bishops must obey the archbishop of Alexandria. Have pity upon us; we would rather die by the hands of the emperor, and by yours than at home. Take our bishoprics, if you will, elect an archbishop of Alexandria, we do not object."

It was eventually decided that the Egyptian bishops should not be allowed to leave until a new Archbishop of Alexandria was elected.

During the rest of the session matters were discussed which had no direct bearing upon the establishment of the faith.

FIFTH SESSION, OCTOBER 22

The object of this session was the establishment of the faith; and the object was accomplished. The first thing was the reading of a form of doctrine which, according to arrangement made in the second session, had been framed, and also the day before had been "unanimously approved." As soon as it was read, however, there was an objection made against it.

John bishop of Germanicia - "This formula is not good; it must be improved."

Then followed a discussion in which the Roman legates demanded that the letter of Leo should be agreed to or they would withdraw, and call a council in the West.

The following extract from the proceedings shows how they were disputing merely about words, and how the authority of Leo, Bishop of Rome, was asserted to establish the faith to be received.

The commissioners. - "Dioscorus has rejected the expression, 'There are two natures in Christ,' and on the contrary has accepted 'of two natures;' Leo on the other hand says, 'In Christ there are two natures *united*;' which will you follow, the most holy Leo, or Dioscorus?"

The whole council. - "*We believe with Leo, not with Dioscorus; whoever opposes this is a Eutychian.*"

The commissioners. - "*Then you must also receive into the creed, the doctrine of Leo, which has been stated.*"

By imperial authority a commission of bishops was appointed to draw up the formula of the true faith. After a short consultation they returned, bringing in the creeds of Nice and Constantinople, with a long preamble, adding the letter of Leo to the statement of Catholic doctrine, and affirming the two natures in Christ, united in one person.

When the reading of this report of the commission was finished, the council adjourned.

SIXTH SESSION, OCTOBER 25

At this session the emperor Marcian and the empress Pulcheria, came with their whole court to ratify the decision which the council in the previous session had reached concerning the faith. Marcian of course approved the faith now "settled" by the council and as declared by "the letter of the holy Pope Leo of Rome." He was hailed as a new Constantine, a new Paul, and Pulcheria as a defender of the faith.

The emperor then "gave thanks to Christ that unity in religion had again
628
been restored, and threatened all, as well private men and soldiers as the clergy, with heavy punishment if they should again stir up controversies respecting the faith."

Instead of dismissing them, however, the emperor commanded them to remain "three or four days longer," and to continue the proceedings. The council continued until November 1, during which time ten sessions were held, in which there was much splitting of theological hairs, pronouncing curses, and giving the lie; and an immense amount of hooting and yelling in approval or condemnation. None of it, however, is worthy of any further notice except to say that twenty-eight canons were established, the last of which confirmed to the archbishopric of Constantinople the dignity which had been bestowed by the Council of Constantinople seventy years before, and set at rest all dispute on the matter of jurisdiction by decreeing that in its privileges and ecclesiastical relations it should be exalted to, and hold, the first place after that of Old Rome.

NO MORE TO BE LEARNED

February 7, A.D. 452, the emperor Marcian, in the name of himself and Valentinian III., issued the following edict confirming the creed of the council, and forbidding anybody to inquire further about the faith: -

All unholy controversy must now cease, as he is certainly impious and sacrilegious who, after the declaration made by so many bishops, thinks that there still remains something for his own judgment to examine. For it is evidently a sign of extreme folly when a man seeks for a deceptive light in broad day. He who, after discovery has been made of the truth, still inquires after something else, seeks for falsehood.

Severe penalties were threatened any who should question the creed established or dispute respecting religion. The faith had been "settled" and all was to be peace and harmony. Eutychus died before the sentence was enforced, and Dioscorus died in exile.

Eutyches and Dioscorus were sentenced to banishment. Eutyches died before the sentence was enforced, and Dioscorus died in exile.

As Leo had published his letters rejecting the canon concerning the see of Constantinople, and had not yet formally published any approval of the doctrinal decree of the council, the report went abroad throughout the East that he had repudiated all the decisions of the council. The report, therefore, was a new incentive to all who disagreed with the creed of the council, and "heresy" became again so prevalent that February 15, A.D. 453, Marcian addressed a letter to Leo, earnestly beseeching him as soon as possible to issue a decree in confirmation of the decision of the Council of Chalcedon, "so that no one might have any further doubt as to the judgment of his Holiness." March 21, Leo responded giving his approval as to the statement of the faith, but rebuking the ambition of the Bishop of Constantinople.

THE POPE OF ROME ESTABLISHED THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH

As the necessity for the Council of Chalcedon was created by the will of Leo alone, as the council distinctly acknowledged Leo as its head, as his letter was made the test, and the expression of the faith, and with that all were required to agree, as the decisions of the council were submitted to him for approval, and were practically of little or no force until he had formally published his approval, and then only such portion as he did approve; as, in short, everything in connection with the council sprung from his will and returned in subjection to his will, - Leo, and in him the bishopric of Rome, thus became essentially *the fountain of the Catholic faith*.

It is not at all surprising, therefore, that Leo should officially declare that the doctrinal decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were inspired. This is precisely what he did. In a letter to Bishop Julian of Cos (Epistle 144), he said: -

The decrees of Chalcedon are inspired by the Holy Spirit, and are to be received as the definition of the faith for the welfare of the whole world.

And in a letter (Epistle 145) to the Emperor Leo, who succeeded Marcian in A.D. 457, he said: -

The Synod of Chalcedon was held by Divine inspiration.

As, therefore, the doctrinal decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were the expression of the will of Leo; and as these decrees were published and held as of Divine inspiration; by this turn, it was a very short cut *to the infallibility of the Bishop of Rome.*

By reviewing the story of this Eutychian controversy which was used to assert the headship of Rome, it will be seen that Leo and the Council of Chalcedon came so near to saying what Eutyches had said, that no difference can be perceived. Eutyches had been condemned as a heretic for saying that in Christ, after the incarnation, the two natures *are one*. Now Leo and the council express the orthodox faith by saying that in Christ there are two natures *united in one*. In other words, Eutyches was a condemned heretic for saying that Christ is "*of two natures;*" while Leo and the council were declared everlastingly orthodox for saying that Christ is "*in two natures.*" In Greek, the difference was expressed in the two small words, *ek* and *en*; which like the two large words, *Homoousion* and *Homoiousion*, in the beginning of the controversy between Alexander and Arius, differed only in a single letter. And like that also, the meaning of the two words is so "*essentially the same,*" that he who believes either, believes the other.

And that is all that there was in this dispute, or in any of those before it, in itself. Yet out there came constant and universal violence, hypocrisy, bloodshed, and murder, which speedily wrought the utter ruin of the empire, and established a despotism over thought which remained supreme for ages, and which is yet asserted and far too largely assented to.

The whole world having been thus once more brought to the "unity of the faith," the controversy, the confusion, and the violence, went on worse than before. But as the *faith of Leo* which was established by the Council of Chalcedon, "substantially completes the orthodox Christology of the ancient Church," and has "passed into all the confessions of the Protestant churches" (Schaff); and as the work of these four general councils - Nice, Constantinople, first of Ephesus, and Chalcedon - was to put dead human formulas in the place of the living oracles of God; *a woman in the place of Christ;* and MAN IN THE PLACE OF GOD; it is not necessary to follow any farther the course of ambitious strife and contentious deviltry, which makes up the story of the councils.

A. T. JONES.

October 21, 1897

"How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Church in the World and the World in the Church" *The Present Truth* 13, 42 , pp. 661, 662.

THE course of the bishops in assuming civil authority led to still further evils. Ecclesiastical officers especially the bishoprics, were the only ones in the empire that were elective. All manner of vile and criminal characters had been brought into the church. Consequently these had a voice in the elections. It became, therefore, an object for the unruly, violent, and criminal classes to secure the election of such men as would use the episcopal influence in their interests, and shield them from justice.

EPISCOPAL OFFICE SEEKING

"As soon as a bishop had closed his eyes, the metropolitan issued a commission to one of his suffragans to administer the vacant see, and prepare, within a limited time, the future election. The right of voting was vested in the inferior clergy, who were best qualified to judge of the merit of the candidates; in the senators or nobles of the city, all those who were distinguished by their rank or property; and finally in the whole body of the people who, on the appointed day, flocked in multitudes from the most remote parts of the diocese, and sometimes silenced, by their tumultuous acclamations, the voice of reason and the laws of discipline. These acclamations might accidentally fix on the head of the most deserving competitor of some ancient presbyter, some holy monk, or some layman conspicuous for his zeal and piety.

"But the episcopal chair was solicited, especially in the great and opulent cities of the empire, as a temporal rather than as a spiritual dignity. The interested views, the selfish and angry passions, the arts of perfidy and dissimulation, the secret corruption, the open and even bloody violence which had formerly disgraced the freedom of election in the commonwealths of Greece and Rome, too often influenced the choice of the successors of the apostles. While one of the candidates boasted the honors of his family, a second allured his judges by the delicacies of a plentiful table, and a third, more guilty than his rivals, offered to share the plunder of the church among the accomplices of his sacrilegious hopes." (Gibbon.)

POLITICAL RELIGION

THE offices of the church, and especially the bishopric, thus became virtually political, and were made subject to all the strife of political methods. As the logical result, the political schemers, the dishonest men, the men of violent and selfish dispositions, pushed themselves to the front in every place; and those who might have given a safe direction to public affairs were crowded to the rear, and in fact completely shut out of office, by the very violence of those who would have office at any cost.

Thus by the very workings of the wicked elements which had been brought into the church by the political methods of Constantine and the bishops, genuine

Christianity was separated from this whole Church-and-State system, as it had been before from the pagan system. The genuine Christians, who loved the quiet and the peace which belong with the Christian profession, were reproached by the formal, hypocritical, political religionists who represented both the church and State, or rather the church and the State in one, - the real Christians were reproached by these with being "righteous overmuch."

In the episcopal elections, "Sometimes the people acted under outside considerations and the management of demagogues, and demanded unworthy or ignorant men for the highest offices. Thus there were frequent disturbances and collisions, and even bloody conflicts, as in the election of Damasus in Rome. In short, all the selfish passions and corrupting influences which had spoiled the freedom of the popular political elections in the Grecian and Roman republics, and which appear also in the republics of modern times, intruded upon the elections of the church. And the clergy likewise often suffered themselves to be guided by impure motives." (Schaff.)

SOME EXAMPLES

It was often the case that a man who had never been baptized, and was not even a member of the church, was elected a bishop, and hurried through the minor offices to this position. Such was the case with Ambrose, bishop of Milan in A.D. 374; Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople in 381; and many others. In the contention for the bishopric, there was as much political intrigue, strife, contention, and even bloodshed, as there had formerly been for the office of consul in the republic in the days of Pompey and Cesar.

It often happened that men of fairly good character were compelled to step aside and allow low characters to be elected to office, for fear they would cause more mischief, tumult, and riot if they were not elected than if they were. Instances actually occurred, and are recorded by Gregory Nazianzen, in which certain men who were not members of the church at all, were elected to the bishopric in opposition to others who had every churchly qualification for the office, because "they had the worst men in the city on their side." And Chrysostom says that "many are elected on account of their badness, to prevent the mischief they would otherwise do." Nothing but evil of the worst kind could accrue either to the civil government or to society at large.

More than this, as the men thus elected were the dispensers of doctrine and the interpreters of Scripture in all points

662

both religious and civil, and as they owed their position to those who elected them, it was only the natural consequence that they should adapt their interpretations to the character and wishes of those who had placed them in their positions.

Nectarius, who has already been mentioned, after he had been taken from the pretorship and made bishop by such a method of election as the above - elected bishop of Constantinople before he was baptized, - wished to ordain his physician as one of his own deacons. The physician declined on the ground that

he was not morally fit for the office. Nectarius endeavored to persuade him by saying, -

Did not I, who am now a priest, formerly live much more immorally than thou, as thou thyself well knowest, since thou wast often an accomplice of my many iniquities?

The physician still refused, but for a reason that was scarcely more honorable than that by which he was urged. The reason was that although he had been baptized, he had continued to practise his iniquities, while Nectarius had quit his when he was baptized.

The bishops' assumption of authority over the civil jurisprudence did not allow itself to be limited to the inferior magistrates. It asserted authority over the jurisdiction of the emperor himself. Dean Milman says: -

In Ambrose the sacerdotal character assumed a dignity and an influence as yet unknown; it first began to confront the throne, not only on terms of equality, but of superior authority, and to exercise a spiritual dictatorship over the supreme magistrate.

THE CHURCH USING THE STATE

AS the church and the State were identical, and as whoever refused to submit to the dictates of the bishopric was excommunicated from the church, this meant that the certain effect of disobedience to the bishop was to become an outcast in society, if not an outlaw in the State. And more than this, in the state of object superstition which now prevailed, excommunication from the church was supposed to mean direct consignment to perdition.

"The hierarchical power, from exemplary, persuasive, amiable, was now authoritative, commanding, awful. When Christianity became the most powerful religion, when it became the religion of the many, of the emperor, of the State, the convert or the hereditary Christian had no strong pagan party to receive him back into its bosom when outcast from the church. If he ceased to believe, he no longer dared cease to obey. No course remained but prostrate submission, or the endurance of any penitential duty which might be enforced upon him." (Milman.)

When the alliance was made between the bishops and Constantine, it was proposed that the jurisdiction of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities should remain separate, as being two arms of the same responsible body. This was shown in that saying of Constantine in which he represented himself as a "bishop of externals" of the church, that which pertained more definitely to its connection with civil society and conduct; while the regular bishops were bishops of the internal, or those things pertaining to the sacraments, ordinations, etc. As Dr. Schaff says in his "History of the Christian Church": -

Constantine . . . was the first representative of the imposing idea of a Christian theocracy, or of a system of policy which assumes all subjects to be Christians, connects civil and religious rights, and regards church and State as the *two arms of one and the same*

divine government on earth. This idea was more fully developed by his successors; it animated the whole Middle Age, and is yet working under various forms in these latest times.

To those who conceived it, this theory might have appeared good enough; and simply in theory it might have been imagined that it could be made to work; but when it came to be put into practice, the all-important question was, Where is the line which defines the exact limits between the jurisdiction of the magistrate and that of the bishop? between the authority of the church and that of the State? The State was now a theocracy. The government was held to be moral, a government of God; the Bible, the supreme code of morals, was the code of the government; there was no such thing as civil government - all was moral. But the subject of morals is involved in every action, yea, in every thought of man. The State, then, being allowed to be moral, it was inevitable that the church, being the arbiter of morals, and the dispenser and interpreter of the code regulating moral action, would interpose in all questions of human conduct, and spread her dominion over the whole field of human action.

To overstep every limit and break down every barrier that seemed in theory to be set between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, was the only consequence that could result from such a union. And when it was attempted to put the theory into practice, every step taken, in any direction, only served to demonstrate that which the history everywhere shows, that "the apparent identification of the State and church by the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the empire, altogether confounded the limits of ecclesiastical and temporal jurisdiction." (Milman.)

The State, as a body distinct from the church, was gone, As a distinct system of law and government, the State was destroyed; and its machinery existed only as the tool of the church to accomplish her arbitrary will and to enforce her despotic decrees.

A. T. JONES.

October 28, 1897

"After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. The Church Leads Toward Ruin" *The Present Truth* 13, 43 , pp. 677-679.

A REVIEW OF THE INFLUENCE OF IMPERIAL PATRONAGE

WE have seen the church secure the enactment of laws by which she could enforce church discipline upon all the people, whether in the church or not. We have seen her next extend her encroachments upon the civil power, until the whole system of civil jurisprudence, as such, was destroyed by being made religious. We shall now see how the evils thus engendered caused the final and fearful ruin of the Roman empire.

Among the first of the acts of Constantine in his favours to the church was the appropriation of money from the public treasury for the bishops. Another

enactment, A.D. 321, which as the church used it - was of vastly more importance, was his granting to the church the right to receive legacies.

That which made this a still more magnificent gift to the church was the view which prevailed, especially among the rich, that they could live as they pleased all their lives, and then at their death give their property to the church, and be assured a safe conduct to eternal bliss.

We have seen in former papers what kind of characters were chosen to the bishopric in those times. Not content with simply receiving bequests that might voluntarily be made, they brought to bear every possible means to induce persons to bestow their goods upon the churches. They assumed the protectorship of widows and orphans, and had the property of such persons left to the care of the bishop.

Now into the coffers of the bishops, as into the coffers of the republic after the fall of Carthage, wealth came in a rolling stream of gold, and the result in this case was the same as in that. With wealth came luxury and magnificent display. The bishopric assumed a stateliness and grandeur that transcended that of the chief ministers of the empire; and that of the bishopric of Rome fairly outshone the glory of the emperor himself.

FIGHTING FOR THE BISHOPRIC

The offices of the church were the only ones in the empire that were elective. The bishopric of Rome was the chief of these offices. As that office was one which carried with it the command of such enormous wealth and such display of imperial magnificence, it became the object of the ambitious aspiration of every Catholic in the city; and even a heathen exclaimed, "Make me bishop of Rome, and I will be a Christian!"

Here were displayed all those elements of political strife and chicanery which were but referred to in preceding articles.

The scenes which occurred at the election of Damasus as bishop of Rome, A.D. 366, will illustrate the character of such proceedings throughout the empire, according as the particular bishopric in question compared with that of Rome. There were two candidates, - Damasus and Ursicinus, - and these two men represented respectively two factions that had been created in the contest between Liberius, bishop of Rome and Constantius, Emperor of Rome.

"The presbyters, deacons, and faithful people who had adhered to Liberius in his exile, met in the Julian Basilica, and duly elected Ursicinus, who was consecrated by Paul, bishop of Tibur. Damasus was proclaimed by the followers of Felix, in S. M. Lucina. Damasus collected a mob of charioteers and a wild rabble, broke into the Julian Basilica, and committed great slaughter. Seven days after, having bribed a great body of ecclesiastics and the populace, and seized the Lateran Church, he was elected and consecrated bishop. Ursicinus was expelled from Rome.

"Damasus, however, continued his acts of violence. Seven presbyters of the other party were hurried prisoners to the Lateran; their faction rose, rescued them, and carried them to the Basilica of

Liberius. Damasus, at the head of a gang of gladiators, charioteers, and labourers, with axes, swords, and clubs, stormed the church; a hundred and sixty of both sexes were barbarously killed; not one on the side of Damasus. The party of Ursicinus was obliged to withdraw, vainly petitioning for a synod of bishops to examine into the validity of the two elections.

"So long and obstinate was the conflict, that Juventius, the prefect of the city, finding his authority contemned, his forces unequal to keep the peace, retired into the neighborhood of Rome. Churches were garrisoned, churches besieged, churches stormed and deluged with blood. In one day, relates Ammianus, above one hundred and thirty dead bodies were counted in the Basilica of Sisinnius. . . . Nor did the contention cease with the first discomfiture and banishment of Ursicinus; he was more than once recalled, exiled, again set up as rival bishop, and re-exiled. Another frightful massacre took place in the Church of St. Agnes. The emperor was forced to have recourse to the character and firmness of the famous heathen Praetextatus, as successor to Juventius in the government of Rome, in order to put down with impartial severity these disastrous tumults. Some years elapsed before Damasus was in undisputed possession of his see. "But Damasus had the ladies of Rome in his favour; and the Council of Valentinian was not inaccessible to bribes. New scenes of blood took place. Ursicinus was compelled at last to give up the contest." (Milman's "History of Latin Christianity.")

Of the bishop of Rome at this time we have the following sketch written by one who was there at

678

the time, and had often seen him in his splendor: -

I must own that when I reflect on the pomp attending that dignity, I do not at all wonder that those who are fond of show and parade, should scold, quarrel, fight, and strain every nerve to attain it; since they are sure, if they succeed, to be enriched with the offerings of the ladies; to appear no more abroad on foot, but in stately chariots, and gorgeously attired; to keep costly and sumptuous tables; nay, and to surpass the emperors themselves in the splendor and magnificence of their entertainments.

The example of the bishop of Rome was followed by the whole order of bishops, each according to his degree and opportunities. Chrysostom boasted that "the heads of the empire and the governors of provinces enjoy no such honor as the rulers of the church. They are first at court, in the society of ladies, in the houses of the great. No one has precedence of them." By them were worn such titles as, "Most Holy," "Most Reverend," and "Most Holy Lord." They were addressed in such terms as, "Thy Holiness" and "Thy Blessedness." "Kneeling, kissing of the hand, and like tokens of reverence, came to be shown them by all classes, up to the emperor himself." (Schaff.)

The manners of the minor clergy of Rome are described by one who was well acquainted with them. "His whole care is in his dress, that it be well perfumed; that his feet may not slip about in a loose sandal; his hair is crisped with a curling-pin; his fingers glitter with rings; he walks on tiptoe lest he should splash himself with the wet soil; when you see him, you would think him a bridegroom rather than an ecclesiastic." (Jerome.)

Such an example being set by the dignitaries in the church, these, too, professing to be the patterns of godliness, their example was readily followed by all in the empire who were able. Consequently, "The aristocratical life of this period seems to have been characterised by gorgeous magnificence without grandeur, inordinate luxury without refinement, the pomp and prodigality of a high state of civilisation with none of its ennobling or humanising effects." (Milman.)

As in the republic of old, in the train of wealth came luxury, and in the train of luxury came vice; and as the violence now manifested in the election of the bishops was but a reproduction of the violence by which the tribunes and the consuls of the later republic were chosen, so the vices of these times were but a reproduction of the vices of the later republic and early empire - not indeed manifested so coarsely and brutally, more refined and polished; yet essentially the same iniquitous practice of shameful vice.

Because of the insatiable avarice of the Roman clergy, and because of the shameful corruption that was practiced with the means thus acquired, a law was enacted, A.D. 370, by Valentinian I., forbidding any ecclesiastics to receive any inheritance, donation, or legacy from anybody.

The fact that such a law as this had to be enacted - a law applying only to the clergy - furnishes decisive proof that the ecclesiastics were more vicious and more corrupt in their use of wealth than was any other class in the empire. This in fact is plainly stated by another who was present at the time: -

I am ashamed to say it, the priests of the idols, the stage-players, charioteers, whores, are capable of inheriting estates and receiving legacies; from this common privilege clerks alone, and monks, are debarred by law, debarred not under persecuting tyrants, but Christian princes." (Jerome.)

MORE PAGAN RITES ADOPTED

NOR was this all. The same pagan rites and heathen superstitions and practices which were brought into the church when the Catholic religion became that of the empire, not only still prevailed, but were enlarged. The celebration of the rites of the mysteries still continued, only with a more decidedly pagan character, as time went on, and as the number of pagans multiplied in the church. To add to their impressiveness, the mysteries in the church, as in the original Eleusinia, were celebrated in the night. As the catechumen came to the baptismal font, he "turned to the west, the realm of Satan, and thrice renounced his power; he turned to the east to adore the Sun of Righteousness, and to proclaim his compact with the Lord of Life." (Milman.)

About the middle of the fourth century there was added another form and element of sun-worship. Among the pagans for ages, December 25 had been

celebrated as the birthday of the sun. In the reigns of Domitian and Trajan, Rome formally adopted from Persia the feast of the Persian sun-god, Mithras, as the *birth* festival of the unconquered sun - *Natales invicti Solis*. The Church of Rome adopted this festival, and made it the birthday of Christ. And within a few years the celebration of this festival of the sun had spread throughout the whole empire east and west; the perverse-minded bishops readily sanctioning it with the argument that the pagan festival of the birth of the real sun, was a type of the festival of the birth of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness. Thus was established the church festival of Christmas.

This custom, like the forms of sun-worship - the observance of the *day* of the sun (the Sunday), worshipping toward the East, and the mysteries - which had already been adopted, was so closely followed that it was actually brought "as a charge against the Christians of the Catholic Church that they celebrated the Solstitia with the pagans." (Neander.) The worship of the sun itself was also still practised. Pope Leo I. testifies that in his time many Catholics had retained the pagan custom of paying "obeisance from some lofty eminence to the sun." And that they also "first worshipped the rising sun, paying homage to the pagan Apollo, before repairing to the Basilica of St. Peter." (Schaff.)

The images and pictures which had formerly represented the sun were adopted and transformed into representations of Christ. And such was the origin of the "pictures of Christ."

The martyrs, whether real or imaginary, were now honoured in the place of the heathen heroes. The day of their martyrdom was celebrated as their birthday, and these celebrations were conducted in the same way that the heathen celebrated the festival days of their heroes.

"As the evening drew in, the solemn and religious thoughts gave way to other emotions; the wine flowed freely, and the healths of the martyrs were pledged, not unfrequently, to complete inebriety. All the luxuries of the Roman banquet were imperceptibly introduced. Dances were admitted, pantomimic spectacles were exhibited, the festivals were prolonged till late in the evening, or to midnight, so that other criminal irregularities profaned, if not the sacred edifice, its immediate neighborhood. The bishops had for some time sanctioned these pious hilarities with their presence; they had freely partaken of the banquets." (Milman.)

So perfectly were the pagan practices duplicated in these festivals of the martyrs, that the Catholics were charged with practicing pagan rites, with the only difference that they did it apart from the pagans. This charge was made to Augustine: -

You have substituted your Agape for the sacrifices of the pagans; for their idols your martyrs, whom you serve with the very same honors. You

appease the shades of the dead with wines and feasts; you celebrate the solemn festivals of the Gentiles, their calends and their solstices; and as to their manners, those you have retained

without any alteration. Nothing distinguishes you from the pagans except that you hold your assemblies apart from them. (Draper.)

And the only defence that Augustine could make was in a blundering casuistical effort to show a distinction in the nature of the two forms of worship.

In the burial of their dead, they still continued the pagan practice of putting a piece of money in the mouth of the corpse, with which the departed was to pay the charges of Charon for ferrying him over the River Styx.

These things show the utter corruption of religion and morals in the church, which as we shall learn next week brought swift ruin upon the Empire.

A. T. JONES.

November 4, 1897

"After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. The Ruin of the Roman Empire" *The Present Truth* 13, 44 , pp. 693-695.

WE have seen how religion was corrupted by the adoption of pagan ideas and observances, and how the exaltation of the papal religion as the religion of the empire filled the church with elements of evil. So that, instead of having an influence to restrain and uplift society, it actually corrupted it and dragged it into deeper vices.

MONKERY

ANOTHER most prolific source of general corruption was the church's assumption of authority to regulate by law the whole question of the marriage relation, both in Church and State. As monkery was so popular among all classes from the height of imperial dignity to the depths of monkish degradation itself, it became necessary for the clergy to imitate the monks in order to maintain popularity. And it led into the same profligacy of morals amongst the clergy generally as existed in monkery.

The first decretal ever issued, namely, that by Pope Siricius, A.D. 385, commanded the married clergy to separate from their wives, under sentence of expulsion from the clerical order upon all who dared to offer resistance. The end of it all was that it was not an uncommon thing for men to gain admission to "holy orders" on account of the facility afforded for leading a vicious life, and a special law was enacted by Valentinian I. in A.D. 370, to deal with this scandal among the clergy.

As the church had assumed "cognisance over all questions relating to marriage," it followed that marriage not celebrated by the church was held to be but little better than an illicit connection. Yet the weddings of the church were celebrated in the pagan way, and the integrity of the marriage bond was slightly held.

Of course there were against all these evils, laws abundant with penalties terrible, as in the days of the Cesars. And also as in those days, the laws were

utterly impotent; not only for the same great reason that then existed, that the iniquity was so prevalent that there were none to enforce the laws; but for an additional reason that now existed; that is, *the bishops were the interpreters of the code*, and by this time, though the interminable and hair-splitting distinctions drawn against heresies, the bishops had so sharpened their powers of interpretation that they could easily evade the force of any law, Scriptural, canonical, or statutory, that might be produced.

HYPOCRISY AND FRAUD MADE HABITUAL

THERE is yet other element of general corruption to be noticed. As we have seen, the means employed by Con-

694

stantine in establishing the Catholic religion and church, and in making that the prevalent religion, were such as to win only hypocrites. This was bad enough in itself, yet the hypocrisy was voluntary; but when through the agency of her Sunday laws, and by the ministration of Theodosius, the church received control of the civil power to compel all, without distinction, who were not Catholics, to act as though they were, hypocrisy was made compulsory; and every person who was not voluntarily a church-member was compelled either to be a hypocrite or a rebel. In addition to this, those who were of the church indeed, through the endless succession of controversies and church council, were forever establishing, changing, and re-establishing the faith. And as all were required to change or revise their faith according as the councils decreed, all moral and spiritual integrity was destroyed. Hypocrisy became a habit, dissimulation and fraud a necessity of life; and the very moral fiber of men and of society was vitiated.

In the then existing order of things it was impossible that it should be otherwise. Right faith is essential to right morals. Purity of faith is essential to purity of heart and life. But there the faith was wrong and utterly corrupt, and nothing but corruption could follow. More than this, the faith was essentially pagan, and much more guilty than had been the original pagan; because it was professed under the name of Christianity and the Gospel, and because it was in itself a shameful corruption of the true faith of the Gospel. As the faith of the people was essentially pagan, or rather worse, the morality of the people could be nothing else.

AS THE HISTORIAN SEES THESE TIMES

DEAN MEDIVALE say, in his lectures on the "Conversion of the Northern Nations": -

"There is ample evidence to show how great had been the reaction from the simple genuineness of early Christian belief, and how nearly the Christian world had generally associated itself, in thought and temper, not to say in superstitious practice, with the pagan. We must not shut our eyes to the fact that much of the

apparent success of the new religion had been gained by its actual accommodation of itself to the ways and feelings of the old. Once set aside, from doubt, distaste, or any other feeling, the special dogmas of the Gospel, . . . and men will naturally turn to compromise, to eclecticism, to universalism, to indifference, to unbelief

"If the great Christian doctors had themselves come forth from the schools of the pagans, the loss had not been wholly unrequited; so complacently had even Christian doctors again surrendered themselves to the fascinations of pagan speculations; so fatally, in their behalf, had they extenuated Christian dogma, and acknowledged the fundamental truth and sufficiency of science falsely so called.

"The Gospel we find was almost eaten out from the heart of the Christian society. I speak not now of the pride of spiritual pretensions, of the corruption of its secular politics, of its ascetic extravagances, its mystical fallacies; of its hollowness in preaching, or its laxity in practice; of its saint-worship, which was a revival of hero-worship; its addiction to the sensuous in outward service, which was a revival of idolatry. But I point to the fact, less observed by our church historians, of the absolute defect of all distinctive Christianity in the utterances of men of the highest esteem as Christians, - men of reputed wisdom, sentiment, and devotion. Look, for instance, at the remains we possess of the Christian Boethius, a man whom we know to have been a professed Christian and churchman, excellent in action, steadfast in suffering, but in whose writings, in which he aspires to set before us the true grounds of spiritual consolation on which he rested himself in the hour of his trial, and on which he would have his fellows rest, there is no trace of Christianity whatever, nothing but pure, unmingled naturalism.

"This marked decline of distinctive Christian belief was accompanied with a marked decline of Christian morality. Heathenism reasserted its empire over the carnal affections of the natural man. The pictures of abounding wickedness in the high places and the low places of the earth, which are presented to us by the witnesses of the worst pagan degradation, are repeated, in colors not less strong, in lines not less hideous, by the observers of the gross and reckless iniquity of the so-called Christian period now before us."

And now all the evils engendered in that evil intrigue which united the State with a professed Christianity, hurried on the doomed empire to its final and utter ruin.

The criminal and frivolous pleasures of a decrepit civilisation left no thought for the absorbing duties of the day nor the fearful trials of the morrow. . . . The banquet, theater, and the circus exhausted what little strength and energy were

left by domestic excesses. The poor aped the vices of the rich and hideous depravity reigned supreme, and invited the vengeance of heaven. (Lea's "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy.")

DESTRUCTION AND DEVASTATION

THE pagan superstitions, the pagan delusions, and the pagan vices, which had been brought into the church by the apostasy, and clothed with a form of godliness, had wrought such corruption that the society of which it was a part could no longer exist. From it no more good could possibly come, and it must be swept away.

The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theater-going, intemperance, lewdness; in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman Empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude, but simple and morally vigorous, barbarians. (Schaff.)

And onward those barbarians came, swiftly and in multitudes. For a hundred years the dark cloud had been hanging threateningly over the borders of the empire, encroaching slightly upon the West and breaking occasionally upon the East. But at the close of the fourth century the tempest burst in all its fury, and the flood was flowing ruinously. As early as A.D. 377 a million Goths had crossed the Danube, and between that time and A.D. 400 they had ravaged the country from Thessalonica to the Adriatic Sea. In A.D. 400 a host of them entered the borders of Italy, but were restrained for a season.

In 406 a band of Burgundians, Vandals, Suevi, and Alani from the north of Germany, four hundred thousand strong, overran the country as far as Florence. In the siege of that city their course was checked with the loss of more than one hundred thousand. They then returned to Germany, and with large accessions to their numbers, overran all the southern part of Gaul. The Burgundians remained in Gaul; the Vandals, the Alani, and the Suevi overran all the southern part of Spain, and carried their ravages over the greater part of that province, and to the Strait of Gibraltar.

In 410 again returned the mighty hosts of the Goths, and spread over all Italy from the Alps to the Strait of Sicily, and for five days inflicted upon Rome such pillage as had never befallen it since the day, nearly a thousand years before, when the Cimbri left it in ruins. They marched out of Italy and took possession of Southeastern Gaul from the Mediterranean Sea to the Bay of Biscay.

In May 429, the Vandals, in whose num-

665

bers of the Alani had been absorbed, crossed the Strait of Gibraltar into Africa, and for ten years ravaged the country from there to Carthage, of which city they took possession with great slaughter, October 9, A.D. 439; and in 440 the terrible Genseric, king of the Vandals, ruled the Mediterranean and sacked the city of Rome.

In 449 the Saxons and their German neighbors invaded Britain, of which they soon became sole possessors, utterly exterminating the native inhabitants.

In 451-453 another mighty host, numbering seven hundred thousand, of all the barbarous nations, led by Attila, desolated Eastern Gaul as far as Chalons, and the north of Italy as far as the Rhone, but returned again beyond the Danube.

And finally, in 476, when Odoacer, king of the Heruli, became king of Italy, the last vestige of the Western empire of Rome was gone, and was divided among the ten nations of barbarians of the North.

NO REMEDY, AND FINAL RUIN

WHEREVER these savages went, they carried fire and slaughter, and whenever they departed, they left desolation and ruin in their track, and carried away multitudes of captives. Thus was the proud empire of Western Rome swept from the earth; and that which Constantine and his ecclesiastical flatterers had promised one another should be the everlasting salvation of the State, proved its speedy and everlasting ruin.

It was impossible that it should be otherwise. Pagan Rome had gone in the days of the Cesars, yet the empire did not perish then. There was hope for the people. The Gospel of Jesus Christ carried in earnestness, in simplicity, and in its heavenly power, brought multitudes to its saving light, and to a knowledge of the purity of Jesus Christ. This was their salvation; and the gospel of Christ, by restoring the virtue and integrity of the individual, *was the preservation of the Roman State.*

But when by apostasy that gospel had lost its purity and its power in the multitudes who professed it; and when it was used only as a cloak to cover the same old pagan wickedness; when this *form* of godliness, practiced not only without the power but in defiance of it, permeated the great masses of the people, and the empire had thereby become a festering mass of corruption; when the only means which it was possible for the Lord himself to employ to purify the people, had been taken and made only the cloak under which to increase unto more ungodliness, - there was no other remedy: destruction must come.

WORSE THAN THE BARBARIANS

And it did come, as we have seen, by a host wild and savage, it is true; but whose social habits were so far above those of the people which they destroyed, that savage as they were, they were caused fairly to blush at the shameful corruptions which they found in this so-called Christian society of Rome. This is proved by the best authority. A writer who lived at the time of the barbarian invasions and who wrote as a Christian, gives the following evidence as to the condition of things: -

The church which ought everywhere to propitiate God, what does she, but provoke him to anger? How many may one meet,

even in the church, who are not still drunkards, or debauchees, or adulterers, or fornicators, or robbers, or murderers, or the like, or all these at once, without end? It is even a sort of holiness among Christian people, to be less vicious. From the public worship of God, and almost during it, they pass to deeds of shame. Scarce a rich man but would commit murder and fornication. We have lost the whole power of Christianity, and offend God the more, that we sin as Christians. We are worse than the barbarians and heathen. If the Saxon is wild, the Frank faithless, the Goth inhuman, the Alanian drunken, the Hun licentious, they are, by reason of their ignorance, far less punishable than we, who, knowing the commandments of God, commit all these crimes. (Salvian.)

"He compares the Christians, especially of Rome, with the Arian Goths and Vandals, to the disparagement of the Romans, who add to the gross sins of nature the refined vices of civilisation, passion for the theatres, debauchery, and unnatural lewdness. Therefore has the just God given them into the hands of the barbarians, and exposed them to the ravages of the migrating hordes." (Schaff.)

And this description, says the same author, "is in general not untrue." And he confirms it in his own words by the excellent observation that "nothing but the divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian, but essentially heathen, world, could open the way for the moral regeneration of society. There must be new, fresh nations, if the Christian civilisation, prepared in the old Roman empire, was to take firm root and bear ripe fruit."

These new, fresh nations came, and planted themselves upon the ruins of the old. Out of these came the faithful Christians of the Dark Ages, and upon them broke the light of the Reformation.

A. T. JONES.

November 11, 1897

"After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. The Papacy Amidst the Wreck of Empire" *The Present Truth* 13, 45 , pp. 710-712.

AS out of the political difficulties of the days of Constantine, the Catholic Church rose to power in the State; so out of the ruin of the Roman Empire she rose to supremacy over kings and nations. She had speedily wrought the ruin of one empire, and now for more than a thousand years she would prove a living curse to all the States and empires that should succeed it.

We have seen how that, by the arrogant ministry of Leo, the bishop of Rome was made the fountain of faith, and was elevated to a position of dignity and authority that the aspiring prelacy had never before attained. For Leo, as the typical pope, was one whose "ambition knew no bounds; and to gratify it, he

stuck at nothing; made no distinction between right and wrong, between truth and falsehood; as if he had adopted the famous maxim of Julius Cesar, -

'Be just, unless a kingdom tempts to break the laws,

For sovereign power alone can justify the cause,'

or thought the most criminal actions ceased to be criminal, and became meritorious, when any ways subservient to the increase of his power or the exaltation of his see." (Bower.)

Nor was the force of any single point of his example ever lost upon his successors. His immediate successor, -

HILARY, 461-467

was so glad to occupy the place which had been made so large by Leo, that shortly after his election he wrote a letter to the other bishops asking them to exult with him, taking particular care in the letter to tell them that he did not doubt that they all knew what respect and deference was paid "in the Spirit of God to St. Peter and his see." The bishops of Spain addressed him as "the successor of St. Peter, whose primacy ought to be loved and feared by all." He was succeeded by -

SIMPLICIUS, 467-483

in whose pontificate the empire perished when the Heruli, under Odoacer, overran all Italy, deposed the last emperor of the West, appropriated to themselves one third of all the lands, and established the Herulian kingdom, with Odoacer as king of Italy.

THE PAPACY AND THE BARBARIANS

IN fact, the more the imperial power faded, and the nearer the empire approached its fall, the more rapidly and the stronger grew the papal assumptions. Thus the very calamities which rapidly wrought the ruin of the empire, and which were hastened by the union of Church and State, were turned to the advantage of the bishopric of Rome. During the whole period of barbarian invasions from 400 to 476, the Catholic hierarchy everywhere adapted itself to the situation, and reaped power and influence from the calamities that were visited everywhere.

Moreover, it was not against religion as such that the barbarians made war, as they themselves were religious. It was against that mighty empire of which they had seen much, and suffered much, and heard more, that they warred. It was as nations taking vengeance upon a nation which had been so great, and which had so proudly asserted lordship over all other nations, that they invaded the Roman Empire.

And when they could plant themselves and remain, as absolute lords, in the dominions of those who had boasted of absolute and eternal dominion, and thus humble the pride of the mighty Rome, this was their supreme gratification. As

these invasions were not inflicted everywhere at once, but at intervals through a period of seventy-five years, the church had ample time to adapt herself to the ways of such of the barbarians as were heathen, which as ever she readily did.

The heathen barbarians were accustomed to pay the greatest respect to their own priesthood, and were willing to admit the Catholic priesthood to an equal or even a larger place in their estimation. Such of them as were already professedly Christian, were Arians, and not so savage as the Catholics; therefore, they, with the exception of the Vandals, were not so ready to persecute, and were willing to settle and make themselves homes in the territories of the vanished empire.

THE BURGUNDIANS

AN account of the conversion of the Burgundians, and through them of the Franks, will illustrate the dealings of the papacy with the barbarians, and will also give the key to the most important events in the history of the supremacy of the Bishopric of Rome.

Ever since the time of Constantine, the god and saviour of the Catholics had been a god of battle, and no surer way to the eternal rewards of martyrdom could be taken than by being killed in a riot in behalf of the orthodox faith, or to die by punishment inflicted for such proceeding, as in the case of that insolent ruffian who attempted to murder Orestes. It was easy, therefore, for the heathen barbarians, victory and surest passport to the halls of the warrior god, was to die in the midst of the carnage of bloody battle, - it was easy for such people as this to become converted to the god of battle of the Catholics. A single bloody victory would turn the scale, and issue in the conversion of whole nation.

The Burgundians were settled in that part of Gaul which now forms Western Switzerland and that part of France which is now the county and district of Burgundy. As early as A.D. 430, the Huns making inroads into Gaul, severely afflicted the Burgundians, who finding impotent the power

711

of their own god, determined to try the Catholic god. They therefore sent representatives to a neighboring city in Gaul, requesting the Catholic bishop to receive them. The bishop had them fast for a week, during which time he catechized them, and then baptized them. Soon afterward the Burgundians found the Huns without a leader, and, suddenly falling upon them at the disadvantage, confirmed their conversion by the slaughter of ten thousand of the enemy. Thereupon the whole nation embraced the Catholic religion "with fiery zeal." (Milman.) Afterward, however, when about the fall of the empire, the Visigoths under Euric asserted their dominion over all Spain, and the greater part of Gaul, and over the Burgundians too, they deserted the Catholic god, and adopted the Arian faith.

THE "CONVERSION" OF CLOVIS

YET Clotilda, a niece of the Burgundian king, "was educated" in the profession of the Catholic faith. She married Clovis, the pagan king of the pagan

Franks, and strongly persuaded him to become a Catholic. All her pleadings were in vain, however, till A.D. 496, when in a great battle with the Alemanni, the Franks were getting the worst of the conflict, in the midst of the battle Clovis vowed that if the victory could be theirs, he would become a Catholic. The tide of battle turned; the victory was won, and Clovis was a Catholic. Clotilda hurried away a messenger with the glad news to the bishop of Rhiems, who came to baptize the new convert.

But after the battle was over, and the dangerous crisis was past, Clovis was not certain whether he wanted to be a Catholic. He said he must consult his warriors; he did so, and they signified their readiness to adopt the same religion as their king. He then declared that he was convinced of the truth of the Catholic faith, and preparations were at once made for the baptism of the new Constantine, Christmas Day, A.D. 496. "To impress the minds of the barbarians, the baptismal ceremony was performed with the utmost pomp. The church was hung with embroidered tapestry and white curtains; odors of incense like airs of paradise, were diffused around; the building blazed with countless lights. When the new Constantine knelt in the font to be cleansed from the leprosy of his heathenism, 'Fierce Sicambrian,' said the bishop, 'bow thy neck; burn what thou hast adored, adore what thou last burned.' Three thousand Franks followed the example of Clovis." (Milman.) The Pope sent Clovis a letter congratulating him on his conversion.

"If unscrupulous ambition, undaunted valor and enterprise, and desolating warfare, had been legitimate means for the propagation of pure Christianity, it could not have found a better champion than Clovis. For the first time the diffusion of belief in the nature of the Godhead became the avowed pretext for the invasion of a neighboring territory." (Milman.) "His ambitious reign was a perpetual violation of moral and Christian duties; his hands were stained with blood in peace as well as in war; and as soon as Clovis had dismissed a synod of the Gallican church, he calmly assassinated all the princes of the Merovingian race." (Gibbon.)

THE "HOLY" WARS OF CLOVIS

THE Bishop of Vienne also sent a letter to the new convert, in which he prophesied that the faith of Clovis would be a surety of the victory of the Catholic faith; and he, with every other Catholic in Christendom, was ready to do his utmost to see that the prophecy was fulfilled. The Catholics in all the neighboring countries longed and prayed and conspired that Clovis might deliver them from the rule of Arian monarchs; and in the nature of the case, war soon followed.

Burgundy was the first country invaded. Before the war actually began, however, by the advice of the bishop of Rhiems, a synod of the orthodox bishops met at Lyons; then with the Bishop of Vienne at their head, they visited the king of the Burgundians, and proposed that he call the Arian bishops together, and allow a conference to be held, as they were prepared to prove that the Arians were in error. To their proposal the king replied, -

If yours be the true doctrine, why do you not prevent the king of the Franks from waging an unjust war against me, and from caballing with my enemies against me? There is no true Christian faith where there is rapacious covetousness for the possessions of others, and thirst for blood. Let him show forth his faith by his good works. (Milman.)

The Bishop of Vienne dodged this pointed question, and replied, "We are ignorant of the motives and intentions of the king of the Franks; but we are taught by the Scripture that the kingdoms which abandon the divine law, are frequently subverted; and that enemies will arise on every side against those who have made God their enemy. Return with thy people to the law of God, and he will give peace and security to thy dominions." (Gibbon.) War followed, and the Burgundian dominions were made subject to the rule of Clovis, A.D. 500.

The Visigoths possessed all the southwestern portion of Gaul. They too were Arians; and the mutual conspiracy of the Catholics in the Gothic dominions, and the crusade of the Franks from the side of Clovis, soon brought on another holy war. At the assembly of princes and warriors at Paris, A.D. 508. Clovis complained, -

It grieves me to see that the Arians still possess the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God; and, having vanquished the heretics, we will *possess and divide their fertile province.*

Clotilda added her pious exhortation to the effect "that doubtless the Lord would more readily lend his aid if some gift were made;" and in response, Clovis seized his battle-ax and threw it as far as he could, and as it went whirling through the air, he exclaimed, "There, on that spot where my Francesca shall fall, will I erect a church in honor of the holy apostles." (Gibbon.)

War was declared; and as Clovis marched on his way, he passed through Tours, and turned aside to consult the shrine of St. Martin of Tours, for an omen. "His messengers were instructed to remark the words of the Psalm which should happen to be chanted at the precise moment when they entered the church." And the oracular clergy took care that the words which he should "happen" to hear at that moment - uttered not in Latin, but in language which Clovis understood - should be the following from Psalm xviii: "Thou hast girded me, O Lord, with strength unto the battle; thou hast subdued unto me those who rose up against me. Thou hast given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me." The oracle was satisfactory, and in the event was completely successful. "The Visigothic kingdom was wasted and subdued by the remorseless sword of the Franks." (Gibbon.)

THE CHURCH A PARTY TO ALL HIS CRIMES

NOR was the religious zeal of Clovis confined to the overthrow of the Arians. There were two bodies of the Franks, the Salians and the Ripuarians. Clovis was king of the Salians, Sigebert of the Ripuarians. Clovis determined to be king of all; he therefore prompted the son of Sigebert to assassinate his father, with the

promise that the son should peaceably succeed Sigebert on the throne; but as soon as the murder was committed, Clovis commanded the murderer to be murdered, and then in

712

a full parliament of the whole people of the Franks, he solemnly vowed that he had had nothing to do with the murder of either the father or the son; and upon this, as there was no heir, Clovis was raised upon a shield, and proclaimed king of the Ripuarian Franks; - all of which Gregory, bishop of Tours, commended as the will of God, saying of Clovis that "God thus daily prostrated his enemies under his hands, and enlarged his kingdom, because he walked before him with an upright heart, and did that which was well pleasing in his sight." (Milman.)

Thus was the bloody course of Clovis glorified by the Catholic writers, as the triumph of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity over Arianism. When such actions as these were so lauded by the clergy as the pious acts of orthodox Catholics, it is certain that the clergy themselves were no better than were the bloody objects of their praise. Under the influence of such ecclesiastics, the condition of the barbarians after their so-called conversion, could not possibly be better, even if it were not worse than before. To be converted to the principles and precepts of such clergy was only the more deeply to be damned. In proof of this it is necessary only to touch upon the condition of Catholic France under Clovis and his successors, as we shall do.

A. T. JONES.

November 18, 1897

"After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. The Papacy an Element of Evil" *The Present Truth* 13, 46 , pp. 726, 727.

LET us notice further the influence of the papal system over the barbarians who overran the empire.

Into the "converted" barbarians, the Catholic system instilled all of its superstition, and its bigoted hatred of heretics and unbelievers. It thus destroyed what of generosity still remained in their minds, while it only intensified their native ferocity; and the shameful licentiousness of society under the papal system likewise corrupted the purity, and the native respect for women and marriage which had always been a noble characteristic of the Germanic nations.

"It is difficult to conceive a more dark and odious state of society than that of France under her Merovingian kings, the descendants of Clovis, as described by Gregory of Tours. . . . Throughout, assassinations, parricides, and fratricides intermingle with adulteries and rapes.

"The cruelty might seem the mere inevitable result of this violent and unnatural fusion; but the extent to which this cruelty spreads throughout the whole society almost surpasses belief. That King Chlotaire should burn alive his rebellious son with his wife and daughter, is fearful enough; but we are astounded, even in these times, that a bishop of Tours should burn a man alive to obtain the deeds of an estate which he coveted. Fredegonde sends two

murderers to assassinate Childebert, and these assassins are clerks [*sic.*]. She causes the archbishop of Rouen to be murdered while he is chanting the service in the church; and in this crime a bishop and an archdeacon are her accomplices." (Milman.)

WHOM SHE COULD NOT CORRUPT THE PAPACY DESTROYED

AT the fall of the empire, the bishopric of Rome was the head and center of a strong and compactly organized power. And by deftly insinuating itself into the place of mediator between the barbarian invaders and the perishing imperial authority, it had attained a position where it was recognized by the invaders as the power which, though it claimed to be not temporal but spiritual was none the less real, had succeeded to the place of the vanished imperial authority of Rome.

And in view of the history of the time, it is impossible to escape the conviction that in the bishopric of Rome there was at this time formed the determination to plant itself in the temporal dominion of Rome and Italy. The emperors been absent from Rome, that the Bishop of Rome had assumed their place there, and we have seen how the church had usurped the place of the civil authority. The Bishop of Rome was the head of the church; and now, as the empire was perishing, he would exalt his throne upon its ruins, and out of the anarchy of the times would secure a place and a name among the powers and dominions of the earth.

The barbarians who took possession of Italy were Arians, which in the sight of the bishop of Rome was worse than all other crimes put together. In addition to this, the Herulian monarch, Odoacer, an Arian, presumed to assert civil authority over the Papacy, which, on account of the riotous proceedings in the election of the pope, was necessary, but would not meekly be borne by the proud pontiffs.

And as these elections were carried not only by violence, but by bribery, in which the property of the Church played an important part, Odoacer, by his lieutenant at this same assembly, A.D. 483, "caused a law to be read, forbidding the bishop who should now be chosen, as well as his successors, to alienate any inheritance, possessions, or sacred utensils that now belonged, or should for the future, belong, to the church; declaring all such bargains void, anathematising both the seller and the buyer, and obliging the latter and his heirs to restore to the church all lands and tenements thus purchased, how long soever they might have possessed them." (Bower.)

By the law of Constantine which bestowed upon the Church the privilege of receiving donations, legacies, etc., by will, lands were included; and through nearly two hundred years of the working of this law, the Church of Rome had become enormously enriched in landed estates. And more especially "since the extinction of the Western empire had emancipated the ecclesiastical potentate from secular control, the first and most abiding object of his schemes and prayers had been the acquisition of territorial wealth in the neighborhood of his capital." (Bryce.)

The Church of Rome had also other lands, scattered in different parts of Italy, and even in Asia. As the imperial power faded away in the West, the Bishop of

Rome, in his growing power, came more and more to assert his own power of protection over his lands in Italy. And when the imperial power was entirely gone, it was naturally held that this power fell absolutely to him. When, therefore, Odoacer, both a barbarian invader and a heretic, issued a decree forbidding the alienation of church lands and possessions, this was represented as a presumptuous invasion of the rights of the Bishop of Rome, not only to do what he would with his own, but above all as protector of the property and estates of the church.

For this offence of Odoacer, there was no forgiveness by the bishop of Rome. Nothing short of the utter uprooting of the Herulian power could atone for it. The Catholic ecclesiastics of Italy began to plot for his overthrow, and it was soon accomplished.

There were at that time in the dominions of the Eastern empire, unsettled and wandering about with no certain dwelling place, the people of the Ostrogoths under

727

King Theodoric. Although in the service of the empire, they were dissatisfied with their lot; and they were so savage and so powerful that the emperor was in constant dread of them. Why might not this force be employed to destroy the dominion of the Heruli, and deliver Rome from the interferences and oppression of Odoacer? The suggestion was made to Theodoric by the court, but as he was in the service of the empire, it was necessary that he should have permission to undertake the expedition.

His proposition was gladly accepted by the Emperor Zeno, and in the winter of 489, the whole nation took up its march of seven hundred miles to Italy, and the Herulian kingdom was destroyed.

And that this was in no small degree the work of the Catholic Church is certain; for, "Throughout the conquest and establishment of the Gothic kingdom, the increasing power and importance of the Catholic ecclesiastics, forces itself upon the attention. They are ambassadors, mediators in treaties; [they] decide the wavering loyalty or *instigate the revolt of cities*." (Milman.)

The bishop of Pavia bore to Theodoric at Milan the surrender and offer of allegiance of that great city.

Another thing which makes this view most certainly true, is the fact that no sooner was order restored in Italy and in Rome, and the Church once more felt itself secure, than a council of eighty bishops, thirty-seven presbyters, and four deacons, was called in Rome by the pope, A.D. 499, *the very first act of which was to repeal the law enacted by Odoacer on the subject of the Church possessions*. Nor was the law repealed in order to get rid of it; for *it was immediately re-enacted by the same council*. This was plainly to declare that the estates of the Church were no longer subject in any way to the authority of the civil power, but were to be held under the jurisdiction of the Church alone. In fact, it was tantamount to a declaration of the independence of the papacy and her possessions.

This transaction also conclusively proves that the resentment of the bishopric of Rome, which had been aroused by the law of Odoacer, was never allayed until

Odoacer and the law, so far as it represented the authority of the civil power, were both out of the way. And this is the secret of the destruction of the Herulian kingdom of Italy.

It was the first of those three powers "plucked up" (Dan. vii. 8) to make way for the full development of the papal supremacy. It is true, Theodoric himself was an Arian, but the Papacy has never hesitated to use one enemy to destroy another, and having secured the overthrow of one could trust to time and influence to subject or destroy the one remaining. And as the story will show, she did not rest until the Ostrogothic power was destroyed.

PEACE UNDER A "BARBARIAN HERETIC."

Theodoric ruled Italy thirty-eight years, A.D. 493-526, during which time Italy enjoyed such peace and quietness and absolute security as had never been known there before, and has never been known since until 1870.

But not alone did civil peace reign. Above all, there was perfect freedom in the exercise of religion. Theodoric and his people were Arians, yet at the close of a fifty-years' rule of Italy, the Ostrogoths could safely challenge their enemies to present a single authentic case in which they had ever persecuted the Catholics.

The separation between Church and State, between civil and religious powers, was clear and distinct. Church property was protected in common with other property, while at the same time it was taxed in common with all other property. The clergy were protected in common with all other people, and they were likewise, in common with all other people, cited before the civil courts to answer for all civil offenses. In all ecclesiastical matters they were left entirely to themselves.

Nor was this merely a matter of toleration; it was in genuine recognition of the rights of conscience. In a letter to the emperor Justin, A.D. 524, Theodoric announced the genuine principle of the rights of conscience, and the relationship that should exist between religion and the State, in the following words, worthy to be graven in letters of gold: -

To pretend to a dominion over the conscience, is to usurp the prerogative of God. By the nature of things, the power of sovereigns is confined to political government. They have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace. The most dangerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief.

Similar pleas had before been made by the parties oppressed, but never before had the principle been announced by the party in power. The enunciation and defense of a principle by the party who holds the power to violate it, is the surest pledge that the principle is held in genuine sincerity.

The description of the state of peace and quietness in Italy above given, applies to Italy, but not to Rome; to the dominions of Theodoric and the Ostrogoths, but not to the city of the pope and the Catholics, as we shall see.

A. T. JONES.

"The Set Time Is Come" *The Present Truth* 13, 46 , p. 729.

"THE time to favour Zion, yea, the set time, is come." The time is here for all the people to receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Do you want it? - Of course you do. Come then, "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking, be put away from you, with all malice." These things grieve the Holy Spirit. The two spirits cannot dwell together. Abandon the spirit of bitterness, malice, and evil-speaking, and the Holy Spirit will gladly take possession.

The Holy Spirit is God's seal of His own righteousness, upon him who receives it. But God never will put His seal upon sin for righteousness. And no person need ever ask Him to do so. Yet for any person to ask for the baptism, or the gift, of the Holy Ghost, while he has not the righteousness of God, this is in itself, though ignorantly and unintentionally, to ask God to put His seal upon sin for righteousness.

Therefore every one who would have the gift of the Holy Spirit must have such righteousness as that Spirit may approve as righteousness indeed. And the righteousness of God is the only righteousness known in the universe which the Spirit of God will approve.

Then let every soul "seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness," as the divinely appointed preparation for receiving the baptism of the Holy Spirit.
A. T. JONES.

November 25, 1897

"After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. The Spirit of Lawlessness" *The Present Truth* 13, 47 , pp. 742, 743.

IN mentioning the peace and quietness which the reign of Theodoric, the Arian, gave to Italy, we remarked that this did not apply to the city of Rome. The spirit of papal lawlessness ruled there.

HOW POPES WERE ELECTED

In A.D. 499, there was a papal election. As there were as usual rival candidates - Symmachus and Laurentius - there was a civil war. "The two factions encountered with the fiercest hostility; the clergy, the Senate, and the populace were divided;" the streets of the city "ran with blood, as in the days of republican strife." (Milman.)

The contestants were so evenly matched, and the violent strife continued so long, that the leading men of both parties persuaded the candidates to go to Theodoric at Ravenna, and submit to his judgment their claims. Theodoric's love of justice and of the rights of the people, readily and simply enough decided that the candidate who had the most votes should be counted elected; and if the votes were evenly divided, then the candidate who had been first ordained.

Symmachus secured the office. A council was held by Symmachus, which met the first of March, 499, and passed a decree "almost in the terms of the old Roman law, severely condemning all ecclesiastical ambition, all canvassing either to obtain subscriptions, or administration of oaths, or promises, for the Papacy" during the lifetime of a pope. But such election methods as these were now so prevalent that this law was of as little value in controlling the methods of the aspiring candidates for the bishopric, as in the days of the republic the same kind of laws were for the candidates to the consulship.

Laurentius, though defeated at this time, did not discontinue his efforts to obtain the office. For four years he watched for opportunities, and carried on an intrigue to displace Symmachus, and in 503 brought a series of heavy charges against him. "The accusation was brought before the judgment-seat of Theodoric, supported by certain Roman females of rank, who had been suborned, it was said, by the enemies of Symmachus. Symmachus was summoned to Ravenna and confined at Rimini," but escaped and returned to Rome. Meantime, Laurentius had entered the city, and when Symmachus returned, "the sanguinary tumults between the two parties broke out with greater fury;" priests were slain, monasteries set on fire, and nuns treated with the utmost indignity.

The Senate petitioned Theodoric to send a visitor to judge the cause of Symmachus in the crimes laid against him. The king finding that the matter was only a Church quarrel, appointed one of their own number, the bishop of Altimo, who so clearly favored Laurentius that his partisanship only made the contention worse. Again Theodoric was petitioned to interfere, but he declined to assume any jurisdiction, and told them to settle it among themselves; but as there was so much disturbance of the peace, and it was so long continued, Theodoric commanded them to reach some sort of settlement that would stop their fighting, and restore public order. A council was therefore called. As Symmachus was on his way to the council, "he was attacked by the adverse party; showers of stones fell around him; many presbyters and others of his followers were severely wounded; the pontiff himself only escaped under the protection of the Gothic guard" (Milman), and took refuge in the church of St. Peter. The danger to which he was then exposed he made an excuse for not appearing at the council.

THE POPE EXALTED

THE majority of the council declared Symmachus "absolved in the sight of men, whether guilty or innocent in the sight of God," for the reason that "no assembly of bishops has power to judge the pope; he is accountable for his actions to God alone." (Bower.) They then commanded all, under penalty of excommunication, to accept this judgment, and submit to the authority of Symmachus, and acknowledge him "for lawful bishop of the holy city of Rome." Symmachus was not slow to assert all the merit that the council had thus recognized in the bishop of Rome. He wrote to the emperor of the East that "a bishop is as much above an emperor as heavenly things, which the bishop administers and dispenses, are above all the trash of the earth, which alone the

greatest among the emperors have the power to dispose of." (Bower.) He declared that the higher powers referred to in Rom. xiii. 1, mean the spiritual powers, and that to these it is that every soul must be subject.

At another council held in Rome in 504, at the direction of Symmachus, a decree was enacted "anathematising and excluding from the communion of the faithful, all who had seized or in the future should seize, hold, or appropriate to themselves, the goods or estates of the church; and this decree was declared to extend even to those who held such estates by grants from the crown." (Bower.) This was explicitly to put the authority of the Church of Rome above that of any State.

OUTBREAK OF PERSECUTION

JUSTIN was emperor of the East A.D. 518-527. He was violently orthodox, and was supported by his nephew, the more violently orthodox Justinian. It was the ambition of both, together and in succession, to make the Catholic religion alone prevalent everywhere. They therefore entered with genuine Catholic zeal upon the pious work of clearing their dominions of heretics. The first edict, issued in 523, commanded all Manicheans to leave the empire under penalty of death; and all other heretics were to be ranked with pagans and Jews, and excluded from all public offices. This

743

edict was no sooner learned of in the West, than mutterings were heard in Rome, of hopes of liberty from the "Gothic yoke." The next step was violence.

Under the just administration of Theodoric, and the safety assured by the Gothic power, many Jews had established themselves in Rome, Genoa, Milan, and other cities, for the purposes of trade. They were permitted by express laws to dwell there. As soon as the imperial edict was known, which commanded all remaining heretics to be ranked as pagans and Jews, as the Catholics did not dare to attack the Gothic heretics, they, at Rome and Ravenna especially, riotously attacked the Jews, abused them, robbed them, and burnt their synagogues. A legal investigation was attempted, but the leaders in the riots could not be discovered. Then Theodoric levied a tax upon the whole community of the guilty cities, with which to settle the damages. Some of the Catholics refused to pay the tax. They were punished. This at once brought a cry from the Catholics everywhere, that they were persecuted. Those who had been punished were glorified as confessors of the faith, and "three hundred pulpits deplored the persecution of the Church." (Gibbon.)

The edict of 523 was followed in 524 by another, this time commanding the Arians of the East to deliver up to the Catholic bishops all their churches, which the Catholic bishops were commanded to consecrate anew.

Theodoric addressed an earnest letter to Justin, in which he pleaded for toleration for the Arians from the Eastern empire. This was the letter in which was stated the principle of the rights of conscience, which we quoted last week. To this noble plea, however, Justin coolly answered: -

I pretend to no authority over men's consciences, but it is my prerogative to intrust the public offices to those in whom I have confidence; and public order demanding uniformity of worship, I have full right to command the churches to be open to those alone who shall conform to the religion of the State.

Accordingly, while pretending to no authority over men's consciences, the Arians of his dominions were by Justin "stripped of all offices of honor or emolument, were not only expelled from the Catholic churches, but their own were closed against them; and they were exposed to all insults, vexations, and persecutions of their adversaries, who were not likely to enjoy their triumph with moderation, or to repress their conscientiously intolerant zeal." (Milman.) Many of them conformed to the State religion; but those of firm faith sent to Theodoric earnest appeals for protection.

Theodoric did all that he could, but without avail. He was urged to retaliate by persecuting the Catholics in Italy, but he steadfastly refused. He determined to send an embassy to Justin, and most singularly sent the pope as his ambassador!

This arrangement gave to the Bishop of Rome the most perfect opportunity he could have asked, to form a compact with the imperial authority of the East, for the further destruction of the Ostrogothic kingdom.

The Pope, John I., "was received in Constantinople with the most flattering honors, as though he had been St. Peter himself. The whole city, with the Emperor at its head, came forth to meet him with tapers and torches, as far as ten miles beyond the gates. The Emperor knelt at his feet, and implored his benediction." Such an embassy could have no other result than more than ever to endanger the kingdom of Theodoric. Before John's return, the conspiracy became more manifest; some senators and leading men were arrested. One of them, Boethius, though denying his guilt, boldly confessed, "Had there been any hopes of liberty, I should have freely indulged them; had I known of a conspiracy against the king, I should have answered in the words of a noble Roman to the frantic Caligula, You would not have known it from me." Such a confession as that was almost a confession of the guilt which he denied. He and his father-in-law were executed. When the Pope returned, he was received as a traitor, and put in prison, where he died, May 18, 526.

He was no sooner dead than violent commotion and disturbances again arose amongst rival candidates for the vacant chair. "Many candidates appeared for the vacant see, and the whole city, the Senate as well as the people and clergy, were divided into parties and factions, the papal dignity being now as eagerly sought for, and often obtained by the same methods and arts as the consular was in the times of the heathen." (Bower.) Theodoric, now seventy-four years old, fearing that these contentions would end in murder and bloodshed again, as they had at the election of Symmachus, suffered his authority to transcend his principles, and presumed, himself, to name a Bishop of Rome. The whole people of the city, Senate, clergy, and all, united in opposition. But a compromise was effected, by which it was agreed that in future the election of the Pope should be by the clergy and people, but must be confirmed by the

sovereign. Upon this understanding, the people accepted Theodoric's nominee; and July 12, 526, Felix III. was installed in the papal office.

The noble Theodoric died a month later, August 30, 526, and was succeeded by his grandson Athalaric, about ten years old, under the regency of his mother Amalasontha. Justin, the emperor, died, and was succeeded by Justinian, August 1, 527, and under Justinian's reign the Papacy was to become fully established in its supremacy.

A. T. JONES.

December 2, 1897

"After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. Justinian Acknowledges the Supremacy of the Papacy" *The Present Truth* 13, 48 , pp. 758, 759.

IN the supremacy of the Papacy, Justinian holds the same place as do Constantine and Theodosius occupy in the establishment of the Catholic Church. "Among the titles of greatness, the name 'Pious' was most pleasing to his ears; to promote the temporal and spiritual interests of the church was the serious business of his life; and the duty of father of his country was often sacrificed to that of defender of the faith." (Gibbon.) "The emperor Justinian unites in himself the most opposite vices, - insatiable rapacity and lavish prodigality, intense pride and contemptible weakness, unmeasured ambition and dastardly cowardice. . . . In the Christian emperor, seem to meet the crimes of those who won or secured their empire by assassination of all whom they feared." (Milman.)

Pope Felix was succeeded by Boniface II., A.D. 530-532, who was chosen amidst the now customary scenes of disturbance and strife, which in this case were brought to an end, and the election of Boniface secured, by the death of his rival, who after his death was excommunicated by Boniface. On account of the shameful briberies and other methods of competition employed in the election of the popes, the Roman Senate now enacted a law against bringing votes and influence in papal elections. Laws of the same import had already been enacted more than once, but they amounted to nothing; because as in the days of Cesar, everybody was ready to bribe or be bribed. Accordingly, at the very next election, in 532, "Votes were publicly bought and sold; and notwithstanding the decree lately issued by the Senate, money was offered to the senators themselves, nay, the lands of the Church were mortgaged by some, and the sacred utensils pawned by others or publicly sold for ready money." (Bower.) As the result of seventy-five days of this kind of work, a certain John Mercurius was made pope, and took the title of John II., December 31, 532.

CIVIL POWER AGAIN ENFORCING RELIGION

In the year 532, Justinian issued an edict declaring his intention "to unite all men in one faith." Whether they were Jews, Gentiles, or Christians, all who did

not within three months profess and embrace the Catholic faith, were by the edict "declared infamous, and as such excluded from all employments both civil and military; rendered incapable of leaving anything by will; and all their estates confiscated, whether real or personal." As a result of this cruel edict, "Great numbers were driven from their habitations with their wives and children, stripped and naked. Others betook themselves to flight, carrying with them what they could conceal, for their support and maintenance; but they were plundered of what little they had, and many of them inhumanly massacred." (Bower.)

There now occurred a transaction which meant much in the supremacy of the papacy. It was brought about in this way: Ever since the Council of Chalcedon had "settled" the question of the two natures in Christ, there had been more, and more violent, contentions over it than ever before; "for everywhere monks were at the head of the religious revolution which threw off the yoke of the Council of Chalcedon." In Jerusalem a certain Theodosius was at the head of the army of monks, who made him bishop, and in acts of violence, pillage, and murder, he fairly outdid the perfectly lawless bandits of the country. "The very scenes of the Saviour's mercies ran with blood shed in His name by his ferocious self-called disciples." (Milman.)

In Alexandria, "the bishop was not only murdered in the baptistery, but his body was treated with shameless indignities, and other enormities were perpetrated which might have appalled a cannibal." And the monkish horde then elected as bishop one of their own number, Timothy the Weasel, a disciple of Dioscorus. (Milman.)

THE "TRISAGION" CONTROVERSY

SOON there was added to all this another point which increased the fearful warfare. In the Catholic churches it was customary to sing what was called the *Trisagion*, or Thrice-Holy. It was, originally, the "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts" of Isaiah vi. 3; but at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, it had been changed, and was used by the council thus: "Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us." At Antioch, in 477, a third monk, Peter the Fuller, "led a procession, chiefly of monastics, through the streets," loudly singing the Thrice-Holy, with the addition, "Who wast crucified for us." It was orthodox to sing it as the Council of Chalcedon had used it, with the understanding that the three "Holies" referred respectively to the three persons of the Trinity. It was heresy to sing it with the later addition.

In A.D. 511, two hordes of monks on the two sides of the question met in Constantinople. "The two black-cowled armies watched each other for several months, working in secret on their respective partisans. At length they came to a rupture. . . . The Monophysite monks in the church of the Archangel within the palace, broke out after the 'Thrice-Holy' with the burden added at Antioch by Peter the Fuller, 'who wast crucified for us.' The orthodox monks, backed by the rabble of Constantinople, endeavored to expel them from the church; they were not content with hurling curses against each other, sticks and stones began their

work. There was a wild, fierce fray; the divine presence of the emperor lost its awe; he

759

could not maintain the peace. The bishop Macedonius either took the lead, or was compelled to lead the tumult. Men, women, and children poured out from all quarters; the monks with their archimandrites at the head of the raging multitude, echoed back their religious war cry." (Milman.)

RIOTING ABOUT THE FAITH

These are but samples of the repeated - it might almost be said the continuous - occurrences in the cities of the East. "Throughout Asiatic Christendom it was the same wild struggle. Bishops deposed quietly; or where resistance was made, the two factions fighting in the streets, in the churches: cities, even the holiest places, ran with blood. . . . The hymn of the angels in heaven was the battle cry on earth, the signal of human bloodshed." (Milman.)

In A.D. 512 one of these *Trisagion* riots broke out in Constantinople, because the emperor proposed to use the added clause. "Many palaces of the nobles were set on fire, the officers of the crown insulted, pillage, conflagration, violence, raged through the city." In the house of the favorite minister of the emperor there was found a monk from the country. He was accused of having suggested the use of the addition. His head was cut off and raised high on a pole, and the whole orthodox populace marched through the streets singing the orthodox *Trisagion*, and shouting, "Behold the enemy of the Trinity!"

In A.D. 519, another dispute was raised, growing out of the addition to the *Trisagion*. That was, "Did one of the Trinity suffer in the flesh? or did one *person* of the Trinity suffer in the flesh?" The monks of Scythia affirmed that one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh, and declared that to say that one person of the Trinity suffered in the flesh, was absolute heresy. The question was brought before Pope Hormisdas, who decided that to say that "one person of the Trinity suffered in the flesh" was the orthodox view; and denounced the monks as proud, arrogant, obstinate, enemies to the Church, disturbers of the public peace, slanderers, liars, and instruments employed by the enemy of truth to banish all truth, to establish error in its room, and to sow among the wheat the poisonous seeds of diabolical tares.

Now, in 533, this question was raised again, and Justinian became involved in the dispute.

This time one set of monks argued that "if one of the Trinity did not suffer on the cross, then one of the Trinity was not born of the Virgin Mary, and therefore she ought no longer to be called the mother of God." Others argued: "If one of the Trinity did not suffer on the cross, then Christ who suffered was not one of the Trinity." Justinian entered the lists against both, and declared that Mary was "truly the mother of God;" that Christ was "in the strictest sense one of the Trinity;" and that whosoever denied either the one or the other, was a heretic.

This frightened the monks, because they knew Justinian's opinions on the subject of heretics were exceedingly forcible. They therefore sent off two of their

number to lay the question before the Pope. As soon as Justinian learned this, he, too, decided to apply to the Pope. He therefore drew up a confession of faith that "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh," and sent it by two bishops to the Bishop of Rome. To make his side of the question appear as favourable as possible to the Pope, Justinian sent a rich present of chalices and other vessels of gold, enriched with precious stones; and the following flattering letter which was used to show that the emperor acknowledged the Pope of Rome to be the head of all churches: -

"Justinian, pious, fortunate, renowned, triumphant; emperor, consul, etc., to John, the most holy archbishop of our city of Rome, and patriarch: -

"Rendering honor to the apostolic chair, and to your Holiness, as has been always and is our wish, and honoring your Blessedness as a father, we have hastened to bring to the knowledge of your Holiness all matters relating to the state of the churches. It having been at all times our great desire to preserve the unity of your apostolic chair, and the constitution of the holy churches of God which has obtained hitherto, and still obtains.

"Therefore we have made no delay in subjecting and uniting to your Holiness all the priests of the whole East.

"For this reason we have thought fit to bring to your notice the present matters of disturbance; though they are manifest and unquestionable, and always firmly held and declared by the whole priesthood according to the doctrine of your apostolic chair. For we can not suffer that anything which relates to the state of the church, however manifest and unquestionable, should be moved, without the knowledge of your Holiness, who are the head of all the holy churches; for in all things, we have already declared, we are anxious to increase the honour and authority of your apostolic chair.

Following out the line of this acknowledgment the arms of Justinian were soon to be used to crush Arian opposition to the pretensions of the Roman bishopric and to fully establish the temporal power of the Papacy. The Herulian kingdom had been already destroyed. Two others were to be "plucked up" before the Papacy could take its place of temporal sovereignty (Dan. vii. 8).

A. T. JONES.

"Eternal Verities" *The Present Truth* 13, 48 , p. 761.

"THE eternal God is thy refuge." Deut. xxxiii. 27.

He "whose goings forth have been from the days of eternity" is your Saviour. Micah v. 2., margin.

"The eternal Spirit guides you into the knowledge of "the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." Eph. iii. 11.

Through Him "whose goings forth have been from the days of eternity," "the eternal God" gives to you "eternal life," in order that "the eternal Spirit" may guide

you into the knowledge of that "eternal purpose," in which He "hath called us unto His eternal glory." Rom. vi. 23; 1 Peter v. 10.

And our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh - is working - for us an eternal weight of glory, while we look at things which are eternal. 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18.

And, "Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, . . . I dwell in the high and holy place, - with Him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit." Isa. lvii. 15. "Fear not: for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art Mine." Isa. xliii. 1.

Do you not see, then, that the Christian belongs to eternity, and not at all to time?

Oh, then stand up, and be a Christian in the full enjoyment of the presence of eternity and the consciousness of "the power of an endless life."

A. T. JONES.

December 9, 1897

"After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. The Temporal Authority of the Papacy Established" *The Present Truth* 13, 49 , pp. 773, 774.

ALL things were now ready for the complete deliverance of the Catholic Church from Arian dominion. Since the death of Theodoric, divided councils had crept in amongst the Ostrogoths, and the Catholic Church had been more and more cementing to its interests the powers of the Eastern throne. "Constant amicable intercourse was still taking place between the Catholic clergy of the East and the West; between Constantinople and Rome; between Justinian and the rapid succession of pontiffs who occupied the throne during the ten years between the death of Theodoric and the invasion of Italy." (Milman.)

THE VANDALS OVERTHROWN

THE crusade began with the invasion of the Arian kingdom of the Vandals in Africa, of whom Gelimer was the king, and was openly and avowedly in the interests of the Catholic religion and church. For in a council of his ministers, nobles, and bishops, Justinian was dissuaded from undertaking the African War. He hesitated, and was about to relinquish his design, when he was rallied by a fanatical bishop, who exclaimed: "I have seen a vision! It is the will of heaven, O emperor, that you should not abandon your holy enterprise for the deliverance of the African church. The God of battle will march before your standard and disperse your enemies, who are the enemies of His Son."

This persuasion was sufficient for the "pious" emperor, and in June, 533, "the whole fleet of six hundred ships was ranged in martial pomp before the gardens of the palace," laden and equipped with thirty-five thousand troops and sailors, and five thousand horses, all under the command of Belisarius. He landed on the

coast of Africa in September; Carthage was captured on the 18th of the same month; Gelimer was disastrously defeated in November; and the conquest of Africa, and the destruction of the Vandal kingdom, were completed by the capture of Gelimer in the spring of 534.

Belisarius dispatched to Justinian the news of his victory. "He received the messengers of victory at the time when he was preparing to publish the Pandects of the Roman law; and the devout or jealous emperor celebrated the divine goodness and confessed, in silence, the merit of his successful general. Impatient to abolish the temporal and spiritual tyranny of the Vandals, *he proceeded, without delay, to the full establishment of the Catholic Church.* Her jurisdiction, wealth, and immunities, perhaps the most essential part of episcopal religion, were restored and amplified with a liberal hand; the Arian worship was suppressed, the Donatist meetings were proscribed; and the Synod of Carthage, by the voice of two hundred and seventeen bishops, applauded the just measure of pious retaliation." (Gibbon.)

As soon as this pious work of uprooting the Vandal kingdom had been fully accomplished, the arms of Justinian were turned against Italy and the Arian Ostrogoths. In 534 Amalasontha had been supplanted in her rule over the Ostrogoths by her cousin Theodotus. And "during the short and troubled reign of Theodotus - 534-536 - Justinian received petitions from all parts of Italy, and from all persons, lay as well as clerical, with the air and tone of its sovereign." (Milman.)

THE OSTROGOTHIC KINGDOM DESTROYED

BELISARIUS subdued Sicily in 535, and invaded Italy and captured Naples in 536. As it was now about the first of December, the Gothic warriors decided to postpone, until the following spring, their resistance to the invaders. A garrison of four thousand soldiers was left in Rome, a feeble number to defend such a city at such a time in any case, but these troops proved to be even more feeble in faith than they were in numbers.

They threw over all care of the city, and "furiously exclaimed that the apostolic throne should no longer be profaned by the triumph or toleration of Arianism; that the tombs of the Caesars should no longer be trampled by the savages of the North; and, without reflecting that Italy must sink into a province of Constantinople, they fondly hailed the restoration of a Roman emperor as a new era of freedom and prosperity. The deputies of the pope and clergy, of the Senate and people, invited the lieutenant of Justinian to accept their voluntary allegiance, and to enter into the city, whose gates would be thrown open to his reception." (Gibbon.)

Belisarius at once marched to Rome, which he entered December 10, 536. But this was not the conquest of Italy or even of Rome. "From their rustic habitations, from their different garrisons, the Goths assembled at Ravenna for the defence of their country: and such were their numbers that, after an army had been detached for the relief of Dalmatia, one hundred and fifty thousand fighting men marched under the royal standard" in the spring, A.D. 537; and the Gothic

nation returned to the siege of Rome and the defence of Italy against the invaders. "The whole nation of the Ostrogoths had been assembled for the attack, and was almost entirely consumed in the siege of Rome," which continued above a year, 537-538. "One year and nine days after the commencement of the siege, an army so lately strong and triumphant, burnt their tents, and tumultuously repassed the Milvian bridge," and Rome was delivered, March, 538. (Gibbon.) The remains of the kingdom were soon afterward destroyed. And thus was the kingdom of the Ostrogoths destroyed before the vengeful arrogance of the Papacy.

774

POPE ASSERTING TEMPORAL AUTHORITY

This completely opened the way for the bishop of Rome to assert his sole authority over the estates of the church. The district immediately surrounding Rome was called the Roman duchy, and it was so largely occupied by the estates of the church that the Bishop of Rome claimed exclusive authority over it. "The Emperor, indeed, continued to control the elections and to enforce the payment of tribute for the territory protected by the imperial arms; but, on the other hand, the pontiff exercised a definite authority within the Roman duchy, and claimed to have a voice in the appointment of the civil officers who administered the local government." (Encyclopedia Britannica.)

Under the protectorate of the armies of the East which soon merged in the exarch of Ravenna, the papacy enlarged its aspirations, confirmed its powers, and strengthened its situation both spiritually and temporally. Being by the decrees of the councils, and the homage of the emperor, made the head of all ecclesiastical and spiritual dominion on earth, and being now in possession of *territory*, and exerting a measure of civil authority therein, the opportunity that now fell to the ambition of the bishopric of Rome was to assert, to gain, and to exercise, supreme authority in all things temporal as well as spiritual. And the sanction of this aspiration was made to accrue from Justinian's letter, in which he rendered such distinctive honor to the apostolic see. It is true that Justinian wrote these words with no such far-reaching meaning, but that made no difference; the words were written, and like all other words of similar import, they could be, and were, made to bear whatever meaning the bishop of Rome should choose to find in them.

BEGINNING OF THE 1,260 YEARS OF PAPAL DOMINION (DAN. VII. 25)

THEREFORE, the year A.D. 538, which marks the conquest of Italy, the deliverance of Rome, and the destruction of the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, is the true date which marks the establishment of the temporal authority of the Papacy, and the exercise of that authority as a world-power. All that was ever done later in this connection was but to enlarge by additional usurpations and donations, the territories which the Bishop of Rome at this point possessed, and over which he

asserted civil jurisdiction. This view is fully sustained by the following excellent statement of the case: -

The conquest of Italy by the Greeks was, to a great extent at least, the *work of the Catholic clergy*. . . . The overthrow of the Gothic kingdom was to Italy an unmitigated evil. A monarch like Witiges or Totila would soon have repaired the mischiefs caused by the degenerate successors of Theodoric, Athalaric, and Theodotus. In their overthrow began *the fatal policy of the Roman see*, . . . which never would permit a powerful native kingdom to unite Italy, or a very large part of it, under one dominion. Whatever it may have been to Christendom, the papacy has been the eternal, implacable foe of Italian independence and Italian unity; and so (as far as independence and unity might have given dignity, political weight, and prosperity) to the welfare of Italy. . . . Rome, jealous of all temporal sovereignty but her own, for centuries yielded up, or rather made, Italy a battlefield to the Transalpine and the stranger, and at the same time so secularized her own spiritual supremacy as to confound altogether the priest and the politician, to degrade absolutely and almost irrevocably the kingdom of Christ into a kingdom of this world." (Milman.)

Then "began that fatal policy of the Roman see," because she was then herself a world-power, possessing temporalities over which she both claimed and exercised dominion, and by virtue of which she could contend with other dominions, and upon the same level.

It is evident that as the Papacy had hitherto claimed, and had actually acquired, absolute dominion over all things spiritual, henceforth she would claim, and, if crafty policy and unscrupulous procedure were of any avail, would actually acquire, absolute dominion over all things temporal as well as spiritual. Indeed, as we have seen, this was already claimed, and the history of Europe for more than a thousand of the following years, abundantly proves that the claim was finally and fully established. Henceforth kings and emperors were but her tools, and often but her playthings; and kingdoms and empires her conquests, and often only her traffic.

A. T. JONES.

December 16, 1897

"After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. After Papal Supremacy Was Established" *The Present Truth* 13, 50 , pp. 791, 792.

THE history of this phase of the Papacy is fully as interesting, though the details are not so important, as that which shows how her ecclesiastical supremacy was established. Here, however, will be noticed but the one point, how the Papacy assumed the supremacy over kings and emperors, and acquired the prerogative of dispensing kingdoms and empires.

The contest began even with Justinian, who had done so much to exalt the dignity and clear the way of the Papacy. Justinian soon became proud of his

theological abilities, and presumed to dictate the faith of the papacy, rather than to submit, as formerly, to her guidance.

And from A.D. 542 to the end of his long reign in 565, there was almost constant war, with alternate advantage, between Justinian and the popes. But as emperors live and die, while the papacy only lives, the real victory remained with her.

LOMBARD INVASION

In A.D. 568 the Lombards had invaded Italy, and for nearly twenty years wrought such devastation that even the pope thought the world was coming to an end. The imperial power of the East was so weak that the defense of Italy fell exclusively to the exarch of Ravenna and the pope. And owing to the weakness of the exarchate the pope alone became really the chief defender of Italy. In 594 Gregory I - the Great - became pope, and concluded a treaty of peace with the Lombards, and "the pope and the the king of the Lombards became the real powers in the north and center of Italy."

The wife of the king of the Lombards was a Catholic, and by the influence of Gregory, she "solemnly placed the Lombard nation under the patronage of St. John the Baptist. At Monza she built in his honor the first Lombard church, and the royal palace near it." From this the Lombards soon became Catholic; but though this was so, they would not suffer the priesthood to have any part in the affairs of the kingdom. They "never admitted the bishops of Italy to a seat in their legislative councils." (Gibbon.) And although under the Lombard dominion "the Italians enjoyed a milder and more equitable government than any of the other kingdoms which had been founded on the ruins of the empire," this exclusion of the clergy from affairs of the state was as much against them now, though Catholic, as their Arianism had been against them before; and the popes ever anxiously hoped to have them driven entirely from Italy.

In 728 the edict of the Eastern emperor abolishing the worship of images, was published in Italy. "The pope defended the images, of course, and the Italians swore to live and die in defense of the pope and the holy images." (Gibbon.) An alliance was formed between the Lombards and the Papacy for the defence of the images. The alliance, however, did not last long. Both powers being determined to possess as much of Italy as possible, there was constant irritation, which finally culminated in open hostilities, and the Lombards invaded the papal territory in A.D. 739.

Charles Martel, the mayor of the palace of the Frankish kingdom, had gained a world-wide glory by his late victory, 732, over the Mohammedans at Tours. Of all the barbarians, the Franks were the first who had become Catholic, and they had ever since been dutiful sons of the Church. The pope, Gregory III., now determined to appeal to Charles for help against the assertion of Lombard dominion.

THE POPE APPEALS TO FRANCE

He sent to Charles the keys of the "sepulchre of St. Peter;" some filings from the chains with which "Peter had been bound;" and, more important than all, as the legitimate inheritor of the authority of the ancient Roman republic, he presumed to bestow upon Charles Martel the title of Roman consul. "Throughout these transactions the pope appears actually, if not openly, an independent power, leaguings with the allies or the enemies of the empire, as might suit the exigencies of the time." And now, "the pope, as an independent potentate, is forming an alliance with a transalpine sovereign for the liberation of Italy." (Milman.)

The Lombards, too, sent to Charles with counter-negotiations. This the pope knew, and wrote to Charles that in Italy the Lombards were treating him with contempt, and were saying, "Let him come, this Charles, with his army of Franks; if he can, let him rescue you out of our hands;" and then Gregory laments, and pleads with Charles thus: -

O unspeakable grief, that such sons so insulted should make no effort to defend their holy mother, the church! Not that St. Peter is unable to protect his successors, and to exact vengeance upon their oppressors, but the apostle is putting the faith of his followers to trial. . . . Close not your ears against our supplication, lest St. Peter close against you the gates of heaven. I conjure you by the living and the true God, and by the keys of St. Peter, not to prefer the alliance of the Lombards to the love of the great apostle, but hasten, hasten to our succor that we may say with the prophet, "The Lord has heard us in the day of tribulation, the God of Jacob has protected us."

The ambassadors and the letters of the pope "were received by Charles with decent reverence; but the greatness of his occupations and the shortness of his life, prevented his interference in the affairs of Italy, except by friendly and ineffectual mediation." (Gibbon.) But affairs soon took such a turn in France that the long-cherished desire of the papacy was rewarded with abundant fruition. Charles Martel was simply duke or mayor of the palace, under the sluggard kings of France. He died October 21, 741. Gregory III. died November 27, of the same year, and was succeeded by Zacharias. No immediate help coming from France, Zacharias made overtures to the Lombards, and a treaty of peace for twenty years was con-

792

cluded between the kingdom of Lombardy and "the dukedom of Rome."

THE POPE A KING-MAKER

Charles Martel left two sons, Carloman and Pepin. Carloman being the elder was his successor in office; but he had been in place but a little while, before he resigned it to his brother, and became a monk, A.D. 747. The late events in Italy, and the prestige which the pope had gained by them, exerted a powerful influence in France; and as the pope had already desired a league with Charles Martel, who, although not possessing the title, held all the authority, of a king,

Pepin, his successor, conceived the idea that perhaps he could secure the papal sanction to his assuming the title of king with the authority which he already possessed.

Pepin therefore sent two ecclesiastics to consult the pope as to whether he might not be king of France, and Zacharias returned answer "that the nation might lawfully unite, in the same person, the title and authority of king; and that the unfortunate Childeric, a victim of the public safety, should be degraded, shaved, and confined in a monastery for the remainder of his days. An answer so agreeable to their wishes was accepted by the Franks as the opinion of a casuist, the sentence of a judge, or the oracle of a prophet; . . . and Pepin was exalted on a buckler by the suffrage of a free people, accustomed to obey his laws, and to march under his standard;" and March 7, 752, was proclaimed king of the Franks. (Gibbon.)

Zacharias died March 14, the same year, and was succeeded by Stephen II., who died the fourth day afterward, and before his consecration, and Stephen III. became pope, March 26. Astolph was now king of the Lombards. He had openly declared himself the enemy of the pope; and was determined to make not only the territories of the exarchate, but those of the pope, his own. "In terms of contumely and menace he demanded the instant submission of Rome, and the payment of a heavy personal tribute, a poll-tax on each citizen." The pope again sent ambassadors; but they were treated with contempt, and Astolph approached Rome to enforce his demand. "The pope appealed to heaven, by tying a copy of the treaty, violated by Astolph, to the holy cross." (Milman.)

THE POPE ANOINTS PEPIN KING

He wrote to Pepin, but got no answer. In his distress he wrote even to Constantinople, but much less from there was there an answer. Then he determined to go personally to Pepin, and ask his help. There was present at the court of the pope an ambassador from the court of France, under whose protection Stephen placed himself, and traveled openly through the dominions of Astolph. November 15, 752, he entered the French dominions. He was met on the frontier by one of the clergy and a nobleman, with orders to conduct him to the court of the king. A hundred miles from the palace he was met by Prince Charles, afterward the mighty Charlemagne, with other nobles who escorted him on his way.

Three miles from the palace, the king himself, with his wife and family, and an array of nobles, met Stephen. "As the pope approached, the king dismounted from his horse, and prostrated himself on the ground before him. He then walked by the side of the pope's palfrey. The pope and the ecclesiastics broke out at once into hymns of thanksgiving, and so chanting as they went, reached the royal residence. Stephen lost no time in adverting to the object of his visit. He implored the immediate interposition of Pepin to enforce the restoration of St. Peter. . . . Pepin swore at once to fulfill all the requests of the pope. . . . Pepin swore at once to fulfill all the requests of the pope, but, as the winter rendered all

military operations impracticable, Pepin invited the pope to Paris, where he took up his residence in the Abbey of St. Denys. (Milman.)

Pepin had already been anointed by a bishop in France, but this was not enough; the pope must anoint him too, and then upon this claim that the king of the Franks held his kingdom by the grace of the bishop of Rome. In the monastery of St. Denys, Stephen III. placed the diadem on the head of Pepin, anointed him with the holy oil, confirmed the sovereignty in his house forever, and pronounced an eternal curse upon all who should attempt to name a king of France from any other than the race of Pepin. The pope was attacked with a dangerous sickness which kept him at the capital of France until the middle of 753.

At some point in this series of transactions, we know not exactly where, the pope as the head of the restored republic of Rome, renewed to Pepin the Roman title and dignity of "patrician," which, as well as that of consul, had been conferred upon Charles Martel. The insignia of the new office were the keys of the shrine of St. Peter, "as a pledge and symbol of sovereignty;" and a "holy" banner which it was their "right and duty to unfurl" in defence of the church and city of Rome.

A. T. JONES.

December 23, 1897

"After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. Popes and Kings" *The Present Truth* 13, 51 , pp. 805, 806.

HAVING anointed Pepin king of the Franks, Pope Stephen persuaded him to march into Italy to repel the Lombard rulers from the territory which was claimed as the estates of the Church. Astolph, the Lombard king, sued for peace and pledged himself, on oath, to restore the territory of Rome.

Pepin returned to his capital; and Stephen retired to Rome. But Pepin was no sooner well out of reach, than Astolph was under arms again, and on his way to Rome. He marched to the very gates of the city, and demanded the surrender of the pope. "He demanded that the Romans should give up the pope into his hands, and on these terms only would he spare the city. Astolph declared he would not leave the pope a foot of land." (Milman.)

IN THE NAME OF PETER

STEPHEN hurried away messengers with a letter to Pepin in which the pope reminded him that St. Peter had promised him eternal life in return for a vow which he had made to make a donation to St. Peter. He told Pepin that he risked eternal damnation in not hastening to fulfill his vow; and that as Peter had Pepin's handwriting to the vow, if he did not fulfill it, the apostle would present it against him in the day of judgment. Pepin did not respond, and a second letter was despatched in which the pope "conjured him, by God and His holy mother, by the

angels in heaven, by the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and by the last day," to hasten to the rescue of his holy mother, the Church, and promised him, if he would do so, "victory over all the barbarian nations, and eternal life." But even yet Pepin did not respond; and as Astolph was pressing closer and harder, the pope determined to have St. Peter himself address the dilatory king. Accordingly, he sent now the following letter: -

I, Peter the Apostle, protest, admonish, and conjure you, the most Christian kings, Pepsin, Charles, and Carloman, with all the hierarchy, bishops, abbots, priests, and all monks; all judges, dukes, counts, and the whole people of the Franks. The Mother of God likewise adjures you, and admonishes and commands you, she as well as the thrones and dominions, and all the hosts of heaven, to save the beloved city of Rome from the detested Lombards. If ye hasten, I, Peter, the apostle, promise you my protection in this life and in the next, I will prepare for you the most glorious mansions in heaven, will bestow on you the everlasting joys of paradise. Make common cause with my people of Rome, and I will grant whatever ye may pray for. I conjure you not to yield up this city to be lacerated and tormented by the Lombards, lest your own souls be lacerated and tormented in hell, with the devil and his pestilential angels. Of all nations under heaven, the Franks are highest in the esteem of St. Peter; to me you owe all your victories. Obey, and obey speedily, and, by my suffrage, our Lord Jesus Christ will give you in this life length of days, security, victory; in the life to come, will multiply his blessings upon you, among his saints and angels.

This aroused Pepin to the most diligent activity. Astolph heard that he was coming, and hastened back to his capital; but scarcely heard he reached it before Pepin was besieging him there. Astolph yielded at once, and gave up to Pepin the whole disputed territory. Representatives of the emperor of the East were there to demand that it be restored to him; but "Pepin declared that his sole object in the war was to show his veneration for St. Peter;" and as the spoils of conquest, he bestowed the whole of it upon the pope - A.D. 755.

All the donations which Pepin had bestowed upon the papacy were received and held by the popes, under the pious fiction that they were for such holy uses as keeping up the lights in the churches, and maintaining the poor. But in fact they were held as the dominions of the new sovereign State descended from the Roman republic, the actual authority of which had now become merged in the pope. All these territories the pope ruled as sovereign. "The local or municipal institutions remained; but the revenue, which had before been received by the Byzantine crown, became the revenue of the Church: of that revenue the pope was the guardian, distributor, possessor." (Milman.)

THE POPE MAKES CHARLEMAGNE EMPEROR

In A.D. 768, Pepin died, and was succeeded by his two sons, Charles and Carloman. In 771 Carloman died, leaving Charles sole king, who by his remarkable ability became Charles the Great, - Charlemagne, - and reigned forty-six years in all - thirty-three of which were spent in almost ceaseless wars.

Charlemagne was a no less devout Catholic than was Clovis before him. His wars against the pagan Saxons were almost wholly wars of religion; and his stern declaration that "these Saxons must be Christianized or wiped out," expresses the temper both of his religion and of his warfare. He completed the conquest of Lombardy and placed, upon his own head the iron crown of that kingdom, and confirmed to the Papacy the donation of territory which Pepin had made.

It seems almost certain that Charlemagne really aspired to consolidate the territories of the West into a grand new Roman empire. In addition to the kingship of all the wide Frankish dominions, he wore the iron crown of Lombardy. The next step was to be emperor indeed; and that was soon brought about. Leo III. was pope. In 799 he made a journey to France, and was royally received and entertained by Charlemagne. "At an imperial banquet, the king and the pope quaffed together their rich wines with convivial glee." In 800 Charlemagne made a journey to Rome. He arrived in the city November 23, and remained there through the month of December.

On Christmas day magnificent services were held. Charlemagne appeared not in the dress of his native country, but in that of a patrician of Rome, which honour he had inherited from his father, who had received it from the pope. Thus arrayed, the king with all his court, his nobles, and the

806

people and the whole clergy of Rome, attended the services. "The pope himself chanted the mass; the full assembly were wrapped in profound devotion. At the close the pope rose, advanced toward Charles with a splendid crown in his hands, placed it upon his brow, and proclaimed him Cesar Augustus." The dome of the great church "resounded with the acclamations of the people, 'Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus, crowned by God the great and pacific emperor of the Romans.'" Then the head and body of Charlemagne were anointed with the "holy oil" by the hands of the pope himself, and the services were brought to a close. (Gibbon.) In return for all this, Charlemagne swore to maintain the faith, the power, and the privileges of the church; and to recognise the spiritual dominion of the pope, throughout the limits of his empire.

"THAT GREAT CITY, WHICH REIGNETH OVER THE KINGS OF THE EARTH

THUS had the papacy arrogated to itself all the authority of the ancient Roman empire, and with this the prerogative of bestowing upon whom she would, the dignities, titles, and powers of that empire. And now, as the representative of God, the pope had re-established that empire by bestowing upon Charlemagne the dignity and titles of Caesar, Augustus, and emperor.

Such was the origin, and thus was established, the doctrine of "divine right" in rulers. Thus was established the doctrine of the supremacy of the bishop of Rome over all things earthly, to whom it "belongs" to set up and to pull down

kings and emperors. Thus did the Papacy become the dispenser of kingdoms and empires, the disposer of peoples, and the distributor of nations. As she had already, and for a long while, asserted supreme authority over all things spiritual, in heaven and hell, as well as upon earth, and now by this transaction was enabled to assert supremacy over kingdoms, and empires, and their rulers, henceforth the papacy recognized no limits to her dominion over heaven, earth, and hell. A. T. JONES.

December 31, 1897

"After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. Germ of the Papacy - Reformation Principles" *The Present Truth* 13, 52 , pp. 821-823.

EVER since that Christmas day, A.D. 800, Leo and all his successors have spent their lives, and exercised their boundless ambition, in making felt to the uttermost this blasphemous claim; and for ages, nations groaned and people perished, under the frightful exercise of this infernal power.

HOW THE PAPACY HAS USED ITS POWER

Under it the famous and the infamous Hildebrand punished Henry IV., Emperor of Germany, in the no less famous and infamous transaction of Canossa. By it Urban and his successors unto Innocent III., like terrible Muezzin, called millions from Europe to dreadful slaughter in the Crusades; and through it, by the instrumentality of the "Holy" Inquisition, Innocent III. and his successors unto Gregory XVI., poured out their demoniacal wrath upon the innocent Albigenses, the devoted Waldenses, and the millions of other Christians who by sword, by captivity, by dungeon, by rack, by torture, and by flame, yielded their lives rather than submit to this horrible despotism over the bodies and souls, the actions and the thoughts, of men, choosing rather to die the free men of Christ, than to live the slaves of that filthy strumpet who has "deluged Europe and Asia with blood" (Gibbon) and which the holy seer of Patmos saw "drunken with the blood of the saints, and the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. xvii. 1-6.

And even the Inquisition in its practical workings, is but the logic of the theocratical theory upon which the Papacy is founded, the theory that men must govern for the Lord, and "protect" religion by forcing it upon others. It is the theory at the foundation of every Sunday law, and all connection of religion and the State.

WHEN MEN ATTEMPT TO EXERCISE MORAL SOVEREIGNTY

God is the moral governor. His government is moral only, whose code is the moral law. His government and his law have to do with the thoughts, the intents, and the secrets of men's hearts. This must be ever the government of God, and

nothing short of it can be the government of God. The papacy then being the head of what pretends to be a government of God, and ruling there in the place of God, her government must rule in the realm of morals, and must take cognizance of the counsels of the heart.

But being composed of men, how can she discover what are the thoughts of men's hearts whether they be good or evil, that she may pronounce judgment upon them? By long and careful experiment, and by intense ingenuity, means were discovered by which the most secret thoughts of men's hearts might be wrung from them, and that was by the *confessional* first, and especially for those who submit to her authority; and by the thumbscrew, the rack, and her other horrible tortures second, and for those who would not submit - in one word it was by the Inquisition that it was accomplished.

There remained but one thing more to make the enormity complete, and that was not only to sanction but to deify the whole

822

deceitful, licentious, and bloody record, with the assertion of infallibility. As all the world knows, this too has been done. And even this is but the logic of the theocratical theory upon which the foundation of the papacy was laid in the days of Constantine.

DEIFYING SIN AND SELF

FOR, the Papacy being professedly the government of God, he who sits at the head of it, sits there as the representative of God. He represents the divine authority; and when he speaks or acts officially, his speech or act is that of God. But to make a man thus the representative of God, is only to clothe human passions with divine power and authority. And being human, he is bound always to act unlike God; and being clothed with irresponsible power, he will often act like the devil. Consequently, in order to make all his actions consistent with his profession, he is compelled to cover them all with the Divine attributes, and make everything that he does in his official capacity the act of God. This is precisely the logic and the profession of papal infallibility. It is not claimed that all the pope speaks is infallible; it is only what he speaks officially - what he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, from the throne.

Under this theory, he sits upon that throne as the head of the government of God, and he sits there as God indeed. For the same pope that published this dogma of infallibility, published a book of his speeches, in the preface to which, in the official and approved edition, he is declared to be "The living Christ," "The voice of God;" "He is nature that protests; he is God that condemns." Thus, in the Papacy there is fulfilled to the letter, in completest meaning, the prophecy - 2 Thess. ii. 1-9 - of "the falling away" and the revealing of "that man of sin," "the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

Therefore, sitting in the place of God, ruling from that place as God, that which he speaks from the throne is the word of God, and must be infallible. This

is the inevitable logic of the false theocratical theory. And if it be denied that the theory is false, there is logically no escape from accepting the whole Papal system. The theory contains within it the germ of THE ENTIRE PAPACY.

REFORMATION PRINCIPLES

THEN came the Reformation, protesting against the papal system, and asserting again the rights of the individual conscience, declaring for a separation between Church and State, and that to Cesar is to be rendered only that which is Cesar's, while men are left free to render to God, according to the dictates of their own conscience, that which is God's.

To Luther more than to any other one, there fell the blessed task of opening up the contest with the Papacy, and of announcing the principles of the Reformation. It is not without cause that Luther stands at the head of all men in the great Reformation and in the history of Protestantism: for he alone of all the leaders in the Reformation times held himself and his cause aloof from the powers of this world, and declined all connection of the State with the work of the Gospel, even to support it. At a time when the Papacy was urging the emperor and princes to destroy him, Luther wrote to the court of the Elector Frederick, who was his friend: -

If the Gospel was of a nature to be propagated or maintained by the power of the world, God would not have intrusted it to fishermen. To defend the gospel appertains not to the princes and pontiffs of this world. They have enough to do to shelter themselves from the judgments of the Lord and his Anointed. If I speak, I do it in order that they may obtain the knowledge of the divine word, and be saved by it.

During his absence, fanatical spirits had arisen, and extreme and somewhat violent steps had been taken, and amongst the first words which he spoke upon his arrival in Wittemberg were these: -

It is by the word that we must fight; by the word overturn and destroy what has been established by violence. I am unwilling

823

to employ force against the superstitious or the unbelieving. Let him who believes approach; let him who believes not stand aloof. None ought to be constrained. Liberty is of the essence of faith.

In 1524 the Swabian peasants revolted, and in January, 1525, Luther addressed to them the following words: -

The pope and the emperor have united against me; but the more the pope and the emperor have stormed, the greater the progress which the gospel has made. . . Why so? Because I have never drawn the sword, nor called for vengeance; because I have not had recourse either to tumult or revolt. I have committed all to God, and awaited his strong hand. It is neither with the sword nor the musket that Christians fight, but with suffering and the cross.

Christ, their captain, did not handle the sword; he hung upon the tree.

In his later years, having refused to walk in the advancing light, and so having less of the Word of God and therefore less faith, even Luther swerved from the genuine Christian and Reformation principle, denied any right of toleration to the Zwinglians, and advocated the banishment of "false teachers" and the utter rooting out of the Jews from "Christian" lands.

At Luther's death many Protestants set themselves to maintain the doctrines stated by him, and so they became Lutherans rather than Reformers, and the power of the Reformation was weakened. But in those early Reformation times the secret of Luther's power as a reformer was in his preaching of the Word as the power of God unto salvation, giving to the world anew those principles of Gospel liberty originally announced by Him who was the Author and Finisher of the faith - JESUS CHRIST, THE AUTHOR OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 14 (1898)

January 6, 1898

"Christ's Second Coming" *The Present Truth* 14, 1 , p. 4.

PREPARE ye the way of the Lord." "To make ready a people prepared for the Lord."

"Lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God! Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand."

"But who may abide the day of His coming; and who shall stand when He appeareth?"

"The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light."

"And now, little children, abide in Him; that, when He shall appear, we may have evidence, and not be ashamed before Him at His coming. If ye know that He is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of Him."

"Fear God and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come."

WHAT IS YOUR COVERING

"WOE to the rebellious children, saith the Lord, that take counsel, but not of Me; and that cover with a covering, but not of My Spirit, that they may add sin to sin."

The Spirit of God is the only safe covering for any soul. But here is described a people who are seeking to cover themselves with a covering that is not of God's Spirit.

Of people just as they are in this world the Lord says they "are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." And it will never do to appear thus

before the Lord. The hearts of men know this, and therefore they seek a covering. This is right; they must have a covering. But the great difficulty is, they do not seek in the right way for their covering: they "cover with a covering, but not of My Spirit," saith the Lord.

NO COVERING

IN another place (Isa. lix. 5) He says they "weave the spider's web," of which to make for themselves garments for covering. What a strange notion a person must have, indeed, to think that such stuff as spider's web will be sufficient for a covering in *that* day! No, no! The Lord continues, "Their webs shall not become garments."

But what is the material out of which they weave this spider-web stuff, to make garments to cover themselves? Here is the answer: "Neither shall they cover themselves *with their works*: their works are of iniquity, and the act of violence is in their hands."

Of their own works they would make garments to cover themselves in the day when God shall search Jerusalem with candles. But such righteousness is as filthy rags, and can never cover anyone so that the shame of his nakedness will not appear. Such material is but spider's web for protection and covering in the great day when the towers fall.

Their works are works of iniquity, and in doing more works they only "add sin to sin." But sin is what has made us naked. And surely that which made us naked can never clothe us. Therefore no works of our own can ever clothe us; by these we can never have any secure covering.

THE ROBE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

YET this need not discourage us. Hear what the Lord, the righteous Judge, says: "Buy of *Me . . . white raiment*, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear." This will clothe us perfectly, and acceptably to the great King.

But He says, "Buy," and how shall I buy, how can I buy, when I am only "wretched, and miserable, and poor"? - Oh, "Come! buy . . . without money and without price." "Ye have sold yourselves for naught; and ye shall be redeemed without money." Therefore "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness."

This robe is no spider's-web stuff. Every thread of it - warp and woof - was manufactured of the character of the eternal God; and it was also woven by Himself in the precious loom of the life of His only begotten Son on earth. This robe of the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, will perfectly cover every soul who will receive it, and will make him fully welcome to the courts of the great King in that great day.

THE HOLY SPIRIT'S SEAL

TO have this robe prepares us, too, for the covering of God's Spirit. For that Spirit is the seal of God's righteousness upon all who have that righteousness. And when He has covered us with the robe of His righteousness, He seals that righteousness upon us by the baptism of His Holy Spirit. And thus is the covering of His Spirit sought. Thus is it rightly sought. Thus is it sought so that it surely shall be secured.

This covering of God's Spirit is to shelter God's people in the terrible times of "the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth," and when the plagues of the just judgments and wrath of God are poured out upon a world confirmed in wickedness.

Do not try to clothe yourself with your works; it is but weaving the spider's web; they are but works of iniquity, and the Holy Spirit cannot put upon them His seal of approval. Clothe yourself only with the robe of God's righteousness; for this the Holy Spirit will willingly and gladly seal upon you as perfect righteousness for evermore.

Thus and then will you be covered with the covering of His Spirit, and will be sheltered, protected, saved, and delivered in the great day of His wrath. For the great day of His wrath is shortly to come, and who shall be able to stand?

What is your covering? "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

A. T. JONES.

January 20, 1898

"'Not Far' Means 'Near'" *The Present Truth* 14, 3 , p. 41.

HAVE you ever thought that God was away off from you, and you did not know how to get hear to him?

His answer to all that is that "he is not far from every one of us."

To be "not far" is to be *near*. Then as he is *not far from* every one of us, he is certainly *near to* every one of us.

Had it occurred to you that this word - "he is not far from every one of us" - was first spoken to a great crowd of heathen, Greek heathen, too, sunken to the very depths of idolatry and all other Greek heathen abominations; and that there was not a single even professed Christian there, except the man who spoke it?

That is the truth: it was spoken by Paul at Athens; and he was there "alone," and he spoke it to a crowd of none but heathen. To them all he said, by inspiration of God, "He is not far from every one of us."

That being true of heathen, and *such* heathen, too, how is it, then, with you who *do* believe in Him and love Him? Is He far from you? - No, no; He is *not* far from you; He is near to you.

Yes, He is more than *near* to you: He says, "Lo, I am *with* you." More than that: He says: "I am with you *always*." Yea, even more than that: He says, "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee."

Then please, please, never think again that God is far from you. Nobody but the devil can ever suggest such a thing. Please believe the Lord rather than the devil.

A. T. JONES.

January 27, 1898

"The Broken Heart" *The Present Truth* 14, 4 , pp. 83, 84.

JESUS died of a broken heart. Ps. lxxix. 20. This is intensely significant.

It was the ingratitude and the reproach of those for whom he endured the cruel suffering of the cross, that broke His heart.

And when, in that great and awful day that is to come, all those who hold to ingratitude or reproach see what they have really done, and what they have lost, reproach will also break their hearts - though with them it will be self-reproach. Who can bear it! O then please do not any longer be ungrateful or reproachful in the presence of the cross of Christ.

A deeper truth than this is that it would be the same with those persons if they were in heaven itself instead of in hell. To them heaven would be the same as hell; for it will not be what is outside of them, but what is inside, that will hurt.

And a yet deeper truth is that even though their ingratitude and reproach did not return upon them, and they were placed in heaven, yet they would die of a broken heart. For to take these persons, wholly unacquainted with true and lasting joy, and place them in the transcendent and eternal bliss of heaven, with the assurance that it was all and eternally theirs - the overwhelming consciousness of this fact would break the heart.

Do you not know that the heart can be broken by joy as truly as by sorrow! Do you not know that such a thing has occurred in this world - though of course in this world of trouble and sorrow, a heart broken by joy is far less usual than hearts broken by sorrow!

The one great consideration in all this is that it is not all of heaven to be in heaven, nor is it all of hell to be in hell. The *all* of either place is in being fit for it.

To be fit for heaven is what will find heaven to be all of heaven. And - awful truth! - to be fit for hell is what will find hell to be all of hell. No one can possibly

84

find either place without the fitness for it; and there is no other place.

O then, dear friend, do not, against the cross of Christ, heap up ingratitude and reproach that fits for hell, and that will surely break the heart. Receive Him, yield yourself to Him, that *now* you may become acquainted with and *enjoy* the true and everlasting joy of heaven, that fits for heaven, so that when heaven itself, with all its glory, with all its transcendent bliss, with its fulness of eternal joy, is placed upon the hearts of the redeemed, your heart will not be broken by it.

Everything that occurred in the life of Christ on earth is laden with meaning. And this one - the most awful of all - is freighted with a most awful meaning. That broken heart! Think of it carefully, study it reverently.

A. T. JONES.

February 3, 1898

"Not the Outside but Inside" *The Present Truth* 14, 5 , p. 73.

IT is not what is outside of us, but what is *inside*, that makes us Christians and keeps us so.

If you think you could be a better Christian if they were better brethren and sisters in the church, you greatly mistake. It is just the other way: if you were a better Christian, you would find better brethren and sisters in the church.

If you think you could do better if only you had better neighbours, you greatly mistake. The truth is that if you would do better, you would have better neighbours. And if you were a better Christian, you would do better. You must *be* better before you can do better.

Christianity does not come from ourselves, nor from anybody nor anything that is around us. It comes down straight from heaven to every soul who will receive it. And having its source in heaven, it is not, and cannot be, affected by anything that is of earth.

Thus the Christian has joy in sorrow, peace in perplexity, riches in poverty, society in loneliness, and friendship among strangers and even enemies.

A. T. JONES.

February 17, 1898

"One" *The Present Truth* 14, 7 , p. 98.

"ONE shall chase a thousand." If you are a Christian, the Lord intends that you shall have more influence for good than a thousand other people can have for evil. He intends that you shall have more influence over a thousand worldlings and sinners than a thousand such can have over you.

What a disappointment to the Lord, then, what a grief to the angels, and what a satisfaction to Satan, it is, when a professed Christian - one who bears the name of the Lord, and stands under the ensign of the Mighty One of Israel - yields to the influence of worldlings and sinners because; they are many, and he is one!

Ah! when that is done, it shows that the *heart* is not loyal to the Lord. It shows that there is in the heart really a love for the world and a willingness to fellowship sin; and the name of the Lord is dishonoured, and ensign is disgraced, by the Christian *profession* of such people. And if you are excusing yourself from genuine Christian faithfulness by the plea that you are alone while there are many sinners around, that is what is really the matter, - at heart you are disloyal to their Lord and a sympathiser with the enemy.

Put it all away. Stand up like a true and loyal soldier. Fix your heart upon the Lord to be loyal to Him, though not; another soul on earth is so. Then though you be but *one*, yet you will have more influence over a thousand than the thousands

can have over you. Remember, it is "not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord." "Now thanks be unto God, which *always* causes us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge *by us in every place.*"

A. T. JONES.

February 24, 1898

"The Secret and the Open Life" *The Present Truth* 14, 8 , p. 117.

"WHEN thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly."

Note, this does not say that He will reward you in *secret*. No; He sees you in secret, He hears you in secret; but He rewards you, He answers you, *openly*.

In this, then, He teaches you and me that we are to care for the secret life, and He will care for the open life. And as certainly as we are watchful upon our secret life, and keep it straight with God, so certainly will He be watchful upon our open life, and will keep it straight with men.

Yet man's way is the reverse of this: he is inclined to be ever watching his *open* life, trying to correct a wrong impression here, to straighten a crooked influence there, all the while neglecting the *secret* life, of which these outward things are but the reflection.

Can a crooked stick cast a straight shadow? - No more can a life that is crooked in secret be straight openly. When a crooked stick has cast its crooked shadow, is it the sensible thing to go tinkering the shadow to make it straight? - No; correct the stick, make it straight; then there will be no difficulty with the shadow; all who see it will see that it is straight. No more is it sensible to be tinkering your outward life to have it straight; straighten the secret life, and God has certified that your open life shall be straight. Then put your time and attention upon your secret life; keep your time and attention there; spend much time with Him who seeth in secret: and He will put His time and attention upon your open life; He will keep His time and attention there, and will spend much time with you openly, and before those who see only openly; and will see to it that your open life tells only of the good, the pure, and the true, - that it tells only of God.

A. T. JONES.

March 3, 1898

"As in Heaven, so in Earth" *The Present Truth* 14, 9 , pp. 129, 130.

WE pray often some of us every day, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." But how many have ever taken the time to find out just how His will is done in heaven? And how can there be any real point in our prayer, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is *in heaven*" so long as we do not know how His will is done in heaven?

Such a prayer is certain to be vague and indefinite, a mere generalisation, unless we know how His will is done in heaven. But when we do know that, our prayer can be definite, positive, and full of faith, and thus with the sure result that, so far as we are concerned, the will of God will be done on earth precisely as it is in heaven.

The Lord does not present to men vain things. It is intended, and it can be so, that the word shall be accomplished as certainly as it is prayed. Though, we say again, How can this be unless we know how it is done in heaven, so that this prayer by us can be definite, positive, and full of faith?

WHO are in heaven to do the will of God there? - The angels, to be sure. Then when we know how the will of God is done by them in heaven, and what they do that the will of God *may* be done in them in heaven, we can know how to pray this prayer so that it shall mean to us just what it says, - we shall know just how the will of God shall be done on earth as it is in heaven.

WHAT, then, of the angels?

First: In heaven the angels "do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven." Matt. xviii. 10.

Second: His angels hearken to the voice of His word. Ps. ciii. 20. And they "do His commandments" *through* "hearkening unto the voice of His word."

Third: The will of God, *as in His Word*, - "as it is in heaven," - is con-

130

veyed to the knowledge of the angels by the Spirit of God - "Whithersoever the Spirit was to go, they went." Eze. i. 20.

Fourth: When the Spirit of God thus conveys to their knowledge the will of God, *as it is in His Word*, to which the angels are "hearkening," instantly their spirit responds, and thus His will becomes at once their will, too, - "Whithersoever the Spirit was to go, they went, thither was their spirit to go." "And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning." Verses 20, 14.

THAT is the way the will of God is done in heaven. And that is the way that it is *to be* done in the earth. That is what is in the prayer, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." And that is the way that His will will be done on earth, in every one who, knowing how His will is done in heaven, puts himself in the same attitude as those in heaven, and makes the prayer in an intelligent faith.

This attitude of the angels in heaven is precisely the attitude which it is intended that we shall hold on earth. Read, then, of ourselves: -

First: We are always to behold the face of God, in the face of Jesus Christ. "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image." 2 Cor. iv. 6; iii. 18. "Unto Thee lift I up mine eyes, O Thou that dwellest in the heavens. Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress; so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God." Ps. cxxiii. 1, 2.

Second: We are to hearken to the voice of His Word - "Mine ears hast Thou opened." Ps. xl. 6. "The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not

rebellious, neither turned away back." "He wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned." Isa. I. 5, 1.

Third: The will of God *as in His Word*, is to be conveyed to our understanding by the Spirit of God. We are to be ever dependent upon the Spirit of God for this. "Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." 2 Tim. ii. 7. The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, *He shall teach you all things*, . . . whatsoever I have said unto you." John xvi. 26. "He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak." John xvi. 13.

Fourth: When the Spirit of God does convey to our understanding the will of God as it is in His Word, instantly our spirit is to respond, and yield submission to His Spirit, that His will may be our will. "As many as are led by the Spirit of Lord, they are the sons of God." "The *Spirit itself* beareth witness *with our spirit*, that we are the children of God." Rom. viii. 6. And "the minding of the flesh is death; but the minding of the Spirit is life and peace." Rom. viii. 6, margin.

Fifth: When we thus hearken to His Word, and receive, by His Spirit, the understanding of His will as it is in His Word, - "as it is in heaven," - and our spirit responds to His Spirit, so that His will becomes our will, *then* the thing is done; His Word is filled, His will is accomplished in us on earth as it is in those in heaven: as it is done just as quickly - "as the appearance of a flash of lightning" - in our innermost, secret life, and shines through all time, openly, before those who are without. For "My Word . . . shall accomplish that which I please." Isa. iv. 11. And the Word of God always acts *instantaneously* - "He spake, and it was." Ps. xxxiii. 9. The leper said, Lord, "If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean." The Lord replied, "I will; be thou clean. And as soon as He had spoken, *immediately* the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed." Mark i. 40-42.

Do you now see more clearly, do you understand better, *how* the will of God done in heaven, and how it is *to be* done on earth? Can you not now pray more intelligently, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven"? Then will you now pray directly, positively, and in full faith, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven"?
A. T. JONES.

April 21, 1898

"The Wisdom of the Spirit" *The Present Truth* 14, 16 , p. 248.

IT has been well said by Archdeacon Farrar that "it needs the grandeur and truthfulness of an intellect which Heaven bestowed, to bring back not a few of the deepest truths of Scripture in their brightness and original intensity." And because of this, and to this very end, the Holy Spirit is given. He "shall bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." "He shall receive of Mine, and show it unto you." "We have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." Infinite loss, however, is incurred by thousands of people in depending upon the intellect of men to bring out these truths instead of depending solely

upon the Holy Spirit, who is given to do it, and who only can do it.
A. T. JONES.

May 12, 1898

"Knowing the Fathers" *The Present Truth* 14, 19 , pp. 274, 275.

IT is written: "No man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."

God is known only in Christ, only as He is revealed through Christ. For "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." He is "God manifest in the flesh." He is "God with us."

It is written also: "Hallow My Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between Me and you, *that ye may know* that I am the Lord your God."

God is known in hallowing the Sabbath: the object of the Sabbath is that in the hallowing of it, the one who hallows it may *know* that the Lord is his God.

Now as God is known in the hallowing of the Sabbath, and as God is known only in the revelation of Jesus Christ, it is certainly true that true hallowing of the Sabbath is known only in Christ, and the true knowledge of Christ is known only in the hallowing of the Sabbath.

As God is known only by those to whom Christ reveals Him, and as the Sabbath is a sign by which the believer may know that the Lord is his God, it is certainly true that the Sabbath is a sign by which He who hallows it may know that the Lord is his God *as Christ reveals Him*.

And it is written, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Therefore, as the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, and as the Sabbath is a sign by which, in the hallowing of it, "ye may know that I am the Lord your God," it is certainly true that *the seventh day is* a sign by which he who hallows it nifty know that the Lord is God *as Christ reveals Him*.

That many people do not believe this, that even many Christians do not believe it, does not affect the truth of it. It is the truth, even though nobody on earth ever believed it. And being the truth, people - even Christians - by not believing it simply rob themselves of its virtue and its power.

"No man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." "Hallow My Sabbaths;

275

and they shall be a sign between Me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

A. T. JONES.

"How Shall We?" *The Present Truth* 14, 19 , pp. 293, 294.

"HOW shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?"
How *shall* we? Can you tell?

Can a man live in what he dies of? When any person dies of any disease, can he live any longer in it? - No; that is why he died - he could *not* live any longer in it.

Having died of that disease, were he even brought back from the dead into that very disease, could he live any longer in it? - No; he would certainly and immediately die again. A person simply *can not* live any longer in the thing of which he has died. This is perfectly plain to everybody.

Very well, then, have you died to sin? Have you grown so sick of sin that you died of it? Have you grown so sick of it that you could live no longer in it, and so died to it?

If you have, do not be afraid; you can not live any longer therein. Were you even taken back from that death, and put once more in the presence of sin, you would certainly and immediately die again. You could not live any longer in it, when you were there before; and because you could not live any longer in it, you died; and if you were brought back to it again, you could not live any longer in it any more than you did before.

Remember, this is being sick unto death, of *sin*; not sick of a few or even many particular sins, while at the same time you choose others because they are pleasing to you, and become fat and flourishing on them. In this way you can live in *sin* forever, and then die in it, and then die the second death *for* it.

No; it is not sins, so that we can die to one and live to another, that are contemplated in the Scripture; it is *sin*, - sin in the essence, - so that when you die to it, it is death indeed to *sin*, in every phase and of every sort. Then, being thus dead to *sin*, you simply can not live any longer therein. The very presence of the thing, the very suggestion of it, is death to you.

And being thus dead to sin, the Lord intends that we shall *not* live any longer in it. And intending that we shall not live any longer in it, He intends that we shall live ever longer *without* sinning.

There is power in Jesus Christ to keep

294

the believer from sinning. There is virtue in the grace of God to hold back the believer in Jesus from serving the sinful propensities and passions that dwell in the human flesh. Praise His holy name forever and ever.

"Where *sin* abounded, *grace* did much more abound; *that as sin* hath reigned unto *death*, even so might *grace* reign thru *righteousness* unto eternal *life* by Jesus Christ our Lord."

Are you dead to sin? Then how shall you live any longer therein?

A. T. JONES.

June 2, 1898

"Free from the Service of Sin" *The Present Truth* 14, 22 , p. 345.

"KNOWING this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we *should not serve sin*."

Plainly, therefore, the Lord intends that we shall not serve sin, and, accordingly, has made provision that this intention shall be fulfilled.

"The body of sin" must be "destroyed," in order that henceforth we shall "not serve sin." If the body of sin is not destroyed, if sin is not taken up by the root, we shall certainly still serve sin, whatever our profession or desire.

Indeed, if I desire not to serve sin, if I desire to live without sinning, and yet do not desire it enough to have the body of sin destroyed, to have sin completely uprooted, whatever the cost, or however painful the process, then my desire is not sincere, and cannot possibly be realized. I am simply tickling my fancy with a mirage.

No; the body of sin must be *destroyed*, - nothing short of destruction will do, - in order that we shall not serve sin. See, too, what "destroy" means: "To pull down; unbuild; demolish; to overthrow; lay waste; ruin; make desolate; to kill; slay; extirpate; to bring to naught; put an end to; annihilate; obliterate entirely; cause to cease, or cease to be."

The Lord has made full provision for this destruction of the body of sin; it must be accomplished by crucifixion. "Our old man is *crucified*," "that the body of sin might be *destroyed*, that henceforth we should *not serve sin*." That is the straight, sure course to freedom from the service of sin.

But thank the Lord, we do not have to go this way alone. "Our old man is crucified *with Him*." He was made "in the likeness of sinful flesh" *for us*. He was "in *all things* made like unto His brethren." He "was *in all points* tempted like as we are." "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." And He was crucified. He was crucified for us. He was crucified as us. He was "the last Adam." He was humanity. And in Him the old Adam - the old, sinful humanity - was crucified. And "our old man is crucified with Him," in order "that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."

Are you indeed crucified with Him? Have you given up yourself to crucifixion, do you give yourself up to destruction, that you may be delivered from the service of sin? Is your desire to be freed from sinning so sincere that you freely give yourself up to crucifixion, - that you abandon yourself to destruction? If it is, then you can easily know the triumph that there is in knowing that the body of sin is destroyed, and that henceforth you shall not serve sin.

Why is this verse of scripture written, if it is not intended that you shall not serve sin? And when it is written to show you this the Lord's intention, then of what good is that to you, what good can it ever be to you, if that intention is not fulfilled in you, and you are not kept from the service of sin?

A. T. JONES.

June 9, 1898

"Are You Dead?" *The Present Truth* 14, 23 , p. 357.

"HE that is dead is freed from sin."

Are you freed from sin? If not, do you not see exactly where the difficulty lies?

There stands the truth of God, that "he that is dead is freed from sin." Then if you are not freed from sin, the only cause of it is that *you are not dead*.

Jesus says, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it dies, it bringeth forth much fruit."

Again he says, "Herein is My Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit."

Again he says, "Herein is My Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit."

As the Father is glorified in your bearing much fruit, and as it is only "if it die," that it "bringeth forth much fruit," it certainly follows that herein is the Father glorified, that ye die.

Are you dead? Are you freed from sin? Will you glorify the Lord by bearing much fruit? Will you die?

"Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone."

Do you want forever to abide alone? "Without Me ye can do nothing."

Without Him you can do nothing; without Him you abide alone; "except it . . . die, it abideth *alone*;" except you die, you can do nothing.

But, bless the Lord, "if it *die*, it bringeth forth *much* fruit."

In being dead, then, there is freedom from sin; there is abiding with the Lord; there is the bearing of much fruit to the glory of God; and the end, *eternal life*.

In not being dead, there is bondage to sin; there is abiding alone; and the end, *eternal death*.

Thus he that will save his life shall lose it; but he that will lose his life for Christ's sake shall keep it unto life eternal.

Will you lose your life and save it? or will you save your life and lose it?

"It is appointed unto men once to die." And in the Gospel, God has fixed it so that every man can die that "once," so as to live forevermore.

Except it die, it abideth alone; but when we choose to die that we may bring forth much fruit, He does not leave us alone, nor ask us to die alone. He only asks us to die *with Him*. Bless His name!

Then "if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him." He does not live in sin. And being with Him, we shall not live in sin.

Are you freed from sin? Are you dead? Are you dead with Christ, so that you live with Christ?

A. T. JONES.

"The Pledge of the Inheritance" *The Present Truth* 14, 23 , p. 361.

THE "Holy Spirit of promise" "is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession."

An "earnest" is "a part paid beforehand on a contract, as security for the whole."

God in Christ has contracted to give us an eternal inheritance in "a better country" than this, "that is, an heavenly" having for its capital a glorious city, "whose builder and maker is God."

This inheritance is all bought and all paid for, *for us*. But the time has not yet fully come for the full redemption of the purchased possession.

But He who has contracted to give it to us when it shall have been fully redeemed, pays us a part beforehand, gives us an earnest, as security for the whole eternal possession.

That earnest, that part paid beforehand on the contract, is the Holy Spirit. That security for the eternal possession is the eternal Spirit.

If you have that eternal Spirit, and as long as you have Him, you are sure of that eternal inheritance. If you have not that Spirit, you have no surety at all of the inheritance.

But the inheritance is a free gift to all; and so is the earnest, the surety, for it is a free gift to all. And that security is "that Holy Spirit of promise."

"Ask, and it shall be given you." "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

A. T. JONES.

June 23, 1898

"Servants of Righteousness" *The Present Truth* 14, 25 , pp. 390, 391.

"BEING then made free from sin, ye become the servants of righteousness."

We can be made free from sin, then: the Word of God says so. "Our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that *henceforth we should not serve sin.*" "He that is dead *is dead from sin.*"

But our blessedness does not stop with being made free from sin: "Being then made free from sin, ye *became the servants of righteousness.*"

We can not be the servants of sin and the servants of righteousness, both at the same time; for "when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness."

We must be freed from sin before we can become the servants of righteousness. And "he that is dead is freed from sin."

We must be "dead with Christ" before we can "live with Him." "For in that He died, He died unto sin once: but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God."

"Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." And just as Christ lives unto God since His death to sin, so we live unto God when we are dead with Him. When we are "dead with Him" "unto sin," we "live with Him" "unto God."

Have you been made free from sin? If not, why not?

Have you become the servant of righteousness? If not, it is because you have not been made free from sin.

Have you been trying, and failing, to be the servant of righteousness? Have you grieved over failures until you were almost, if not entirely, ready to think that there is

391

no such thing in this world as being indeed a servant of righteousness?

O toiling, discouraged soul, "be of good cheer; I have overcome the world"! There is, in truth, in this world, *in Him*, the service of righteousness. But it comes only through "being made free from sin;" and only "He that is dead is freed from sin."

Have you "endured the cross" of Christ *with Christ*? Are you crucified *with Him*? Have you given up to destruction the body of sin, in order that henceforth you should not serve sin? Are you dead with Him, and, so, freed from sin?

Be sure that all this is accomplished with you: *then*, and so, being "made free from sin," you will become the servant of righteousness as surely as the Lord has spoken that glorious promise.

A. T. JONES.

August 25, 1898

"Believing the Word of God" *The Present Truth* 14, 34 , p. 537.

ONE of the leading preachers of the United States has published a book on the "puzzling" books of the Bible, of which *he* has found *seven*. This book is written not so much to tell how puzzling these Bible books are to him, nor *why* their puzzling to him, as it is to make it appear to other people that these Bible books are puzzling books to *them*. Another thing that may be noted is that in this book he has dealt only with the *books* - old books - that are puzzling to him, and therefore, as a matter of course, are, or ought to be, puzzling to everybody else; he has not touched the particular passages or verses of the Bible, outside of the special books, which are puzzling.

But why should even a preacher think that because certain books of the Bible are puzzling to him, this fact can be of so much importance to other people as to call for the publication of a book on it? Does it certainly follow that because something is puzzling to him, it *must* be puzzling to everybody else - especially as soon as it is known that it is puzzling to him?

Now the only possible way that any book, or any passage, of the Bible can be puzzling to anybody, is by his *not believing* it. And there are many things, even outside of the Bible, that puzzling to the person who does not believe them. The A B C's are exceedingly puzzling to any man who does not believe them. And neither the Bible, nor any book or passage *in* the Bible, is any more puzzling to the person who believes it, than are the A B C's to the person who believes them.

But that is just the trouble with all these "critics," - they do not believe the Bible, they do not accept it as the word of God. They are *critics* of the word of God, not *believers* of the word of God. They do not receive the word of God for what "it is in truth, the word of God." They hold it off, and criticize it, and puzzle over it; and so it can not work effectually in them, because they do not believe it.

That they do not accept it as the word of God, even when they believe it to be true, is clear from this: Ever since 677 B.C. the Bible has said that "the captains of the host of the king of Assyria took Manasseh among the thorns, and bound him with fetters, and carried him to Babylon." One of the critics have said that until lately "this passage have always been a stumbling-block to the critics." And the only means by which it was ever a stumbling-block to the critics was solely because they did not believe it.

The stumbling-block that they found in this passage was in that it says that the *Assyrians* brought Manasseh to *Babylon*; while it was known that Nineveh was the capital of the kingdom of Assyria. The critics thought that it should have said that they brought Manasseh to Nineveh; and because it did not say what *they* thought, it was a stumbling-block.

But what caused this passage to cease to be a stumbling-block? - Why, the records of Esar-haddon, who was then king of Assyria, were discovered; and these records told that Babylon was subdued and possessed by Assyria, and that Babylon was his residence in those years.

But now the point, - they did not believe, before, that the passage told the truth, and of course did not believe it to be the word of God. *Now*, however, they admit that the passage tells, and always did tell, the exact truth; but why do they believe this now? - Not because it is the Word of God, but only because of what Esar-haddon said. If they had not yet found these words of Esar-haddon, or others to the same effect, they would not yet believe that the passage tells the truth; it would still be to them a stumbling-block. Therefore, as they believed it now only on the authority of Esar-haddon, and not on the authority of God, it is perfectly plain that though they now believe it to be true, they do not so believe it because it is the word of God. The authority which they accept rest upon for the truth of the passage is the authority of a man, not of God.

And whoever accepts the Word of God on the authority of a man, has only the word of the man; to him the Word of God is only the word of the man: the word of the man is put above the Word of God; the man is put in the place of God.

To the person who accepts the Bible as the Word of God, that passage never was, and never could be, a stumbling-block. It was the truth. And it was the truth *because* it was the Word of God. True, he might not be able to explain it to the critics, or even to himself; nevertheless, he knew that it was the truth; and he rested there. And *now* he is no more sure of the truth of that passage than he was before. Now he knows exactly *how* it was done; but *that* it was done, he knew as well before as now or ever, because he had the word of God for it, and "the Word of our God shall stand forever."

A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 15 (1899)

January 12, 1899

"True Faith" *The Present Truth* 15, 2 , pp. 17, 18.

ONE day a centurion came to Jesus, and said to Him: "Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tormented. And Jesus saith unto him, I will come and heal him. The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldest come under my roof; but *speak the word only*, and my servant *shall be healed*. . . . When Jesus heard if, He marveled, and said to them that

followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great *faith*, no, not in Israel." Matt. viii. 6-10.

THERE is what Jesus pronounces faith. When we find what that is, we have found faith. To know what that is, is to know what faith is. There can be no doubt about this; for Christ is "the Author . . . of faith," and He says that that which the centurion manifested was "faith;" yes, even "great faith."

WHERE, then, in this, is the faith? - The centurion wanted a certain thing done. He wanted the Lord to do it. But when the Lord said, "*I will come*" and do it, the centurion checked him, saying, "*Speak the word only*," and it shall *be done*.

Now, what did the centurion expect would do the work? - "*The word only*." Upon what did he depend for the healing of his servant? - Upon "*the word only*."

And the Lord Jesus say that that is faith.

HERE was a Roman, by Israel despised and shunned as a heathen and held to be hated of God, who had spent his life among heathen influences, with no Bible advantages, yet who had discovered that when the Lord speaks, in that word itself there is power to do what the word says, and who depended on that word to do what it said.

And there were the people of Israel, who all their lives had been in daily connection with the word of the Lord, who prided themselves on being "the people of the Book," and boasted of their knowledge of the Word of God; and yet had not learned that in the word there is power to accomplish what the word says.

ALL this lack on the part of Israel prevailed, too, when that very word in which they boasted said to them plainly, and showed over and over, that such is alone the character of the Word of God; and that word was read in their synagogues every Sabbath day.

That word had all their lives said plainly to them: "*As the rain* cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; *so shall My word be* that goeth forth out of My mouth; it shall not return unto Me

18

void, but *it shall accomplish that which I please*, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." Isa. lv. 10, 11.

NATURE itself held constantly before them the instruction that the earth of itself could produce nothing; that it was the moisture of rain and snow, *from heaven*, the *made it* bring forth and bud, and produce fruit.

And the Lord said, "*So shall My word be*." As the earth of itself can do nothing, so you of yourself can do nothing. And as the moisture of rain and snow from heaven makes the earth bring forth, and bud, and produce fruit, so shall My word make you bring forth the fruit of righteousness to the glory of God. "My word, . . . IT shall accomplish that which I please."

MANY and a time had Israel read this scripture. And year in and year out they had read the Word of God, and had said: *I will do what the Word says; I will accomplish that which pleases Him.*

And that they might be the more certain that *they* should do exactly what the word said, that word was separated into parts, and each part drawn out into many fine-spun distinctions. Then they set about diligently to do, carefully and particularly, *themselves*, each specification of the word, as thus set forth.

TRUE, nowhere in all this did they find any peace, much less any joy. With all their doing, they never found the things done. Always they found themselves far short of having done what the word said, - so far short, too, that it was the despairing cry of Israel that "if but one person could only for one day keep the whole law, and not offend in one point, - nay, if but one person could but keep that one point of the law which affected the due observance of the Sabbath, - then the troubles of Israel would be ended, and the Messiah at last would come." Yet still they slaved on in the treadmill round of their own fruitless doings, - all of works, and none of faith; all of themselves, and none of God; all of their own doing, which was not really doing at all, and none of the word itself doing, which is the only real doing of the word of God.

HOW refreshing it was to the spirit of Jesus, in the midst of this desert waste of Israel, to meet a man, whoever he might be, who had found the word of God indeed; who knew that when the word was spoken, that word itself would accomplish the thing spoken; and who would depend upon "the word only." This was faith. This opened the life to the power of God. And as the consequence, there was accomplished in the life that which pleased God.

"My word, . . . IT [not you] shall accomplish that which I please." "The *word* of God . . . *effectually worketh* also in you that believe." 1 Thess. ii. 13. To depend upon it to work in you that which is well pleasing in His sight - this is faith. To cultivate this dependence upon the word is to cultivate faith.

A. T. JONES.

August 17, 1899

**"More 'Oppositions of Science Falsely So-called'" *The Present Truth*
15, 33 , pp. 525, 526.**

SO-CALLED science has made another immense contribution to the tide that is already flooding the world. Prof. W. O. Atwater, of the Wesleyan University, has announced that "scientific" discovery that alcohol "is a food." "After long and careful experiments on various men," he made the announcement, June 13. *Harper's Weekly* summarizes his report, as follows: -

Alcohol in limited quantities is not a poison, but serves some of the uses of food, like sugar and starch: it supplies heat and energy, and protects the material of the body from consumption, but does not make new tissue. It is useful as a fuel, but not to repair the machine. Professor Atwater does not recommend it as a food. He says that its effect on the brain and nerves is often such as to counteract its food value, and that the moderate use of it often leads to excess. But he holds that, taken in small quantities, it *is* a

food, and not a poison, and that from two to two and a half ounces may be consumed without harm in the course of a day.

It would be difficult to get more false teaching and contradictions into the same space than is set down in that paragraph.

1. Alcohol in any quantity is poison, and does not and can not serve any of the uses of food. Alcohol, in its whole course in the human system, acts contrary to nature. It affects the nerves first of all; indeed it affects only the nerves, first, last, and all the time. It tears down, instead of building up. It gets strength out of a man without putting strength into him. Anything that acts that way in the human system is a poison, and a poison only; and can not be in any sense a food.

2. It is literally impossible to supply "heat and energy," and to "protect the material of the body from consumption," without making new tissue. The statements that it does do so are not only contradictory to the truth, but are contradictory to themselves; for it is recognized that new tissue must be made, that the machine must be repaired. Yet alcohol is given the wonderful property of supplying heat and energy, and protecting the material of the body from consumption! It is possessed of the amazing quality of causing the machine to go, and at the same time of keeping it from wearing out! That is simply not true. Alcohol is not divine, nor does it bear in itself "the promise and potency" of perpetual motion.

The truth is, and is here recognised, that there is waste of tissue, in fact, every motion in or of the human system, even to thinking, consumes material of the body, and so causes loss of tissue. Now anything that induces energy without supplying tissue, does it simply, and can do it only, by consuming the material of the body. But anything that induces consumption of the material of the body without supplying new tissue, only tears down and destroys the human system; and that is poison. It is confessed in this "scientific" announcement, that alcohol "does not make new tissue," does not "repair the machine" while it does induce energy; and that is in itself a confession that alcohol is not a food, but a poison.

It is exceedingly proper, therefore, that Professor Atwater "does not recommend it as a food." Yet what a contradiction it is that "a food" can not be recommended as a food by the very person who, by "long and careful experiments," has scientifically discovered that "it *is* a food"!

But he can not recommend it as a food because "its effect on the brain and nerves is often such as to counteract its food value;" that is to say, the effect of a food is such as to destroy its food value! That simply demonstrates again that it is not a food at all, but poison only.

Yet after all this contradiction of the truth, and self-contradiction in the statements themselves, which demonstrate that it is a poison, he still "holds that, taken in small quantities, it *is* a food, and not a poison, and that from two to two and a half ounces may be consumed without harm in the course of a day." Now when it is understood that alcohol can not be taken raw, and that in the course of a day

a person must take about three average drinks of whisky, or two quarts - about fourteen glasses - of lager beer, or a pint and a half of claret, in order to consume

two and a half ounces of alcohol, it can in some measure be estimated what an immense contribution to the tide of drunkenness is made in this latest "scientific" "discover" and announcement by a professor of high standing in his profession and in a Methodist university and theological school.

If ever the divine warning were needed, to "avoid . . . oppositions of science false so-called," that time is just now, when all the evils of drunkenness and of Spiritualism are "scientifically" commended to the world.

A. T. JONES.

October 5, 1899

"Result of Being 'Like the Nations'" *The Present Truth* 15, 40 , pp. 629, 630.

ISRAEL would form a State, and have a king, that they might be "like all the nations."

All the nations were heathen. To be "like all the nations," then, was only to be like the heathen.

All the nations became heathen by rejecting God. Then when Israel would be like all the heathen, they could do so only by rejecting God.

It was therefore but the simple statement of a fact when the Lord said: "They have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them."

When Israel formed a State, they thereby created a union of religion and the State. But they had to reject God in order to form a State. Therefore they had to reject God in order to form a union of religion and the State.

It follows, therefore, plainly, that no people can ever form a union of religion and the State without rejecting God.

But though Israel had rejected God, yet He did not reject them. He still cared for them; and, through His prophets, still sought to teach and guide them, ever doing His best to save them from the evil consequences which were inevitable in the course which they had taken.

Long before the days of Samuel and Saul, Israel had been taught what would be the outcome of forming themselves into a State and choosing a king; for the formation of a kingdom in the days of Saul was but the culmination of a long-cherished desire in that direction.

After the great victories of Gideon, a hundred years before the day of Saul, "the men of Israel said unto Gideon, Rule thou over us, both thou, and thy son, and thy son's son also; for thou hast delivered us from the hand of Midian." Judges viii. 22.

This was nothing else than a proposition to establish at that time a kingdom, with Gideon as the first king, and the kingship to be hereditary in his family. But Gideon refused the offer, and "said unto them, I will not rule over you; neither shall my son rule over you; *the Lord shall rule over you.*"

Gideon knew that such a proposition meant the rejection of God; and he would have no part in any such thing. But the desire still lurked among the

people; and forty years afterward, upon the death of Gideon, it was manifested openly in the

630

men of Shechem making Abimelech, a son of Gideon, king in Shechem.

But in a parable, Jotham, the only son of Gideon who had survived the slaughter wrought by Abimelech, mapped out plainly to the people what would be the sure result of their venture.

Jotham stood on the top of Gerizim and called to the people of Shechem, and said: -

"The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them; and they said unto the olive tree, Reign thou over us. But the olive tree said unto them, Should I leave my fatness, wherewith by me they honor God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? And the trees said to the fig tree, Come thou, and reign over us. But the fig tree said unto them, Should I forsake my sweetness, and my good fruit, and go to be promoted over the trees? Then said the trees unto the vine, Come thou, and reign over us. And the vine said unto them, Should I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? Then said all the trees unto the bramble, Come thou, and reign over us. And the bramble said unto the trees, If in truth you anoint me king over you, then come and put your trust in my shadow; and if not, let fire come out of the bramble, and devour the cedars of Lebanon. Now therefore, if ye have done truly and sincerely, in that ye have make Abimelech king, . . . then rejoice ye in Abimelech, and let him also rejoice in you; but if not, let fire come out from Abimelech, and devour the men of Shechem, and the house of Millo; and let fire come out from the men of Shechem, and from the house of Millo, and devour Abimelech." Judges ix. 8-20.

And so it came to pass; for in three years the distrust and dissension had so grown between the parties to the transaction respecting the kingship, that open war broke out, which ended only with the death of Abimelech; and, with that, the end of their experiment at setting up a kingdom.

Now all this was held up before all Israel who should come after, as a solemn warning and a forcible admonition of what would inevitably be the result of any attempt at setting up a kingdom. And when, in disregard of all this, and against the Lord's open protest, they did at last again set up a kingdom, this very result, though longer delayed, did inevitably come.

Almost all the reign of Saul, their first king, was spent by him in envy and jealousy of David and a steady seeking to kill him. The reign of David was marred by his own great sin, which he never could have carried out if he had not been king; and was also disturbed by the treason of his chief counsellor, and the insurrection of his son Absalom. The latter half of the reign of Solomon was marked by his great apostasy, and was cursed by the abominable idolatries that came in with his heathen wives - all "princesses," the daughters of kings - and which in turn brought heavy burdens and oppression upon the people.

At the end of the reign of these three kings, the nation had been brought to a condition in which it was not well that they should continue as one; and they were

therefore divided into two - the Ten Tribes forming the kingdom of Israel, and the two other tribes forming the kingdom of Judah.

And from that day, with the Ten Tribes there was continuous course of apostasy, of contention, and of regicide, till at last, from the terrors of anarchy, they were compelled to cry out, "We have no king." Hosea x. 3. Then the Lord offered Himself to them again, saying: "Thou hast fled from Me." "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself." "Return unto Me." "I will be thy King." Hosea vii. 13; xiii. 9, 10. But they would not return, and consequently were carried captive to Assyria, and were scattered and lost forever.

When this happened to the kingdom of Israel, it could yet be said of Judah, "Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints." Hosea xi. 12. But this was only for a little while. Judah, too, went steadily step by step downward in the course of apostasy, until of her too the word had to be given: "*Remove the diadem, take off the crown; . . . exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until He come whose right it is, and I will give it Him.*" Eze. xxi. 25-27.

Thus Judah too was obliged to say, We have no king. And Judah had to go captive to Babylon, with her city and temple destroyed, and the land left desolate. Thereafter the Lord was obliged to govern His people by the heathen powers, until He Himself should come. And even when He came, because He would not at once set Himself up as a worldly king and sanction their political aspirations, they refused to recognise Him at all. And when at last even Pilate appealed to them, "Shall I crucify your King?" they still, as in the days of Samuel, insisted on rejecting God, and cried out, "We have no king but Cesar." John xix. 15.

And this was but the direct outcome, and the inevitable logic, of the step that they took in the days of Samuel. When they rejected God and chose Saul, in that was wrapped up the rejection of the Lord and their choosing of Caesar. In rejecting God that they might be like all the nations, they became like all the nations that rejected God.

And such was the clear result of the union of Church and State among the people of Israel. And it is all written precisely as it was worked out in detail, for the instruction and warning of all people who should come after, and for the admonition of those upon whom the ends of the world are come.

Will the professed people of God to-day in the churches, societies, leagues, unions, and associations of all sorts, everywhere, learn the lesson taught thus in the Word of God of the experience of the people of God of old who would have a State, and so rejected God?

A. T. JONES.

November 16, 1899

"Christian Education" *The Present Truth* 15, 46 , pp. 732, 733.

THERE are thousands of persons who are surprised whenever it is said that the Bible must be the basis of all true education; that the Bible must be the text-

book in every line of study. The reason of that surprise is evident; the only reason that there can be for it is that to those persons the Bible is so small a thing, so narrow and confined, that, in their estimation, to undertake to make the Bible the basis of all education, and the text-book in all studies, is like teaching nothing at all. But how much Christianity, how much confidence in the Bible, has a person to whom the Bible is so small as that? That is the question - the important question. So, one who is astonished that the Bible should be the basis of all education is Christian schools, one who is surprised that the Bible should be the text-book in every study in a Christian school, by that simply certifies to his own narrow view of the Bible, he simply tells how small the Bible is to him, and what a small place the Bible has in his life.

Bear in mind that the Bible as the *text*-book in every study does not mean the Bible as the only *study*-book in education. To use the Bible as a text-book is literally to take the Bible as a book from which to take the *text* of all lessons to be given, in Christian education. Take a statement of the Bible as a text; and then use all the realm of history, literature, science, nature, and human experience as your *study-book*. And that is not a narrow field of study.

THE STUDY OF BOTANY

Perhaps I had better illustrate that: Botany must be a study in Christian schools everywhere; and the Bible will be the text-book. One of the *texts* will be this, "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow." And then, the *lily itself*, and how it grows - what causes it to grow - all the history, the literature, and the science of the lily - will be the *study-book*. That will be the field of study on that *text*. And for that purpose? Why does Jesus tell you and me to "consider the lilies of the field, how they grow"? "Consider;" that is, to *study* the lily. And why? - For the reason stated in that place where it is written: "Israel . . . shall grow as the lily." You and I, - Christian, - the students themselves are to grow, under God, as the lily grows. Jesus tells every student to study the lily, to see and know how it grows, so that he may know how he himself is to grow. He is to find in the lily the life and the power of God by which it grows, - the means which God employs in the sunshine, the soil, the dew, and the rain to cause it to grow, - and the science and philosophy of the growing itself, so that he may know how God will cause him *himself* to "grow as the lily." Than every student studying botany that way only, so far as the lily is concerned, will, whenever he sees a lily, get from that lily a lesson direct from God, telling him

733

what God is doing in *his* life, and what God will put into his life by his believing on Him.

Another *text*: "He shall revive as the corn and grow as the vine." That is the *text*; and the study-book will be the *corn* and the *vine* themselves, in all the science, the philosophy, the literature, and the Scripture that can be found relating to the nature of the corn and the vine. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." "I am the true vine, and My father is the husbandman." "Ye are the branches." Thus the

corn and the vine will be the *study-book* for the student who has in the Bible the text, Israel "shall revive as the corn, and grow as the vine." Then whenever he sees either corn or vine anywhere, it will speak to him lessons of experience, in the language of God.

A. T. JONES.

(*To be Continued.*)

November 23, 1899

"Christian Education. (*Continued.*)" *The Present Truth* 15, 47 , pp. 748, 749.

ASTRONOMY will be a study in Christian schools everywhere, and one of the texts used will be, "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?" With that as a *text*, all the astronomy of the Pleiades will be the *study-book*. And when the student has covered the field of the Pleiades, and knows what *are* the sweet influences of the Pleiades, he will know, in his own life, the sweet influences of the Spirit of Him who gave sweet influences to the Pleiades; and this will make him in *his place* in the order of God what the Pleiades are in their place in the order of God.

More than this, it is written, in Ps. cxlvii. 3, 4: "He telleth the number of the stars; He calleth them all by their names." "He healeth the broken in heart, and bindeth up their wounds." When one has taken for his *text*, "Cast thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?" and has studied thoroughly the book of the Pleiades, and knows *Him* who *can* bind their sweet influences, he will know the sweet influences of Him who binds up the broken heart and heals the wounded spirit.

Now read Isaiah xl., the last three verses. First the 26th verse: "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: He calleth them all by names by the greatness of His might, for that He is strong in power; not one faileth." Why study these things? - "He calleth them all by names by the greatness of His might, for that He is strong in power; not one faileth." Not one of them escapes His notice. And then the next verse: "Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest, O Israel, My way is hid from the Lord, and my judgment is passed over from my God?" When the student, with this as his *text*, looks into that *study-book*, and knows something of the infinite number of the starry host, and knows that God calls these *all* by their *names*, he can easily understand that the Lord will never forget *his* name, nor shall he ever escape the Lord's notice. This is the Bible as a text-book.

Meteorology will be a study in all Christian schools; that is the study of the winds and the waves, the atmosphere, the rain, the dew, the ocean tides, the ocean itself. And one of the *texts* may be: "The wind goeth toward the south, and turneth about unto the north; it whirleth about continually, and the wind returneth again according to his circuits." With that as the *text*, the teacher will lead the students into the *study-book* of the course of the winds as they come out of the

north, as they go to the south, as they whirl about continually, and as they return again according to their circuits. He will lead the students into the books that give the science of the winds, and so will conduct the students along the whole course of the circuit of the winds. Then the students will know that the wind has a circuit as certainly as the sun a course, and that the gentlest breeze that fans the cheek on a summer's day *is* wafted by the hand of the Lord, who "causeth His wind to blow." And *that* will be no small study-book.

Another text will be: "All the rivers

749

run into the sea; yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again." Eccl. i. 7. The teacher will take that *text*, and will have his class get it well in mind. Then he will lead the class through the whole course of the philosophy, and the science, as it is given in the literature of the true science, of the return of the rivers from where they flow into the sea, to the place whence they came in the first place.

Another text on that same subject will be: God "calleteth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth." That will be the *text*; the *study-book* will be all the literature that can be had that contains the science and the philosophy that will give to the student the actual facts, the procedure, and the means by which God picks up the water from the sea, and transports it over the - two hundred and fifty-five cable *miles* of water every twenty-four hours.

And, by the way, by the time that the student has gone through that, he will be no tyro in arithmetic. You can see, from what I have cited, how arithmetic will come in, not as an abstract thing, but as an actual experience in the daily life of the students as he studies the taking up of the waters from the sea, the transporting of them through the air, the pouring out of them in the form of the rain or the snow. As the student actually practices arithmetical calculations as a material part of his studies, arithmetic will be found a most practical thing, and will be far more beneficial than when it is studied abstractly and merely for practice.

But the greatest benefit is that in all the study and work the student is studying the works of God. And it will be found that such study will have such a hold upon the student, such a charm indeed, that there will be no need of urging, driving, threatening, etc., to have the students get their lessons. They will be so wrapped up in it that they will be studying their lessons, and will have them well learned because they are interested at every step, and wish to know.

The child who, in his first steps in figures, has all his problems in the use of figures drawn from the Bible, and is acquainted with them in the Bible, has far better influences surrounding him, and meets something of far more benefit to his character and character development, than if all his problems are concerned with hogs, and horses, and "per cent.," and "how much did he make?" "how much did he lose?" "did he gain or lose?" - all taken from the world, and in the world's own way; simply teaching him selfishness - how to make money. The associations that fix themselves in the child's mind, and inevitably mould his character, - *that is* the philosophy of the Bible in the beginning of number work, with little children; and it is all expressed in that saying that, "first impressions are most lasting." The

first impressions upon the mind of a child are always most lasting, and these will associate with his thoughts in spite of himself with everything that ever comes to him. The only question is as to whether it is preferable to have these first impressions from the Word of God, or from the things of the world. And surely nobody whose heart is with God can have any difficulty in answering the question.

The Bible is the beginning and the end; the all in all; the basis of all true education, and the text-book in every line of study that is taken up in Christian education. Make the study of this one Book the study of your life; study it until it becomes your very life. Is not that the very best preparation that a teacher can make?

A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 16 (1900)

January 4, 1900

"God's Message to the World" *The Present Truth* 16, 1 , p. 4.

IN the book of Daniel there are four announcements, or proclamations, of God's truth to the world, all by kings of the world. All this was brought about through the faithfulness of the people of God in captivity. And the people of God being in captivity was simply the consequence of their failure to be faithful out of captivity.

If the people of God had been as faithful in Judea as they were in Babylon, they never would have seen Babylon; and if the people of God being as faithful in Judea as they were in Babylon, the light shining through them is their faithfulness in Judea as in Babylon, God would never have needed to use the kings of the kingdom aside from the special people of God *to spread His truth to the world*. That is true yet, as in *this tho book* of Daniel is present truth *now*. It is, and *has* been, in the *people always* to be most *faithful* only under the greatest disadvantages.

Do not forget that God's church and God's people are the light of the world, whether they are free and in peace, and dwelling as He longs for them to do; or whether they are in the darkness and the gloom of a dungeon and captivity. They are the light of the world, and the light shines through them. If they will believe it, if they will not let it shine during peace and quietness, and through all the advantages which He gives, and which He longs for us to enjoy; then it will shine anyhow, and it will have to shine through the disadvantages of distress and captivity. But it will shine: and it will reach the people of the world, whom it should reach; and they will receive it and glorify God. In captivity, whatever is done, is preaching the Gospel, and is reaching souls. We have that comfort always. Yet we would do all that without the captivity if we were only as faithful to God out of captivity as we always will be in captivity.

A. T. JONES.

May 31, 1900

"A Serious Mistake" *The Present Truth* 16, 22 , pp. 339, 340.

THERE is a serious and very bothersome mistake, which is made by many persons.

That mistake is made in thinking that when they are converted, their old sinful flesh is blotted out.

In other words, they make the mistake of thinking that they are to be delivered from the flesh by having it taken away from them altogether.

Then, when they find that this is not so, when they find that the same old flesh, with its inclinations, its besetments, and its enticements, is still there, they are not prepared for it, and so become discouraged, and are ready to think that they never were converted at all.

And yet, if they would think a little, they ought to be able to see that that *is* all a mistake. Did you not have exactly the same body after you were converted as that of which it was composed before? To these questions everybody will promptly say, Yes. And plainly that is the truth.

And now there are further questions: Was not that flesh also of exactly the same *quality* as before? Was it not still human flesh, natural flesh, as certainly as it was before? - To this also everybody will say, Yes.

Then also a still further question: It being the same flesh, and of the same quality, - it still being human flesh, natural flesh, is it not also still just as certainly sinful flesh as it was before.

Just here is where creeps in the mistake of these many persons. To this last question they are inclined to think that the answer would be "No," when it must be only a decided "Yes." And this decided "Yes" must be maintained so long as we continue in this natural body.

And when it is decided and constantly maintained that the flesh of the converted person is still sinful flesh, and only sinful flesh, he is so thoroughly convinced that in his flesh dwells no good thing that he will never allow a shadow of confidence in the flesh. And this being so, his sole dependence is upon something other than the flesh, even upon the Holy Spirit of God; his source of strength and hope is altogether exclusive of the flesh, even in Jesus Christ only. And being everlastingly watchful, suspicious, and thoroughly distrustful of the flesh, he never can expect any good thing from that source, and so is prepared by the power of God to beat back and crush down without mercy every impulse or suggestion that may arise from it and so does not fail, does not become discouraged, but goes on from victory to victory and from strength to strength.

Conversion, then, you see, does not put new flesh upon the old spirit; but a new

Spirit within the old flesh. It does not propose to bring new flesh to the old mind; but a new mind to the old flesh. Deliverance and victory are not gained by having the human nature taken away; but by receiving *the divine nature* to subdue and

have dominion over the human, - not by the taking away of the sinful flesh, but by the sending in of the *sinless Spirit* to conquer and condemn sin in the flesh.

The Scripture does not say, Let this *flesh* be upon you, which was also upon Christ; but it *does* say, "Let this *mind* be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." Phil. ii. 5.

The Scripture does not say, Be ye transformed by the renewing of your *flesh*; but it does say, "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your *mind*." Rom. xii. 2. We shall be *translated* by the renewing of our *flesh*; but we must be *transformed* by the renewing of our *minds*.

The Lord Jesus took the same flesh and blood, the same human nature, that we have, - flesh just like our sinful flesh, - and because of sin, and by the power of the Spirit of God through the divine mind that was in Him, "condemned sin in the flesh." Rom. iii. 3. And therein is our deliverance (Rom. vii. 25), therein is our victory. "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." "A new heart will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you."

Do not be discouraged at sight of sinfulness in the flesh. It is only in the light of the Spirit of God, and by the discernment of the mind of Christ, that you can see so much sinfulness in your flesh; and the more sinfulness you see in your flesh, the more of the Spirit of God you certainly have. This is a sure test. Then when you see sinfulness abundant in you, thank the Lord that you have so much of the Spirit of God that you can see so much of the sinfulness; and know of a surety that when sinfulness abounds, grace much more abounds in order that "as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

June 28, 1900

"How to Understand the Bible" *The Present Truth* 16, 26 , p. 406.

THE Bible is not difficult to understand when it is taken as it says.

Whoever will allow the Bible to mean what it says, will never have any difficulty in knowing what it means.

And whoever will allow that the Author of the Bible is capable of knowing what He wants to say, and that He has clearness of mind enough to say what He wants to say just as He wants to say it, will have no difficulty in taking the Bible as it says, and consequently will have no difficulty in understanding it.

The Bible comes to us as the Word of God. In itself it claims to be the Word of God. It is the Word of God.

And whosoever will receive it as the Word of God, will find it to be that. Then to allow that the Author of the Bible had sense enough to know exactly what He wanted to say, and ability to say it just as He wanted to say it, is only to allow, that God has sense enough to know what He wanted to say, and had sufficient clearness of mind to say it as He wanted to. In other words, it is only to allow that God in giving His Word knew what He meant, and meant what He said.

When the Bible is taken this way and treated thus, no one will have any difficulty whatever in understanding it. And for any man not to take it this way, and not to treat it thus; that is, for any man to say that the Bible does not mean what it says, and that it is left for the man himself to say what it means - this is only to claim that he knows better than God just how it ought to have been said, and just what should have been meant. In other words, he puts himself in the plans of God.

But when the Bible is taken just as it says, and is allowed to mean exactly what it says because the Author of it knew well enough what He wanted to say to be able to say just what He meant, it is all plain enough. Even a child can understand it then, for it is written, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no case enter therein." Now the Word of God is the word of the kingdom. Through that Word we enter into the kingdom. And as whosoever, does not receive that kingdom as a little child, cannot have it, it is perfectly plain that it is intended by the Word that a little child shall understand the Word, and that a little child can understand it. Even grown people must receive it as little children," and must become as little children in order to receive it.

Any system, therefore, any writing, any way that is taken, by anybody, that has a tendency to mystify the sayings of the Bible, to turn them into hard problems or to make them difficult to understand, can never be the right way. And anything offered as an exposition of any doctrine that presents a problem difficult to be understood, cannot be the truth. Therefore again, it is written, "I fear lest as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."

The Word of Christ is simple. His Word is plain. It is as simple as A, B, C. And anything that tends to make it anything else than plain and simple, cannot be the right way. The simplicity that is in Christ is the perfection of simplicity. When He was on earth He taught all classes of people at once. The common people heard Him gladly because He spoke with such simplicity of language, and such directness of meaning that they could understand Him. And it was only the subtlety of the serpent in the Scribes and Pharisees that pretended not to be able to understand Him.

It was so in the very beginning. When God placed in the Garden the first human pair, He said to them plainly, Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou attest thereof thou shalt surely die." Yet there came the serpent with his subtlety and proposed that the Lord did not mean what He said, that it was necessary that it should be explained, and that he was one who was qualified to explain it and convey to them the true meaning. He therefore said, "Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil."

Thus Satan proposed that God had not said exactly what He meant, and had kept back the real meaning, and had left His saying dark and problematical That is the first explanation that was ever offered; the first comment that was ever made upon the Word of God. And everything since, that has ever tended to make

problematical the Word of God, to make it mean otherwise than exactly as it says, is following the same lead. It is of the subtlety that beguiles from the simplicity that is in Christ.

It has been well written of Moses that "He gave God credit for wisdom to know what He meant, and firmness of purpose to mean what He said; and therefore Moses acted as seeing the Invisible." And it was "By faith that Moses endured as seeing the Invisible." It is therefore faith to give God credit for wisdom to know what He means, and firmness of purpose to mean what He says. And "without faith it is impossible to please Him.

A. T. JONES.

(To be Continued.)

July 5, 1900

"How to Understand the Bible. (Concluded.)" *The Present Truth* 16, 27 , pp. 422, 423.

NOW it is a fact that there is much discussion of the Sabbath question. Many people seem to have great difficulty in knowing just what day is the Sabbath; yet the Word of God says plainly, "the seventh day is the Sabbath." Any person who will simply accept that statement as it stands, taking it simply as it says, will never have any difficulty at all in knowing exactly what day is the Sabbath. And the Bible throughout speaks just as plainly and is as easily understood in all its statements with reference to the Sabbath, as it speaks in this sentence quoted.

The people who accept the Bible statements exactly as they are on this subject, never do have any difficulty at all in knowing what day is the Sabbath. But those who will not accept it have endless confusion and difficulty; and in fact, never do get the question settled to their perfect satisfaction.

He who knows most can always make plainest and simplest what he has to tell, however deep the subject he may be discussing. God, knowing all things, and being the embodiment of all wisdom, is capable of making subjects that are of eternal depth so plain that a little child can receive them and understand them. But when anybody, whether it be the devil or a man not believing what the Lord says just as He says it, undertakes to interpret it and by subtle distinctions to tell what the Lord means, he produces only infinite and eternal confusion. And all who allow themselves to be so beguiled from the simplicity that is in Christ, inevitably find it to be so.

When the Scripture is read that says plainly, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," those who do not believe it and will not accept it as the truth of God, and will not allow that He knew what He wanted to say and then said just what He meant, put on an air of child-like innocence and inquire "The seventh day of what?" or "What seventh day is the Sabbath?"

In the very first chapter of the Bible the Word of God is, that in six days the Lord created the heavens and the earth and all things that are in them. Then the same word follows with a statement that on the seventh day He rested, and that

He blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from the work which He had created and made. And that particular seventh day, that rest day, is the Sabbath, for Sabbath is rest.

That six days of creative work followed by the seventh day of rest, formed the first week of time that this world knows anything about. And from that record just as it stands, without any interpretation or explanation whatever, it is perfectly plain that the seventh day, which is God's rest day; the seventh day, which is the Sabbath of the Lord, is the seventh day of the week.

Such is the record that the Lord Himself has given of His own creative acts through the first six days of the world's existence, and of His rest on the seventh day of the world's existence. These together compose the original week of the world's existence. And every one who will believe the record just as it stands and simply as it says, will know for himself and to his perfect satisfaction what seventh day it is that is meant in the Bible, when it says that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.

Then if anyone wants to have another statement of the case, he needs only to turn to the 20th chapter of Exodus and read what the Lord Himself said with His own voice, speaking from the top of Sinai. To His people there assembled and for all people for all time who will be His people, the Lord Himself said, "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work; . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day, wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it."

Here the Lord says that the people are to work six days and rest the seventh, because at creation He Himself had worked six days and then rested the seventh day. Now anyone who is willing to allow that the Lord tells the truth, and was able to remember at Sinai what He had done at creation, will have no difficulty whatever in understanding what seventh day it is that is referred to in this language. For it is the identical day of His rest at the close of the six days of creation, which cannot possibly be any other than the seventh day of the week; for there was no other existing period of which it could possibly be the seventh day.

The people who stood at the base of Sinai that day and heard that voice, have continued, through their descendants, unto this day; and are scattered over the whole earth, amongst all the nations. And the day that there God gave them, upon His own count, by His own voice, in connection with the facts in which He Himself was the actor, they have never lost.

If anyone wants yet further evidence, come fifteen hundred years still further down. Then He who made the heavens and the earth, who rested that seventh day at the close of the work of creation, He who spoke from the top of Sinai the word we have just quoted, stood upon the earth Himself in the form of a man as a teacher sent from God. He observed this same seventh day as the Sabbath. He ever called it the Sabbath.

And it was the same day that the people of Israel had observed as the Sabbath, from the day that He Himself had spoken from the top of Sinai. And though there was constant criticism of all His words and ways on the part of the

scribes, Pharisees, lawyers and rabbis, yet there was never any shadow of a question raised as to whether He observed the proper day as the Sabbath. There was always agreement between Him and them as to that. Their objections against Him were solely with reference to His manner of observing the day. And He in this as in everything else was the grand exemplar of the right way for all mankind for ever.

Thus three separate times the Lord Himself has stated the facts concerning the origin and the basis of the Sabbath, and has made plain exactly what seventh day it is. First, in the record of the original creation in the first and second chapters of Genesis. Secondly, in repeating with His own voice the record of the original creation. Thirdly, when upon the earth He repeated with His own voice and manifested in His own life the living truth as the example for all mankind.

423

O that man would believe the Word of the Lord which He has taken all this pains to make plain to their understanding. Why will men continue to allow the same serpent that beguiled Eve, and in the same way, through his subtlety, to corrupt their minds from the simplicity that is in Christ?

A. T. JONES.

July 19, 1900

"Keeping the Commandments of God" *The Present Truth* 16, 29 , p. 454.

EVERYTHING that the Lord has ever done for mankind since the sin of Adam, has been done solely to bring man back into harmony with His law.

The establishment of ordinances, the giving of His law, the sending of His prophets, the sending of His Son, "that Prophet" greater than all, the gift of His Holy Spirit, and the gifts of the Spirit - all, everything, that has been given, established, or employed by the Lord, has been to bring men to obedience to His law.

In bringing men to His law He is bringing them to Himself; for it is written: Thou "testifiedst against them, that Thou mightest bring them again unto *Thy* law" and "testified against them to turn them *to Thee*." Neh. ix. 29, 26. Read carefully the whole chapter, and see the object of all that He did. Bringing men to His law is only turning them to Himself: because "God is love," and "this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments."

No higher attainment than the love of God can ever be reached by any soul in the wide universe. And since it is the love of God, and only the love of God, that we keep His commandments, it is the very certainty of truth that no higher attainment than the keeping of the commandments of God can ever be reached by any soul in the wide universe.

Jesus said, "I have kept My Father's commandments, and abide in His love," and "I and My Father are one." There cannot possibly be any higher nor any better attainment than oneness with God, than likeness to Christ, who is one with God. And as He kept the Father's commandments, and abode in His love by

keeping His commandments, so there is no higher nor better thing that could possibly be attainable than the keeping of the commandments of God.

The greatest gift of God to men is the gift of His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. Yet with this wondrous gift to men, even in Christ nothing avails on the part of men "but faith which worketh by love." Faith is the gift of God, and, working by love, works only by the love of God. And "this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments." Therefore it is certain that the one great object of the very gift of Christ, and of faith in Him, is to bring men to the keeping of the commandments of God, to faithful obedience to His law.

The greatest gift God can bestow on men through Jesus Christ, the only means of His gifts to man, is His Holy Spirit. Yet in this gift all that He does, all that He can do, is to cause men to know the love of God; for "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Rom. v. 5. And since it is "the love of God, that we keep His commandments," and "love is the fulfilling of the law," it is perfectly plain that the one purpose of this greatest gift of God through Christ is the keeping of the commandments of God, faithful allegiance to His law.

All the working of the Spirit of God, through all the diversities of operations, is to bring souls unto charity, the bond of perfectness, which is perfect love, the love of God. And this is the love of God that we keep His commandments." Therefore all the working of the Spirit of God through His many gifts and operations, is solely to bring men to the keeping of the commandments of God.

By all this therefore it is certain that the keeping of the commandments of God is the greatest blessing, the highest honour, and the richest gift that even God can bestow upon any soul. All other blessings, honours, and gifts are subordinate to this; they are given only to be conducive to this one thing; and they are to be used only as means of attaining this.

For any person to use any of the gifts of God for any other purpose than to make himself a true keeper of the commandments of God is for that person to miss the will of God, and to frustrate the object of the very gift which He would use. To be willing to use the word of God, to use God's gift of His dear Son, to use the gift of the Holy Spirit, or any of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, with any other aim than the perfect keeping of the commandments of God, is to miss the will of God, and to pervert the purpose of that word, or that gift. That one aim, and that alone, is true Christianity.

This is what *Christian patriotism* means. So to honour the law of God, is what it means to be a true citizen of the commonwealth of Israel. This is what means loyalty to the government of God, and allegiance to the constitution, the supreme law, of the Most High.

Now are you a Christian patriot? Is the keeping of the commandments of God your one single aim? Are all the gifts and blessings of God counted by you as only contributory to this single object? These questions are important. This whole subject as here presented, is of vital importance.

A. T. JONES.

July 26, 1900

"The Forgiveness of Sin and the Healing of Disease" *The Present Truth* 16, 30 , pp. 470, 471.

THERE are to-day presented to the public many means of healing. Besides the dreadful drug medications, there are pretended faith healings, magnetic healings, hypnotism, Christian science healings, etc., etc.

There are thousands of persons to-day who have diseases, and who so long to get rid of them that they will willingly apply anything that gives them the promise of doing away with the disease, without asking any questions as to any consequences. The only question with them is, How can I get rid of this, and in the quickest way? There are thousands of persons who are diseased, - persons who have brought disease upon themselves, and who are keeping disease upon themselves, by their wrong methods of living; and who will adopt, and give themselves up to, anything that will relieve them of the suffering, rather than to set about a rational, conscientious course to correct their manner of living, so that the disease may go. Those persons need not expect anything else than that they will fall under the deceptive power of the enemy, who, by curing, or apparently curing, their bodies, gets a hold upon both soul and body that nothing but the power of God Himself can break. Then why not have God to deliver them at the first? - Simply because the way of the Lord is not the thing of supreme importance with them.

And when you do go to God to be healed of disease, do not ask nor expect Him to take away the disease while you continue the cause of that disease. Bear in mind for ever that disease does not come without cause. Diseases have their cause every one of them has its causes. Seek for the cause, and conscientiously correct that, and God will invariably co-operate with you.

To ask the Lord to heal you of disease while you are continuing the cause, is only to ask the Lord to set Himself against Himself, and work contrary to His own eternal laws and established principles: and all for your sake. For if a person is not willing to put away the cause of the disease, - yea, if a person is not willing to seek diligently and study faithfully to find out the cause, that he may honestly and decidedly put it away, - then it is plain that his own pleasure, and not the glory of God, is his chief aim in asking the Lord to heal him. And it is plain that in asking the Lord to do so, he does it, not for the Lord's sake, but for his own sake.

It is a perfectly safe proposition that when a person has done all in his power to search out and put away the causes of his disease, and it should be found after all that the cause is beyond all human effort to remove, then if the one sole aim of his healing is the glory of God and the keeping of the commandments of God, he may with perfect confidence and full assurance of faith ask the Lord to heal him.

And in your searching, remember that sin is the first of all causes of disease; for if there had never been any sin, there never could have been any disease. Accordingly in the Bible, forgiveness of sin is connected with the healing of

disease. "Bless the Lord, O my soul . . . who forgiveth all thine iniquities, who healeth all thy diseases." "The prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." "That ye may know that the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins (He saith unto the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go into thy thine house."

Therefore as sin is the first of all causes of disease, all plans or means of getting rid of disuse utterly miss the mark if they do not take into consideration *the getting rid of sin*; and the getting rid of sin as *the principal thing*.

471

For as sin is the very foundation of all the causes of disease, surely there can be complete deliverance from disease only in complete deliverance from sin. Therefore it is written of those who shall inhabit that glorious land, "The inhabitant shall not say, I am sick;" and why? - Because "the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." Isa. xxxiii. 24.

Again: As sin is the first of all the causes of disease, the getting rid of sin must be the chief thing in putting away the causes of disease. And as sin is the transgression of the law of God, - the Ten Commandments, - the putting away of sin as the chief of all things in putting away the causes of disease, inevitably brings every soul face to face with the keeping of the commandments as the chief of all things to be had in view in all efforts made to get rid of disease. Accordingly all efforts made to be rid of disease must be made in conformity with the commandments of God. And loyalty to the commandments of God will utterly discountenance and repudiate everything - miracles and all - that is offered so a means of getting rid of disease, if in any way it draws away from the keeping of the commandments of God.

A. T. JONES.

August 16, 1900

"The 'Return of the Jews'" *The Present Truth* 16, 33 , pp. 515, 516.

"FOR there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek."

It will be of interest to notice the scriptures which discuss the great truth that there is no difference between the Jew and the Gentile. Here is one passage of divine argument as to the relative standing, and the true standing, of the Jews and the Gentiles: -

"Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law; and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law.

"Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through

breaking the law dishonourest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written.

"For circumcision [being a Jew] verily profiteth, *if thou keep the law*: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. Therefore if the uncircumcision [the Gentile] keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision [the Gentile] which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee [the Jew], who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?

"For he is not a Jew, which is one *outwardly*; neither is that circumcision, which is *outward in the flesh*: but he is a Jew, which is one *inwardly*; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Rom. ii. 17-29.

Now, how would it be possible more forcibly to show that there is not, and can not be, any sort of difference between Jew and Gentile; for the whole question of the relation of either to God, turns upon character. "There is no respect of *persons* with God;" there is respect of *character*. And the sole standard of character is the righteousness of God, which is expressed in his law. And when a Jew disregards the law of God, in *character* he is a *Gentile*, and in *person* he is as a Gentile.

516

And when a Gentile keeps the righteousness of the law, and so fulfills the law, he becomes in character a true Jew, and in person is as a Jew. This because being truly a Jew consists altogether in character, in the true circumcision "of the heart, in the spirit," which is, indeed, "the putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh," and having the love of God shed abroad in the heart, which love is manifested in the keeping of the his commandments.

Since, then, when a Jew according to the flesh, wanders from God, and by transgression of the law of God his circumcision is made uncircumcision, and he becomes a Gentile in character, and as a Gentile in person; and when a Gentile comes to God, and his uncircumcision becomes circumcision, and he becomes in character truly a Jew, and in person is as a Jew, what is this but a return - a true return - of the Jew?

And even so says the Scripture, in another place: "They are not all Israel, which are *of* Israel; neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children; but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called.

"That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Rom. ix. 6-8. And, "WE, brethren [Galatians - Gentiles], as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

"But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." Gal. iv. 28-30. And when the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman, how much less shall he be heir above the son of the freewoman, as the theory of the "Return of the Jews" represents him!

And all this is simply to say again that the only way of return for the Jews is the way of the faith of Jesus Christ, the way of the truth of the one Gospel of Christ, the way of return of all sinners alike: even as is demonstrated over and over in the books of Galatians, Romans, and Hebrews especially, as it is also in the other books of the New Testament, as well as in the very essence of the whole plan of the Gospel itself.

A. T. JONES.

(*To be continued.*)

August 23, 1900

**"The 'Return of the Jews.' (Concluded.)" *The Present Truth* 16, 34 ,
pp. 532, 533.**

IN Jer. 11:16 it is written: "The Lord called thy name, A green olive tree, fair, and of goodly fruit: with the noise of a great tumult he hath kindled fire upon it, and the branches of it are broken."

This is the tree of Israel. The word in Jeremiah leaves the tree only where the branches of it are broken. In Romans xi. Inspiration takes up the subject, and carries it to completion. There it is shown that when the natural branches of the tame olive tree - the Jews - were broken off, in the place of these there are grafted in branches from "a wild olive tree" - the Gentiles.

In Romans xi. it is also shown that these natural branches of the tame olive tree were broken off "because of unbelief;" and the branches of the wild olive tree are grafted in and remain "by faith." It is also shown that if the Jews, the natural branches, "abide not still in unbelief," they too shall be grafted in; "for God is able to graft them in again."

This settles it beyond all possibility of legitimate controversy that no Jew will ever return, or shall ever be counted among the children of God, *except by faith*: precisely as any Gentile comes to God and is counted among the children of God. This again demonstrates the truth that "there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek."

The Gentile, from the wild olive tree, who is grafted in, is warned not to become exalted in his own merit and begin to boast against the branches that were broken off, that I might grafted in." And the caution to all such in this is: "Well; *because of unbelief* they were broken off, and thou standest *by faith*. Be not high-minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, *if thou continue in His goodness*: otherwise *thou also* shalt be cut off. And *they also*, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graff them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?" Rom. xi. 20-24.

That tells the whole story, and in such a way that no one who will consider what it says can possibly fail to see that there is, indeed, no difference between the Jew and the Greek; but that when the Jews, because of their unbelief, rejected God, and, so, as dead and withered olive branches, were broken off, branches are taken from the wild olive tree of the Gentiles and grafted into the good olive tree in their places: so that, in the economy of God and the plan of his tree of Israel, the believing Gentile takes the place of the unbelieving Jew. just as He has said in another place: "They which are the children of *the flesh*, these are not the children of God: but the children of *the promise* are counted for the seed." Rom. ix. 8. Those who are of the flesh have no claims upon the Lord; for the minding of the flesh is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. They which be of faith, these only are the children of Abraham, and so the children of God.

In the plan of God, there is the tree of Israel. As written, because of unbelief its branches withered, died, and were broken off. That left the tree incomplete. But He sends His husbandmen to the wild olive tree; and from that branches are gathered and grafted into the good olive tree - His own tree of Israel. And that work will continue until the branches gathered from

533

the wild olive tree and grafted into the good one, shall fill all the places of the branches broken off - till these branches from the wild olive tree, by being grafted in and partaking of the root and fatness of the good olive tree, become live, fruitful branches of that good tree. And thus the good olive tree shall be caused to stand full and complete in its symmetry, as originally conceived in the mind of God.

Thus the fulness of that broken olive tree is made up from the wild olive tree - the Gentiles. And this is the significance of that expression, "Till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." This "fulness of the Gentiles" is the fulness of that broken, good olive tree which is made up from the Gentiles as the wild olive tree. That good olive tree, with its branches all broken, is marred and incomplete: it in no sense represents the idea of God concerning it. But when all those broken branches are replaced from the wild olive tree, and that tree stands, full and flourishing, as originally planned in the mind of God, then the "fulness" of the tree is there, as originally designed: it is a complete tree. And this "fulness" of that tree - that which makes it a complete tree, after it was all marred and broken - comes from the Gentiles, from the wild olive tree. This is the "fulness of the Gentiles," and this is how that "fulness" comes in.

And upon all this, as the conclusion of all, it is written: "And so all Israel shall be saved." "So" signifies "in this way," "by this means," "after this manner." There it is written: "In this way, by this means, after this manner, shall all Israel be saved." And that is the only return of the Jews, and the only salvation of Israel.

True, as already noted, from this the original branches are not arbitrarily excluded: any one of these will gladly be grafted in again, "if they abide not still in unbelief."

A. T. JONES.

August 30, 1900

"The Millennium" *The Present Truth* 16, 35 , p. 548.

The word "millennium" is composed of two Latin words, *mille*, "a thousand," and *annus*, "a year," and signifies "a thousand years." Any period of a thousand years is a millennium; but that period of a thousand years designated and understood universally as "the millennium" is a certain thousand years mentioned and measured off in the Scriptures.

The particular scripture which defines the thousand years - the millennium - is Rev. xx. 1-7. The connection in which this thousand years is set is such that from it can be certainly known, not the *date* of its beginning, but the *event* that marks its beginning. Also the connection in which it is set is such that from it can be certainly known what the character of that millennium is to be.

In that scripture it is said that Satan is to be bound and shut up for a thousand years, and that the saints live and reign with Christ a thousand years. "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This [living of the saints] is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

By these words we know that the event that marks the beginning of the millennium is "the first resurrection," - the resurrection of the "blessed and holy," - the resurrection of "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands." And this resurrection of the saints, this "first resurrection," is at the coming of the Lord in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory; for it is written: "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. iv. 15-17.

And again: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52.

And again: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." Verses 22, 23.

There are many other scriptures to the same purpose, but these are enough to settle it as the truth of God that the second coming of Christ marks the beginning of the millennium, because the second coming of Christ brings the resurrection of the just, of the blessed and holy; and this resurrection, the first one, marks the beginning of the thousand years - the millennium.

Here, then, at the beginning of the millennium, is the resurrection of all the righteous dead; the translation of all the righteous living; and these all are caught away *from the earth*. They meet the Lord, not on the earth, but "in the air;" and as all the resurrected and translated ones hitherto have done, they ascend to heaven with Christ their Lord, where they reign with him upon the thrones of judgment for a thousand years. Thus the righteous.

What, then, of the wicked at the beginning of the thousand years, and during the thousand years? What occurs to them at the coming of the Lord? Read: "You who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Thess. i. 7, 8. They call for the mountains and rocks to fall on them and hide them "from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" Rev. vi. 14-17. They are slain by the "armies which were in heaven," but which follow "Him upon white horses," and by the "sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." Rev. xix. 11-21. As it is written in another place: "The Lord shall roar from on high, and utter His voice from His holy habitation; He shall mightily roar upon His habitation; He shall give a shout, as they that tread the grapes, against all the inhabitants of the earth. A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations, He will plead with all flesh; He will give them that are wicked to the sword, saith the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Behold, evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth. And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth: they shall not be lamented, neither gathered, nor buried; they shall be dung upon the ground." Jer. xxv. 30-33.

Now, since it is the truth of the word of God that the resurrection of the righteous - the first resurrection - marks the beginning of the millennium; since that resurrection is caused by the second coming of the Lord; and since at his coming all the righteous, dead and living, are taken away from the earth, and all the wicked upon the earth are slain, it is certain that the earth is at that point left desolate. And as the saints do not return to the earth for a thousand years, and the wicked dead do not live again until the thousand years are finished, it is certain that the earth is left desolate during *that thousand years*. And that is to say that, during *the millennium*, this earth is to be utterly desolate.

A. T. JONES.

September 6, 1900

"The Millennium. (Concluded.)" *The Present Truth* 16, 36 , pp. 564, 565.

SATAN BOUND AND DESTROYED

"AND when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison." Rev. xx. 7. This, because, the thousand years being finished, "the rest of the dead lived," and this releases him. It was the taking away of all people from the earth, by the resurrection and translation of the righteous, and the slaying of all the wicked, *at the beginning of the thousand years*, which put a bond upon Satan, in that he is left utterly without resource. There is thus none upon whom he can exercise any of his wiles or faculties in any way whatever. And being confined to this earth in its utterly wasted, desolate, broken-down, dark, and dismal condition, it is a horrible and gloomy prison, indeed.

But when the thousand years are expired, and the rest of the dead all live, in the resurrection of the unjust, - the second resurrection, - *then* Satan is loosed. Now he has something to do: now he has subjects upon whom he can work: now he can be active once more in all his satanic ingenuity.

GATHERING THE NATIONS TO BATTLE

Accordingly it is written of him that immediately when he is loosed, he goes "out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea." Rev. xx. 8. And this battle, into which, by his deception, he leads this multitude to engage, is a battle against the camp of the saints and the beloved city, for "they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city."

They are enabled to do this because, in Zechariah xiv., it is declared that when the Lord Jesus comes, at the end of the thousand years, "His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley. . . . and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee." Verses 4, 5. Thus the holy city, the heavenly Jerusalem, the camp of the saints, is brought down upon the earth at his coming to the judgment of the wicked. And this is how it is that Satan can gather all the nations of the wicked, who have then been raised from the dead, against this camp of the saints and the beloved city.

And how easy it will be for him to deceive them all in this, however much he has deceived them before! What a vast multitudes of the wicked dead of the ages have died in battle! And even when Jesus comes to gather to Him His saints at the beginning of the thousand years, the kings of the earth and their armies are gathered together to make war against him that sits "upon the horse," and his army, and, in this warlike mind and spirit, they are slain by the brightness of His coming. And when all these awake from the dead, it is to them just as if they had awaked in the midst of the battle and turmoil in which they went down. It will

be indeed, in their minds, almost a continuation of the scenes in which they perished in the beginning. And now Satan and his armies are there, with his spirit reigning supreme, to seize their minds in this crisis and in this spirit of war, and to draw them up to battle against the camp of the saints and the beloved city. And so "they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city."

THE SHEEP DIVIDED FROM THE GOATS

And thus, and at that time, the Son of man sit upon the throne of his glory, and before Him are "gathered all nations," and they are separated one from another, as a shepherd divideth His sheep from the goats: the sheep - the righteous - are at "His right hand," *in the city*, and the goats - the wicked - are at "His left hand," outside the city. Matt. xxv. 31-33.

"And I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell ["the grave," margin] delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works." Rev. xx. 11-13.

These are all the wicked dead; for the righteous dead all lived a thousand years before. And mark: these are judged out of the things "written in the *books*;" not out of the things written in the *book*. These books are the records of their lives. The book of life is there as the witness that they might have had their places in *that* book, and so might have had all the records in "the books" blotted out, and they have lived at the beginning of the thousand years, and be reigning now with Christ. But they would not have their place in "the book of life," and so they must now meet the record in "the books," exactly as that record is, "according to their works."

And now all the books are opened; and every soul of that vast throne, as it stands compassed about "the camp of the saints and the beloved city," sees his life exactly as it was lived. He sees all the blessedness and the joy that he might have had. He sees "the book of life," in which he might have had his name. But, alas! it is too late. They are judged out of those things written in the books, "according to their works."

"There all flesh is at once in the sight of the Lord,
And the doom of eternity hangs on His word."

And every soul of them, seeing all this, and, in the light of the judgment of the just Judge, - seeing that it is all just, every knee bows to Christ, and every tongue confesses to God that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. Rom. xiv. 11; Phil. ii. 11. Thus, all they "that go down to the dust shall bow before Him;" yet, as each one has chosen his way in spite of all that the Lord could possibly do, now "none can keep alive his own soul." Ps. xxii. 29. Then to those on His left hand the awful word goes forth, "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire,

prepared for the devil and his angels." "And these go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." Matt. xxv. 41, 46.

"It is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompences for the controversy of Zion. And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch." "The breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it." "And fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them."

"And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire." "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." And "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

"O mercy! O mercy! look down from above,
Great Creator, on us, thy sad children, in love;
When beneath to their darkness the wicked are driven,
May we find a reward and a mansion in heaven."
A. T. JONES.

September 13, 1900

"After the Millennium" *The Present Truth* 16, 37 , p. 580.

AFTER the wicked are destroyed, as shown in Revelation xx., and in the previous study on this subject, "he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. . . . It is done."

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea;" and the new Jerusalem, the holy city, having already come down from God out of heaven, and being thus upon the earth, it is written: "And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away." Rev. xxi. 3, 4.

And thus is fulfilled the promise made of old: "For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people: and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying." Isa. lxv. 17-19.

"And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there." Rev. xxi. 23-25.

And there the wilderness shall be "like Eden," and the desert as "the garden of the Lord." "Joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving, and the voice of melody." Isa. li. 3.

There "the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days." And even "then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." Isa. xxx. 26; 24:23.

There "the inhabitants shall not say, I am sick;" for "the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." Isa. xxx. 24.

There the people "shall be all righteous" (Isa. lx. 21), and "the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing." Isa. xxv. 1, 2.

There the eyes of the blind shall have been opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped. There the lame man shall "leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert." "And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with sons and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Isa. xxv. 5, 6, 10.

There all shall be so quiet and so secure that the people can dwell safely in the wilderness, and sleep in the woods. And the people, and the very places round about, shall be a blessing; yea, "there shall be *showers* of blessing." Eze. xxiv. 25, 26.

There the very land itself shall rejoice even with joy and singing; and there, for very joy, "the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands." Isa. lv. 12.

There "we shall ever feel the freshness of the morning, and shall ever be far from its close."

"And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them," are heard "saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Rev. v. 13.

"And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and His servants shall serve Him: and they shall see his face; and His name shall be in their foreheads. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever." Rev. xxii. 3-5.

"Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel; be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord hath taken away thy judgment, He hath cast out thine enemy: the King of Israel, even the Lord, is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more. . . . The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty; He will save, He will rejoice over thee with joy; He will rest in his love, He will joy over thee with singing."

"Bless the Lord, O my soul: and all that is within me, bless his holy name."
"And let all the people say, Amen" and Amen.
A. T. JONES.

September 27, 1900

"Debtor to Do the Whole Law" *The Present Truth* 16, 39 , pp. 612, 613.

"FOR I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." Gal. v. 3.

"Debtor to do the whole law." It is curious that many, in considering this statement, have made it mark a distinction between two laws, and have made it exclude the law of God from the subject under consideration, by showing to the word "debtor" only the sense of "obligation."

They know, by the scripture, that it is the whole duty of man to fear God and keep His commandments. They know that there cannot be any other scripture to contradict that. They know that every man is under obligation to keep the whole law of God, whether he is circumcised or uncircumcised. And, allowing that this term implies only obligation, - that if he is circumcised, he is under obligation to do the whole law, - they conclude that this must exclude the law of God: they conclude that it must be some law that no person is under any obligation to do unless he be circumcised; and that therefore the "whole law" here under consideration must be only the whole ceremonial law of sacrifices and offerings.

On the other hand, there are those who hold themselves under no obligation whatever to keep the law of God, who bring in this text to support them in their disobedience and opposition. They will have it that only those who are circumcised are under any obligation to keep the law of God, and that it was only by being circumcised that the obligation comes; and they know that they are not under any obligation to keep the ten commandments.

But both of these are wrong: both of them fail to see the thought that is in this verse. And the cause of this failure is in their allowing to the word "debtor" only the sense of "obligation."

It is true that the word signifies "obligation." But, in this place, and in every other place in its connection with men's moral obligations, the word has a meaning so much broader and deeper than that of mere obligation, that the sense of mere obligation becomes really secondary.

A PENNILESS DEBTOR

THE word "debtor" in this verse - Gal. v. 3 - signifies not only that a person is in debt, and under obligation to pay; but that, beyond this, he is overwhelmingly in debt, with nothing at all wherewith to pay. If a man is debtor, and so under an obliga-

tion, to pay one thousand pounds, and yet has abundance or even only the ability to pay the one thousand pounds that is easy enough. But if a man is debtor, and so under obligation to pay millions of pounds, and has not a single penny wherewith to pay, and is in prison besides, and has no ability whatever to make a penny wherewith to pay his debt, to that man the word "debtor" signifies a great deal more than mere "obligation to pay."

And that is precisely the case here. That is the thought in this verse. That is the meaning embodied here in the word "debtor." This is because the word "debtor," when used in connection with morale, implies, and can imply, only sin: that the man is a sinner.

This word "debtor" in Gal. v. 8 is precisely the word that is used in Luke xiii. 4, - "Those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem?" - where the word "sinners" in the text, is "debtors" in the margin.

It is the word used in the Lord's prayer (Matt. vi. 12), "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our *debtors*;" and which, in Luke's version of the prayer, plainly expresses the thought of sin, in the words: "Forgive us *our sins*; for we also forgive every one that is *indebted* to us." Luke xi. 4.

It is the same word also that is used by the Saviour in Luke vii. 41, 42: "There was a certain creditor which had two *debtors*: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. And when they had *nothing* [with which] to pay, he frankly forgave them both."

It is the same word also that is used in the parable in Matt. xviii. 23-35. Indeed, from the verse, Luke xiii. 4, where the word "sinners" is used in the text, and "debtors" in the margin, the reference is direct to this parable in Matthew xviii. That is the parable in which it is said that when a certain king "had begun to reckon with his servants," one was brought note him, which owed him ten thousand talents, nearly three million pounds - and he *had nothing* with which to pay. Then he for "forgave him the *debt*." But when the servant found one of his fellow servant who owed him about three pounds, It would not forgive him the debt, but put him into prison until he should pay the small sum. Then the king called up his debtor," and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that wt due unto him. So likewise shall My Heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." Matt. xviii. 23-35.

That thought of delivering the debtor to the tormentors until he should pay all that was due to his lord, belongs with the word; for "the use of the word involves the idea that the debtor is one that must expiate his guilt."

A BANKRUPT ASSUMING IMPOSSIBLE OBLIGATIONS

FROM these scriptures the attentive reader can begin to see that in the words of Gal. v. 3, - "he is debtor to do the whole law," - there is far more suggested than that he is merely under obligation to accept the claims of the law upon him, and do his best to meet them. All this shows that he is not only under obligation to recognise the binding claims of the law of God, but that he is actually debtor to

render to that law all the claims that it has upon him. And in this it is further shown that, of himself, he must everlastingly be *debtor*: because he has absolutely nothing wherewith to pay, and of himself has no means of acquiring anything with which to pay.

And this indebtedness lies not only in his obligation to do the law from this time forward; it also lies in obligation to make satisfaction for *all that is past*, - for all the accumulations of the past, up to the present time.

Accordingly, of himself, every man is everlastingly a debtor in all that is implied in this thought in Gal. v. 3, and the kindred texts that we have here cited; because "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." And whosoever would be circumcised in order to be saved, and thus seek to be saved by works of self-righteousness, thereby takes upon himself the obligation to pay to the law of God his whole debt, from the beginning of his life unto the end of it. And in that, he also takes upon himself the obligation to *expiate all the guilt* attaching to his transgressions, and accumulated thereby.

That is what it is to be "debtor to do the whole law." That is what is stated in the words: "I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a *debtor* to do *the whole law*." He is not only debtor; but, by that transaction, he himself voluntarily assumes *of himself* to discharge all that is involved in his indebtedness.

Now it is true that every man in the world is of himself that kind of a debtor. It is also true that any man to-day who seeks justification by his own works, even in the doing of the ten commandments, or of anything else that the lord has commanded, does thereby assume, and bind himself to pay, all that is involved in the indebtedness. But he cannot pay. There is not with him the first element of any possibility, in himself, to pay any of the debt. He is overwhelmed and lost.

THE DEBT DISCHARGED BY A FREE GIFT

BUT, thanks be to God, whosoever has the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, whosoever depends only on the Lord Jesus and that which Jesus has done, though he be of himself debtor just like any other man, yet, in Christ, he has wherewith abundantly to pay all the indebtedness. Christ has expiated, by punishment and satisfaction, all the guilt of every soul; and by the righteousness of God which He brings, Christ supplies abundance of righteousness to pay all the demands that the law may ever make in the life of him who believes in Jesus.

Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift of the unsearchable riches of Christ. Oh, believe it! Oh, receive it! Poor, overwhelmed, lost "debtor," "buy of Me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed." "Yea, come, buy . . . without money and without price."

A. T. JONES.

October 4, 1900

"God, Law, and Prayer" *The Present Truth* 16, 40 , pp. 629, 630.

WHAT a queer mistake people make who hold that all things are ruled "y" law, absolute law; "and that therefore there is no place for prayer, because prayer would be an attempt to interfere with "law," and must necessarily be futile.

Even if it be granted that "law, absolute law," holds everything in its grip like a vice, it would not follow that there could be no place for prayer; because *prayer itself* would be included in the realm and reign of "law, absolute law." Prayer would be just as certainly a part of that system of absolute law as is anything else.

The only way in which prayer could be excluded from such a realm and reign of "law, absolute law," would be *the exclusion of man himself*. And this is exactly

630

the way in which it is done. A man sets himself aloof from all things. There he stands, self-centred, solitary, and supreme, and passes his superior and critical judgment upon all things, to the effect that all things are ruled by "law, absolute, inexorable law," that this leaves "no place for prayer," and accordingly *he will not pray*; and having thus relieved himself of all accountability, he proceeds to hold all other people to the most rigid accountability.

But the whole conception is a self-imposed fallacy. All things are not ruled by "law, absolute law." All things are ruled by God, the loving, the faithful, the merciful God. All things are not held in the grip of an inexorable law as in a vice: all things are held in God's hand, that hand which in His love was pierced on the cross in behalf of men.

His rule is not according to law, as if there were law above Him; but is the expression of principle that inheres within Him. The so-called "laws of nature" are but "the *habits* of God." They are simply His accustomed ways of doing things. And this is so, in mercy, in order that His creatures, who are finite, may know what to depend on. And when for the good of His creatures it is needed, He can do any of these things another way, as He chooses, *without violating any law*.

And all this gives the largest possible place for prayer. Prayer is simply the response in consent on the part of intelligent creatures, to the wish of God to rule them through principle, which is only the expression of Himself. Thus the principle of prayer is the principle of the harmony of the intelligent universe. It is the means of finding and holding the accordances of the universal intelligence.

A. T. JONES.

November 8, 1900

"The Gift of Life in Christ" *The Present Truth* 16, 45 , pp. 709, 710.

"BY one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. v. 12.

Whosoever believes that, and grasps the fact there stated, is prepared to understand the fulness of the salvation that the Lord Jesus brought to the world. And whosoever does not so grasp that which is stated in this verse as to

recognise it constantly, cannot grasp, in its truth, in its sincerity, the salvation that Christ has brought.

All have sinned: and death came by sin. But all of us have sinned as the consequence of that which was brought to the world, - because of our being in that vortex into which the world was plunged by the sin of that "one man" to whom God gave the world in the beginning. "By one man sin entered into the world." When sin had so entered by that one man, it was impossible for any of his, of themselves, to rise above that - which he had entailed. It was impossible for any of us to receive from him more than he had. And after he had sinned, sin only was that which he had. Consequently, he sunk the human race under the power of sin - in the sea of sin; and because of that sin we all have sinned; and so death has passed upon all. When that one man sinned, death passed upon him; and he never could draw any of us, any of his posterity, higher than he was. Consequently, when he became subject to death, by sin, we all became subject to death, because, being thus crippled, we all have sinned.

The deception of thinking that they have life in themselves has been for ages, and is still, the bane of mankind. This deception is couched in the conception of the immortality of the soul. Vast multitudes of the human race, and indeed the whole human race, naturally, as it is, have come under the power of that deception - of thinking that they have life themselves so certainly that even the Lord Himself cannot deprive them of it. Through the deception in which they are involved, they have come to believe that a part of themselves is "immortal," and, logically enough, that therefore it is "a part of God" - and then the conclusion, "How can God destroy a part of Himself?" By that argument they convince themselves that the Lord Himself could not destroy them, if He wished to.

The whole human race is naturally under that deception. And the way in which they came under this deception is precisely the way in which they came under the deception of sin. It is a part of the original deception; yea, rather, it is the very kernel of the original deception. For what was it that the deceiver said to the woman, to get her to depart from God into sin? - "Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be like God." You will be like the Divine, and not subject to death. That was the original proposition in the original deception into which the race went by that "one man," by whom came sin and death; and it is not strange that this deception of men's thinking that they have life in themselves should be as widely disseminated as is sin. The two things came in together; and they belong together for ever.

But the Lord spoke otherwise. Before this deceiver spoke, the Lord had said: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. ii. 17. And this was the truth. It was the truth when He spoke it; it was the truth the day they ate of the tree; and it is the truth for ever. And the only reason that Adam and Eve did not die in the very hour that they ate, is that Jesus Christ stepped in between, and took upon Himself the curse of sin, and its penalty of death. And this He did in order that mankind might be delivered from the death into which they had been plunged by that "one man." Therefore, since the Lord Jesus stepped in between, and Himself received the stroke of death that must come upon the man the day

he sinned; and since the Lord Jesus did this solely in order that the man might have the opportunity to receive life instead of death, it became essential, and in the gift of Christ that day it was given, that the man and all mankind should have sufficient space in which to breathe to allow them to live long enough to fix, each his choice of life or death.

That is the origin, that is the source, and that is the philosophy, of the life which now we have in the breath that we draw moment by moment. It all lies solely in the gift of Christ: it is indeed Christ, and only Christ. Each person to-day and ever is directly indebted to Christ for the life which he has in the breath that he draws moment by moment.

Surely, if it were not that this life, even though it be truly a vapour, were given us, mankind would never have had any opportunity to breathe at all after Adam sinned. And let it be repeated, for it cannot possibly be repeated too often, this

710

breath itself is given us by the gift of the Lord Jesus; and for the breath drawn moment by moment, every soul in the world to-day, and ever, is dependent upon the gift of Christ, which He made when man had sinned.

The word that Jesus spoke, therefore, is literally true, - true in every sense, - when He spoke of Himself as "the living Bread which came down from heaven," and "giveth life unto the world." For all the life that the world has to-day, is because the Lord Jesus gave Himself to receive the stroke of death that otherwise must have come upon the man at the beginning, because of the sin that he had sinned. And, in another place, Christ Himself said "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

Oh, that tells the whole story again! When did Jesus come, in the meaning of that text? When was His coming? When was He offered? At what time was the offering of Christ made? He is the Lamb "slain from the foundation of the world." The offering of Christ, in its very substance, was when, in the beginning, the man had sinned, and had become subject to death because of the sin. Then and there Christ gave Himself: there He set Himself forth as the offering. The gift was as certainly made then as it is now. Consequently, when He came thus *at the beginning*, He came that mankind might have life; because just then mankind needed life.

Adam and Eve needed life from that day in the garden; for if Jesus had not then offered Himself, if He had not thus "come," death would have come to them the day that they sinned. But the Lord Jesus came and gave Himself, and thus took upon Himself all that was to fall upon them, or upon us, that Adam and Eve might receive what was better. And in the nature of things, they must have breath to enable them to live long enough to give them time to choose that which God had brought, - the gift of Himself, which is life. Consequently, *at that point* He *came*, that mankind might have *life*, even life enough to allow us to breathe, in order that we might make use of this breathing spell of life in such a way that we should have life more abundantly, even the life which is eternal substance, even as the fulness of the life of God.

A. T. JONES.

November 15, 1900

"Freed from the Power of Death" *The Present Truth* 16, 46 , pp. 725-727.

CONSIDER for a little while what sin really is; what it is in essence. You know the Divine definition: "Sin is the transgression of the law." Now I wish you to consider what it is to transgress the law. Is it only the positive doing of something that is evil? - No; it is the coming short of positively doing that which is good. Is it not written that "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all"?

In another word, sin is the coming short of the righteousness of God. To come short of the righteousness of God is to transgress the law. Then, whatever

726

righteousness I may present, whatever deeds I may do, as obedience to the law of God as it stands in His word, which, in any sense at all, or to any degree at all, comes short of the righteousness of God, that is sin: it is indeed transgression of the law. This is emphasised by the fact that both in the Hebrew and in the Greek the word that God selected by which to convey to the minds of men, the root thought of what is sin, of what is transgression of the law, is the word that means to "miss the mark;" and to miss the mark by coming short.

It was in the time when they used bows and arrows that the word was selected. A man with his bow and arrow, shooting at a mark, would aim most carefully, and do his very best, to hit the mark: all his intentions were good; his purpose and his endeavour were of the best; but yet he could not reach the mark. He missed the mark by coming short. He was not strong enough to give to the arrow that impetus which would carry it so that it would hit the mark. Remember he did not miss the mark by overshooting, but by coming short of it. That is the root-thought in the word which God chose, both in the Hebrew and in the Greek, to convey to mankind the idea of what sin is.

Now no man in the world is strong enough, doing his very best, to hit the mark of the law of God, which is only the righteousness of God; for "all have sinned, and come short." That mark is too high as well as too far away for us to hit it. But, bless the Lord, "when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly." And in Christ alone we find the hitting of the mark. Therefore, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Phil. iii. 13, 14. In Christ it is, only in Christ, that we find the righteousness of God, which is the keeping of the law of God. Only in Christ do we find the keeping of the law of God.

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW

COME then, look with me at that law. By it is the knowledge of sin. That covers everything. All there is in sin is covered by that. Suppose you and I look into the law of God, and get the brightest, clearest possible view that a man can

get of that law. Suppose we see its demands, in the greatest breadth that a man can: and that we actually fulfil to perfection all the breadth of it that we see - have we really fulfilled it? Think of that. Have you? Have you then fulfilled the law as God fulfils it? as God would if He were in your place? - Oh, no. We have fulfilled only what we could see. But have we seen it all, in its intensity of righteousness? - We have not. No one but God can, for it is only the law of God.

That law being the law of God, only God's righteousness is truly manifest in it; so it is the reflection of what God is, in character. And that being so, nobody but God can see the true measure of the righteousness that is in the ten commandments. And there is the fallacy of our thinking that we can do true righteousness by keeping the ten commandments. We cannot grasp the righteousness of the ten commandments. If we were able to grasp it, we might do it. But that would require that we be infinite in understanding. But there is none infinite but God. Therefore none but God can grasp the infinity of the law of God.

There is another phase of this: I look into that law, and I see to the greatest height and breadth that I can; and I do to perfection all that I see - whose is the doing? - It is only mine. I have done it to perfection, according to my understanding. I have done all that I can see. But the seeing is only mine, not God's; and the doing is only mine, not God's; therefore all the righteousness of such doing is but mine, not God's. Now put this with that. The only righteousness that any man can ever see in the law of God is his own righteousness. And God can see in that law His own righteousness.

Therefore, I state the principle in a broader way: The only righteousness that anybody, God or man, can see in the law of God is his own righteousness. But when God sees in the law of God His own righteousness, it is all right; for it is the righteousness of God; it is holiness; it is the genuine. But when we see in the law of God our own righteousness, it is only "filthy rags;" it is only self-righteousness; it is only sin.

Therefore it is written, "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." Gal. ii. 21. To nobody in the wide universe does righteousness come by the law. Righteousness comes, to angels as to men, as the gift of God, through the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Head of the universe, with God. Consequently, there is no righteousness that comes to anybody but by the faith of Jesus Christ. And when the cross was set up on Calvary, it became the centre of the universe. The cross of Christ contains the whole philosophy of the plan of salvation: it is the seal of salvation to the angels who never sinned; it is the sign and seal of salvation to men who have sinned. To the angels who never sinned, the cross of Christ is the seal of certainty that their righteousness will abide for ever, that they will never sin; to sinful men, it is the sign and seal that they will be saved to the uttermost from all sin, and held in righteousness for evermore.

So, then, righteousness cometh to the world only as the gift of the Lord Jesus. "Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, . . . even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ." He is the One through whom it comes; He is the One who paid the price of it, who took upon Him the curse; the One who bore the penalty and paid all the claims of sin and death, upon every soul. And to Him belong the glory, the honour, and the majesty for all

the righteousness of men who have sinned; and for the security in righteousness of angels who never sinned

DEATH CONQUERED

THIS is the Gospel, and this is the salvation, which the Lord Jesus brought. And this gives a glimpse of the mighty thing that sin is, and of what a fearful depth it is to which sin has plunged us, in plunging us into death - when it took such a gift and such a price to deliver us. But, thank the Lord, the deliverance in righteousness and life is as high on that side as the loss in sin and death is deep on that side. And so it is written: "He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life.

And note the power that is in Him to conquer death, and the power that was displayed in Him in the conquering of death. He gave Himself up, bodily and wholly, to the power of death. He went into the enemy's prison-house; He allowed Himself to be looked up there, in the bonds of death, and a great stone was rolled unto the mouth of the sepulchre, and the sepulchre was sealed with the seal of the Roman Empire. So, both by the chief of the spiritual powers and by the chief of the temporal power of the world, the Lord Jesus was locked in the power of death. But, being dead, He broke the power of death!

It is a little enough thing that one who is alive should break the power of death. But, oh, the majesty, the divinity, the

727

infinity of the power of Him who, being dead, could break the power of death! That is the majesty of our Saviour, of the Lord who has bought you and me, and who is able to, and who does, set us free from the power of death.

A. T. JONES.

December 6, 1900

"Let No Man Deceive You" *The Present Truth* 16, 49 , pp. 770-772.

"AND Jesus went out, and departed from the temple; and His disciples came to Him for to show Him the buildings of the temple. And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.

"And as He sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto Him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the world?

"And Jesus answered." He answered fully. His answer covers all the time from that time until His coming and the end of the world.

A number of important matters are touched, and others are quite fully considered. But the first of all things said in the Lord's answer to the question of His disciples, is, "*Take heed that no man deceive you.*" This, then, is the most important of all considerations in connection with the coming of the Lord and the end of the world.

This thought is repeated and emphasised by Paul, when he writes of the same subject: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto Him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. *Let no man deceive you by any means.*" 2 Thess. ii. 1-3.

To be deceived with respect to the coming of the Lord and the end of the world is the worst possible deception; for to be so deceived is to be unprepared for that wonderful and all-decisive event, and so is to be taken unawares, and to be destroyed. For "the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." And "when they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them; and they shall not escape" (1 Thess. v. 3); "for as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth" (Luke xxi. 35).

To be deceived into thinking that the Lord is *not* coming when He *is* coming, is to be unprepared, and so taken unawares and destroyed. To be deceived into thinking that He *is* coming when He is *not* coming, is only to be disappointed, and so by the deception and disappointment to be caused *not* to believe in His coming when He is really coming, and thus, also, to be not ready, and therefore to be taken un-

771

awares, and, as a consequence, destroyed. And just because to be thus deceived involves the most fatal of all consequences, Jesus begins His instruction on this all-important question with that which is the most important of all considerations. "Take heed that no man deceive you."

Further, this is the most important of all instruction in connection with the subject, because in this very matter more effort is made to deceive than in any other. Jesus Himself says that "many shall come in My name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." Matt. xxiv. 5.

And again, "Many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many." Verse 11.

And yet again, "There shall arise false christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before." Verses 24, 25.

NO NEED TO BE DECEIVED

HAVING taken such precaution as this, and having shown such care to guard all against being deceived, it must needs be that He would make the whole matter so plain that all may escape deception. This, indeed, He has done. He has done it so thoroughly that any one who will believe His word, can entirely escape all deception as to His coming, whether as to the personality, the time, or the manner of His coming.

First, as to the personality and manner of His coming. Note again His word in verse 5: "Many shall come in My name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." It is therefore perfectly plain that any one who comes anywhere, at any

time, or in any manner, saying, "I am Christ," is a deceiver; and no one is ever to believe any such representation.

Again He says, "If any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not." Verse 25. From this it is perfectly plain that whenever or wherever one person shall say to another, "Christ is come here, or He has come there, come and see Him," that person is a deceiver, and, if he believes it himself, is himself deceived. And no person in the world is ever to believe that any such thing as that is the coming of the Lord. Jesus further emphasises this: "Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, He is in the desert; go not forth; behold, He is in the secret chambers, believe it not." Verse 26.

Surely, then, no one need ever be deceived in any of these ways as to the coming of the Lord; it is exceedingly easy to escape all deception in any of these ways. The way is made perfectly plain; the tests are all simple, and easily applied; and the word concerning them is brief and easily remembered. All that any one needs to do is simply to believe this simple word of Jesus.

Yet He does not stop even here. He goes on and states the case so clearly as absolutely to preclude any possibility of deception as to His coming, on the part of anybody who will pay any attention whatever to His word. He not only tells, as in the words already quoted, that any person coming and saying, "I am Christ," or saying, "Lo, He is here, in the secret chamber," or, "Lo, He is there, in the desert," is a deceiver, but He tells why all such ideas are deception.

THE BRIGHTNESS OF HIS COMING

And here is the reason: "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Verse 27. As stated in another place, "For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in His day." Luke xvii. 24.

That is a reason so simple, so easily remembered, and yet so conclusive, it annihilates every possibility of deception as to His coming on the part of anybody who has any disposition whatever to believe the Word of Jesus as to His own coming again to the world. There is no possibility of any one counterfeiting His coming, and when that coming is in its brightness as the lightning that brilliantly lightens up the whole heavens and earth, there is neither chance nor need for one person to say to others, "Lo, here He is, or there." Is it not even written, "Behold, He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see Him." Rev. i. 7. How, then, could it be possible to counterfeit it? and how can anybody be deceived with regard to it, who will but believe the Word?

A word farther as to the heavenly-shining brightness in which the Lord's coming is displayed; the cause of this is not in some particular display that is made to grace the occasion; it is simply the nature of His coming itself. For He Himself comes in His own proper glory; He comes also in the glory of the Father, and with the holy angels.

Now of Jesus Himself in His glory it is written, "His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; and his

feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace. . . . and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength." Rev. i. 14-16.

Of the Father it is written that He dwells in "the light which no man can approach unto" - a light so far above the brightness of the sun that in that day the sun shall be ashamed (Isa. xxiv. 23), and the city of God has no need of the sun to shine in it, for the glory of God lightens it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.

This is the glory of the Father and of Christ, in which Jesus appears at His second coming.

THE ACCOMPANIMENTS OF HIS COMING

Yet even this is not all; the holy angels come with Him. And of but one of these it is written that "His countenance was like lightning, and His raiment was white as snow." Matt. xxviii. 3. This of only one; and yet when Jesus comes there come with Him of these "ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands," "an innumerable company" - such a mighty host that the heavens are so filled with them and their glory that the whole seems like vast billows of clouds. The whole heavens are perfectly "wrapped in a blaze of boundless glory."

And such as this is the coming of the Lord. This, and this only, is the manner of His coming.

Yet more: the accompaniments of that coming: -

First, the tearing asunder of the heavens with a great noise, when the heaven departs as a scroll when it is rolled together. 2 Peter iii. 10; Rev. vi. 14.

Secondly, uttered from the temple of heaven, from the throne, that voice that shakes both earth and heaven, so that they are completely broken up and removed. Heb. xii. 26; Rev. xvi. 17-20.

Thirdly, the resurrection of the dead and the translation of the righteous living: "for the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and]remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

The coming of the Lord is all this, and not an iota less; yea, it is even much more. And in view of it all, or in view of only so

772

much of it as we have been able here to set down, now is it possible for anybody to be deceived as to His coming? - It is not possible, except as people refuse to believe His Word.

"Take heed that no man deceive you." "Let no man deceive you by any means." And that is only to say in other words, Believe the Word, receive the Word, hold fast to the Word, as it is spoken by Jesus, and as it is in Jesus. So shall you be safe from all deception, and so shall you be saved.

ALONZO T. JONES.

January 10, 1901

"The Faith of Jesus" *The Present Truth* 17, 2 , pp. 20, 21.

"LET this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who. . . emptied Himself."

He emptied Himself so entirely that, in becoming the Saviour of the world, he did not set himself forth in a way to make himself prominent or to draw attention to himself. "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins. . . . And no man *taketh this honour unto himself*, but he that is *called of God*, as was Aaron. So also Christ *glorified not Himself* to be made an high priest; but He that said unto Him, Thou art My Son, to-day have I begotten Thee. As He saith also in another place, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." Heb. v. 1, 4-6.

He emptied Himself so entirely that, in coming to the world, he did not do it in a way to make Himself conspicuous, or to draw attention to Himself; but in a way in which He could say, truly: "I am not come of Myself, but. . .

February 14, 1901

"The Holy Spirit" *The Present Truth* 17, 7 , p. 98.

THE Holy Spirit is now given without measure; and the Lord is calling upon all to receive the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit, when given, is to impart gifts "to a every man severally as He will." The object of these gifts is the perfecting of the saints. And this object will be accomplished in bringing all "in the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.

Therefore "receive ye the Holy Ghost," and "covet earnestly the best gifts," that thus you may be brought to perfection, and may receive the seal of God in words, in spirit, and in character.

A. T. J.

September 5, 1901

**"The Two Sides in the Great Controversy" *The Present Truth* 17, 36 ,
p. 564.**

SELF-SACRIFICE OR SELF-DEFENCE

"SELF-PRESERVATION is the first law of nature."

But self-sacrifice is the first law of grace.

In order to self-preservation, self-defence is essential.

In order to self-sacrifice, self-surrender is essential.

In self-defense, the only thing that can be employed is force.

In self-surrender, the only thing that can be employed is love.

In self-preservation, by self-defence, through the employment of force, force meets force, and this means only war.

In self-sacrifice, by self-surrender, thru love, force is met by love, and this means only peace.

Self-preservation, then, means only war; while self-sacrifice means only peace.

But war means only death. Self-preservation, then, meaning only war, means only death; while self-sacrifice, meaning only peace, means only life.

Self-preservation being the first law of nature, nature then means only death; while self-sacrifice being the first law of grace, grace means only life.

But death only is the wages of sin; nature, then, meaning only death, it is so only because nature means sin; while life, being only the reward of righteousness; grace, meaning only life, it is so only because grace means righteousness.

Sin and righteousness, nature and grace, are directly opposite and antagonistic elements. They occupy realms absolutely distinct. Nature, self-preservation, self-defence, force, war, and death, occupy only the realm of sin; grace, self-sacrifice, self-surrender, love, peace, and life occupy only the realm of righteousness.

The realm of sin is the realm of Satan. The realm of grace is the realm of God. All the power of the domain of grace is devoted to saving men from the dominion of sin. This in order that, "as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign, thru righteousness, unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

On which side do you stand in this great controversy?

A. T. JONES.

October 3, 1901

"Living for Eternity" *The Present Truth* 17, 40 , p. 629.

THE *eternal God* is thy refuge." - Deut. xxxiii. 27.

He "whose goings forth have been from the *days of eternity*" is your Saviour. - Micah v. 2, margin.

"The *eternal Spirit*" is your guide. - Hab. ix. 14; John xvi. 13.

The eternal Spirit guides you into the knowledge of "the *eternal purpose* which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." - Eph. iii. 11.

Through Him "whose goings forth have been from the days of eternity," "the eternal God" gives to you "*eternal life*," in order that "the eternal Spirit" may guide you into the knowledge of that "eternal purpose," in which He "hath called us onto His *eternal glory*." - Rom. vi. 23; 1 Peter v. 10.

And our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh - is working - for us an *eternal weight* of glory, while we look at the things which are eternal. - 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18.

And, "Thus saith the high and lofty One that *inhabiteth eternity*, . . . I dwell in the high and holy place, - with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit." - Isa. lvii. 15. "Fear not: for I have redeemed thee: I have called thee by thy name; *thou art Mine*. - Isa. xliii. 1.

Do you not see, then, that the Christian belongs to eternity, and not at all to time.

O then stand up, and be a Christian in the full enjoyment of the presence of eternity and the consciousness of "the power of an endless life."

A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 18 (1902)

February 13, 1902

"Called Out of Egypt" *The Present Truth* 18, 7 , pp. 100, 101.

WHEN the Lord visited and redeemed His people, to take them into the land of promise, the land He swore to Abram, Isaac, and Jacob to give to them; when He took them unto Himself to swerve Him only, in the keeping of His holy law, He said, first of all: "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before Me," etc.

Israel missed God's call: they believed Him not, and therefore could not enter into His rest. These fell in the wilderness. And the generation that went into the land of Canaan did not in that go into "the land" and the "rest" to which the Lord would have taken the people when they first left Egypt, had they only believed. They drifted further and further away from God until they actually rejected Him, that they might be like the nations.

And they became like all the nations. They failed exactly as had their fathers before them. For, in the days of David, the Lord still said: "To-day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness: when your fathers tempted Me, proved Me, and saw My works forty years. Whereupon I was grieved with that generation, and said, They do always err in their heart; and they have not known My ways. So I swear in My wrath, They shall not enter into My rest." Heb. iii. 8-11; iv. 7, 8.

But still they hardened their hearts, and went further away from the Lord, until they got into such darkness that it was the very darkness of "the shadow of death," which is "darkness as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." And there the people sat, when there shined unto them a "great light," even the light of God, in which darkness itself is light. Isa. ix. 2; Job x. 21, 22; Matt. iv. 16.

Christ came. Again God visited to redeem His people, to make them not simply servants, but *sons* of God, that we "might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life." And at that time again God said: "Out of Egypt have I called My Son."

Why was it necessary that the infant Jesus should be taken into *Egypt* at the time of the slaughter of the innocents by Herod? It was not alone to escape the decree of Herod, that Jesus was taken *into Egypt*; for that decree could have been easily escaped by a much shorter journey. This was done to teach all people for ever the deep spiritual lesson of the true deliverance from *Egypt*.

Jesus came into the world to take the place of man, to be our substitute and surety. Mankind is overwhelmed in the darkness and bondage of sin - Egyptian darkness, a darkness that may be felt. He was made to be sin; upon Him was laid the iniquity of us all; He was numbered with the transgressors; He was made in all things like those who substitute He became.

Therefore He was taken *into Egypt*, and was *brought out* again, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, "*Out of Egypt have I called my Son*;" and that by this object lesson there might be emphasised anew, and for ever, the great lesson taught from of old to all people, the great truth that men become the *sons of God* only by their being called *out of Egypt*.

The Ten Commandments express the whole duty of man. All that ever a man can do, in deed, word, or thought, in righteousness, is covered by the Ten Commandments. All man's service to God is in the keeping of this His Law. And when it was written of Christ, and it was fulfilled in Christ, as the Example of all mankind, that "out of *Egypt* have I called My Son," this was simply speaking anew to all mankind the words which, that great day, God spoke from heaven, as the preamble to the whole Ten Commandments and their keeping: "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of *Egypt*, out of the house of bondage."

This is the universal lesson: that no man can serve God, that no man can keep a single one of the Ten Commandments, except he is first delivered, by the power of God, from the darkness of *Egypt*, from the darkness of the shadow of death, from the realm and bondage of sin.

This is the lesson of the whole Bible. Look, for instance, at Eph. ii. 1-10: how men are dead in trespasses and sins, in the darkness of this world; walking according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the ruler of the darkness of this world (Eph. vi. 12), the spirit that works in the children of disobedience. But God, who is rich in mercy, has quickened us together with Christ, and has raised us up together with Him, to live and walk with Him. And this He did, not by our works, nor because of our works, but of His own mercy and grace; "for we are His workmanship, *created* in Christ Jesus *unto good works*, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Thus is the lesson taught, that no man can do good works except he is created unto it by the power of God.

After men have been delivered from this present evil world, into the glorious liberty of the children of God, and are standing fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, - the liberty by love to serve one another, - filled with the Spirit, so that all the fruits of the Spirit are shining in the life, reflecting the sunshine of righteousness, - only then it is that the generally considered practical things of the Christian life are enjoined.

Why is this? It is the same universal, divine lesson, that no man can do good works, no man can possibly do the practical things of the Christian life," who has not first *the Christian life as a practical thing*. And, therefore, it is made perfectly plain that deliverance from the darkness and bondage of sin; the finding of the sonship of God; the ability to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free; the receiving of the fulness of the Spirit of God in the life, - *these things* are the *practical things* of Christianity, equally with the others. Indeed, in a sense these are the more practical things; because so certainly must these precede the others that, without these, the other practical things of the Christian life can never be seen at all.

Therefore when, from Mount Sinai, God would speak, with a voice that shook the earth, the practical things of the life of man, He spoke *first of all* this original practical thing of the life of man - deliverance from the realm and bondage of sin;

101

"I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Ex. xx. 2.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before Me."

Yet this is not the preamble of only *the first* commandment, but of the whole law. And since, when He sent His only begotten Son to redeem us indeed, He renewed and emphasised this preliminary thought, in the words, "Out of Egypt have I called My Son," it is as if *this* were the preamble and the whole law. And all of it - the preamble and the whole law - is expressed in the great thought of the Third Angel's Message: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. xiv. 12.

A. T. JONES.

February 20, 1902

"The First Commandment. Deliverance from the God of This World"
The Present Truth 18, 8 , p. 119.

"I AM the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." Ex. xx. 2, 3.

What is it to have other gods before the Lord? Since to truly have Him alone, is to love Him with all the heart, and all the soul, and all the mind, and all the strength, then, plainly enough, it follows that anything by which any part of the heart, any part of the soul, any part of the mind, or any portion of the strength, is turned from God, is devoted to anything other than to God, is, in itself, to have another god than the Lord. And all this is what is forbidden in the First Commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me."

It is important, therefore, to notice the gods which the Lord points out as the principal ones that it is natural for men to have before the Lord.

One of these, if not the chief one, is "the world." For it is written: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love

of the Father is not in him." 1 John ii. 15. And, "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." James iv. 14.

The reason of this is that "the world" itself has a god. And "the god of this world" is "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience," and is, in fact, Satan himself. Friendship of the world, therefore, is of the spirit of the world; it is fellowship with the spirit of Satan. And this is why it "is enmity with God." Note, the Word does not say that the friendship of the world is *at* enmity with God, but that it *is* itself "*enmity* with God." And this is because it is of the very spirit of him who is the god of this world.

This is made plain in another text: "The whole world lieth in the evil one." 1 John v. 19, R.V. It is true, as our King James version renders it, that "the whole world lieth in wickedness," lieth in evil; but this is so because the whole world lieth in the wicked *one*, in the evil *one*. And the thought expressed here in the word "lieth" is "to lie at ease continually."

Plainly, then, a person who has friendship, and is in fellowship, with that which lies at perfect ease, and is content continually so to lie, in the evil one, is of the same spirit; and that can be only the spirit of the evil one, and, therefore, is of itself "enmity with God." And one thus so in friendship with the evil one, who is the fixed and continual enemy of God, makes himself thereby "the enemy of God."

This spirit of enmity is described in another place: "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. viii. 7. It can not be subject to the law of God, because it is of the very mind and spirit of Satan, who is the decided enemy of God.

But thanks be to God, there is deliverance from this enmity; there is deliverance from this present evil world. For Christ Jesus "is our peace, who hath made both [God and man] one [who had been separated by this enmity], and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having *abolished* in His *flesh* the *enmity*. . . . for to make in himself of twain [God and man] one new man, so making peace." Eph. ii. 14, 15.

Therefore, though that enmity can not be subject to the law of God, in Christ every soul can find it completely abolished. Though such a spirit is enmity with God, in Christ every soul can find that spirit completely driven out, and himself made on with God, having not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that he may know *not* the things of the world, but "the things that are freely given to us of God." Therefore, for a man to love the world, or to have friendship for the world, is for him to have the world as his god. And that is, in reality, to have the god of this world as his god; it is to do service to the evil one as his god.

And so, when the god of this world, the evil one, had shown to Christ "all the kingdoms of the world, and *the glory of them*," and had offered them to Him, Christ could have them only on the condition that He would "fall down and worship" the evil one. And these are the only terms upon which anybody in the world can ever have the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them, or the things of this world and the glory of them. "For, all that is in the world, the lust of

the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world."

Christ's answer to that whole thought, for Himself and all who are His forever, is: "Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." Matt. iv. 10.

And when Jesus had taken this stand against all the world, against all that is of the world, against all worldliness, and all the spirit that is of the world, and for God only, "then the devil leaveth Him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto Him." Verse 11. And so shall it be forever with every one who, in the faith of Christ, takes his stand as did Christ.

Thus utter separation from the world and from all that is of the world - nothing less than this - is the keeping of the First Commandment. "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world." "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world."

Deliverance from the world - this is the way to the keeping of the Commandments of God. And Christ "gave Himself for our sins that He might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God."

Deliverance from sin is deliverance from the world. Deliverance from the world is deliverance from sin. This is the way to the keeping of the Commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

Who would have other gods?

A. T. JONES.

February 27, 1902

**"The First Commandment. The Lust of the Flesh" *The Present Truth*
18, 9, p. 132.**

"I AM the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Ex. xx. 2, 3.

We have seen that, for any one to have this world, or anything that is of this world, is to have another god before the Lord. And this other god is "the god of this world," the "spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience," which is Satan.

But Christ came to "bring us to God." And this is the whole work of the preaching of the Gospel; for it is written: "Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." Acts xxvi. 17, 18.

Now "the world" is divided into three parts - "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." And under one or all of these three heads is idolatry manifested. We shall study them one by one as they are written.

First: "the lust of the flesh" - appetite, or intemperance. This is specifically defined as a god; for it is written: "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is destruction, *whose god is their belly*, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." Phil. iii. 18, 19.

Temperance is self-control, - not merely the control of one particular part of the man, self-control in one particular thing, - it is the control of self, the very being, the whole man. But this can never be done by the man himself; for the man himself is already subject to the control of "the god of this world," the evil one. This control was gained by the evil one, in the garden, and *through appetite*, this very "lust of the flesh." Since man is thus the subject of "the god of this world," a slave, "sold under sin," it is impossible for him of himself to clear himself of that power to which he surrendered himself.

But there is deliverance by *the power of God*, the true God, the living God, the rightful God of man. God can set free every man, from all the power of "the god of this world;" and it is *only thus* that any man can ever gain control of *himself*. It is only thus that any man can attain to true self-control, to true temperance.

The heart of man is the place of the seat of God in things pertaining to the man; for "the kingdom of God is within you." The kingdom of the heart and life of man belongs to God: it is alone His dominion. Through the deception of man this kingdom has been usurped by "the god of this world." This was done at the choice of man. At the choice of man, God, the true God, will return to His kingdom, and will take His place upon His throne in that kingdom, and will there rule and reign in righteousness, "even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference." Rom. iii. 22.

Therefore the whole question of having other gods, or the true God alone, turns simply upon the one question: Who has the heart? Therefore it is written: "Keep thy heart above all keeping; for out of it are the issues of life." Prov. iv. 23, margin.

Since, then, it is only by the power of God that any man can ever truly have control of himself, can be truly master of himself, it follows, inevitably, that the use of anything which has a tendency to take control of the man, to deprive the man of the control of himself; anything the use of which creates a habit which must be satisfied, and demands that it shall be served, - that is the having of another god. The man who has thus surrendered himself, and is thus controlled, is of those whom the scripture describes, "whose god is their belly."

This principle is expressed in the scripture: "All things are lawful unto me, . . . but I will not be brought under the power of any." 1 Cor. vi. 12. Anything, therefore, which has a tendency to bring man under its power is the indulgence of idolatry: it is to have another god before the Lord.

Now not only the tendency, but the positive effect of all stimulants and narcotics, is to take control of the man who uses them. The only effect of any of these things is to create an appetite for itself, - an appetite that must be served at whatever cost, - and thus to rob the individual of all control of himself. Also it makes him not only a slave to that particular habit, but so weakens him that in

other things he can not control himself. And "from tear to hasheesh we have, through hops, alcohol, tobacco, and opium, a sort of graduated scale of intoxicants, which stimulate in small doses, and narcotize in larger. The physiological action of all these agents gradually shades into each other; all producing, or being capable of producing, consecutive paralysis of the various parts of the nervous system." - *Encyclopædia Britannica, Art., "Drunkeness."*

Thus the First Commandment is the basis of all true temperance; and the keeping of that commandment and the faith of Jesus, is the only way to true temperance.

March 6, 1902

**"The First Commandment. The Lust of the Eyes" *The Present Truth*
18, 10 , pp. 148, 149.**

THE FIRST COMMANDMENT

THE second of the three forms under which "the world" is embraced, and idolatry manifested, is -

"The lust of the eyes."

The lust of the eyes can be summed up in one word, vanity; and vanity is simply love of display. Something is put on ourselves, or that which is ours, merely for display, to attract the attention and excite the lust of the eyes of others, and cause them to envy our condition.

Further, on our own part, this idolatry is indulged in our seeing something that somebody else has, and not being content until we have imitated him by obtaining for ourselves a like thing.

That which we see with others may be perfectly proper, and strictly becoming, to them; yet, when imitated by us, it may be altogether improper, and unbecoming in itself, besides our indulging idolatry in the use of it. Because, if our eyes had not seen that particular thing, no thought of our own, and no need of our life, would ever have suggested that we should have it. The only reason of our having it being solely that our eyes saw it in possession of some other one, the possession of it by us is sheer idolatry in the lust of the eyes.

This principle of idolatry is expressed in the one word, the worldly word, "fashion." The world spends time in inventing particular styles of dress, or whatever else may be a part of the living. The world is expected to follow, and expects to follow, the fashion set by the world.

God has made no two persons alike. He has made each person with characteristics which single him out distinctly from all others in the universe. This is for a purpose. We are created for the glory of God; that is, the purpose of our creation is that each one, in the characteristics which make him himself alone, distinct from all others in the universe, shall be a means of making God manifest, - of reflecting a ray of the light of God, in a way that no other can possibly do, that by each one God shall be manifested as not by any other one. And, in order that

this shall be so, it is essential that each one shall be joined only *to God*, and this with all his heart, and all his soul, and all his mind, and all his strength - the whole being.

This principle is expressed in the parable of the talents in Matthew xxv. When the master took his journey into a far country, and delivered to his servants his goods, - to one five talents, to another two, and to another one, he gave "to every man according to his several [individual; not common to two or more; separate, particular] ability." And from the master, at His returning and reckoning, each one receives according as he has used the gift of God, according to this "several ability."

149

No one is to use, indeed no one can use, this gift of God in *imitation of others*. To attempt to use it in imitation of others is to separate from God, and put others in His place; it is to have other gods before the Lord; it is idolatry.

There are desires of the flesh which are not lusts of the flesh, in the wrong sense. While we are in this world, it will be necessary for us to eat and to drink - not to make a god of the belly, not for the satisfaction of appetite, not for the lust of the flesh, but for *the glory of God*. Those who serve God in the keeping of the First Commandment eat and drink that which, in every respect, enables them best to discern what is the will of God, and how best to serve Him according to that will.

While we are in the world, it will be essential to clothe ourselves - not to please the world; not to conform to some silly style that our eyes see, which is altogether of the world, and which we ourselves would never think of it our eyes had not seen it as displayed by the world - not that; but the glory of God.

It is proper, indeed it is essential, to our glorifying God, that we shall dress neatly; that we shall wear as good clothing as we honestly can; that it shall be made to fit us becomingly, that is, that it shall conform strictly to our own individuality; that it shall be a proper expression of our own several selves, as God has made us. But to imitate the dress of others, to put something on ourselves simply because we have seen it on others, to adopt a style for ourselves which we have seen adopted by others, - all this is of the lust of the eyes; all this is not of the Father, but is of the world; it is idolatry.

A long coat is strictly becoming to a long man, but not at all so to a short man. A high collar is entirely proper for a man who has a long neck; but for a man with a short neck to wear a collar so high that it throws up his head as if he were constantly gazing at the moon, is not at all proper. A blue dress, or one of some other color, may be exactly becoming to the one whom you saw wearing it; but it may be the last color in the world that you should wear in a dress.

Now, all this imitating of others, all following of fashion, is but the lust of the eyes, is of the world, and is idolatry.

Ask God what He will have you do. It can never be a proper question with you, as to whether anybody else in the wide universe does it. You are to glorify God, not others.

Study, in the fear of God, your own self as the workmanship of God; and study, in the fear of God, asking *Him only* what you shall wear, what you shall

eat, what you shall drink, what you shall do, that shall most fully glorify Him, that shall most fully represent the talent which He has given you to be used for Him only, according to *your* "several ability."

A. T. JONES.

March 13, 1902

**"The First Commandment. The Pride of Life" *The Present Truth* 18,
11 , pp. 163, 164.**

"THE PRIDE OF LIFE.

ANOTHER phase of the worship of "the god of this world," included in "the pride of life," is the worship of Mammon, or riches. And this is not by any means least, though it is the last one in the list. For is it not written, "The love of money is the root of all evil"?

There is nothing that gives worldly glory so quickly, so easily, and so abundantly as money; and there is nothing that gives power so quickly and so easily as does money. All this, simply because Mammon is such a familiar deity to mankind, because mankind is naturally so worshipful of Mammon. And yet it is all idolatry; it is all a denial of the true God; it is a breaking of the First Commandment, which says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." For, says Jesus: "Yet can not," - not, Ye ought not; not, Ye should not; but, - "Ye *cannot* serve God and Mammon."

Since the true worship of God is to love God with all the heart, and all the soul, and all the mind, and all the strength; and anything that draw away either the heart, soul, mind, or strength to it, and comes between man and the true worship of God, is another god; so the allowing of money, the desire for money, the love of money, to come between a man and his true service to God, is the worship of Mammon. And to allow the desire for money, the love of money, to separate a man from true Christian thoughtfulness, and care of mankind temporally and eternally, is the worship of Mammon; it is to have another god than the Lord; it is to break the First Commandment.

The distinction may be clearly drawn by saying that the keeping of the First Commandment is the being right, and doing right, with no thought whatever, at any time, as to what it will cost. No amount of money can ever have any consideration whatever in any question of serving God; in any question of loving God with all the heart, or our neighbor as ourself. And yet everybody knows that "What will it cost?" does have a positive bearing with the vast majority, even of professed Christian people, upon the exercise of their love to God with all the heart, and their neighbour as themselves.

But to allow this question to have any bearing whatever is the worldly way. It is not of the Father, but of the world. For with the world the first question is always, "What will it cost?" "How much can I make?" In all the dealing, all the traffic of business relationship, in the world, the way of the world, and the inquiry

of the world, is only, "How much can I make?" And if more can be made by oppressing the neighbour, the oppression takes precedence of the love of the neighbour; and the neighbour is deliberately robbed.

If a neighbour begins business of the same order as that of a man who has already begun, he is deliberately underbitten, undersold, that, if possible, he may be crowded completely out of the business, in order that the first one may be left alone, to have all, in order that he alone may be rich, and have the worldly glory of his little kingdom of the crossroads. And those that have succeeded most fully at this, form gigantic combinations to crush out, or absorb, all lesser ones, until there remains but one vast combination drawing tribute from all the people in the nations, and even of the whole world.

But God has written of it all that "he is a proud man" "who enlargeth his desire as hell, and is as death, and can not be satisfied, but gathered unto him all nations, and heapeth unto him all people;" "that coveteth an evil covetousness to his house, that he may set his nest on high, that he may be delivered from the power of evil." But "shall not all these take up a parable against him, and a taunting proverb against him, and say, Woe to him that increaseth that which is not his? how long?" "Shall they not rise up suddenly that shall bite thee, and awake that shall vex thee, and thou shalt be for booties unto them? Because thou hast spoiled many nations, all the remnant of the people shall spoil thee." Hab. ii. 5-9.

This is all "the pride of life," which is not of the Father, but is of the world. It is all Mammon worship. And since the literal, original meaning of the word "mammon" is "that in which one *trusts*," it is particularly appropriate that these various combinations, which crush out all individuality and demand tribute of all peoples, should be called "trusts."

Yet the most gigantic of the "trusts" is but the extreme of that trick of trade held by the individual, by which, to get the trade, he undersells and crowds out the man across the way.

The most gigantic "trust" is but the extreme of that trick in trade by which the individual or the little partnership or corporation asks more for a thing when there is no competition than would be asked if there were competition. Whosoever, without competition, demands a greater price than he knows that he would take if there were competition, is an exactor of unjust gain. And "he that by usury and unjust gain increases his substance, he shall gather it for him that will pity the poor." Prov. xxviii. 8.

The most gigantic "trust" is but the extreme of that trick in trade on the part of the individual, by which, through his beating down, or "jewing," he tries his best to get a thing for less than he knows that it is worth. "It is naught, it is naught, saith the buyer: but when he is gone his way, then he boasteth." Prov. xx. 14.

The organiser or the president of the "trust" who boasts in his enormous gains is no more an idolater and a sinner in this thing than is the *individual* who, in his degree, and to the extent of *his* power, does the same thing precisely. If *he* had the ability, or the power, of the organiser or the president of the "trust," he would be doing precisely the same things that he is doing *now*, only in the larger

measure that would be his, as the head of a mighty corporation. And so certainly is it true, as written, "In the world, the god of traffic is the god of fraud."

All such is but the worship of Mammon; it is idolatry; it is to have another god before the Lord; it is not of the Father, but is of the world; it is neither loving God with all the heart nor the neighbor as the self. "If I have made gold my hope, or have said to the fine gold, Thou art my confidence; if I rejoiced because my wealth was great, and because mine hand had gotten much; . . . this also were an iniquity to be punished by the judge: for I should have denied the God that is above." And this equally and as really as if I were a worshipper of the sun and the moon. Job xxxi. 24-29.

There is a better way: it is the way of the keeping of the commandments of God: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." It is the way of Christianity: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." You know that you do not like to have a man work a scheme upon you, by which he requires you to pay for a thing more than he would take for it if there were competition. You know that you would not like to have people beat you down to take for a thing less than you know that it is worth. Put yourself in the other man's place - and stay there. Look at things from his side, and continue to do so. "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." This is Christianity; it is the keeping of the First Commandment. Yea,

164

it is the keeping of all "the law and the prophets."

Nor is it hard to do this. It is the easiest thing in the world for him who has the *heart* to do it. And *God gives the heart* to do it; as it is written: "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you."

"I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." "Out of Egypt have I called my Son." "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." A. T. JONES.

March 20, 1902

"The Second Commandment" *The Present Truth* 18, 12 , p. 179.

"I AM the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." Ex. xx. 2, 4-6.

The First Commandment forbids the having of any other god than the Lord; and so calls upon all to have God alone, and Him with all the heart, and all the soul, and all the mind, and all the strength.

Thus the First Commandment requires all creatures to worship only the true God; and the Second Commandment forbids the worshiping of Him in any but the true way.

The First Commandment forbids the having of any false gods; the Second Commandment forbids the having of the true God in a false way.

It is thus forbidden to worship God, or to think of Him, under any form or representation of any kind whatever. This is made clear by the word of the Lord in the fourth chapter of Deuteronomy. Having described how God came down upon Mount Sinai and spoke to the people out of the midst of the fire, declaring the Ten Commandments, it is remarked especially: "Ye heard the voice of the words, *but saw no similitude*."

It is not suggested that there *was no similitude* there. There were similitudes: multitudes of the host of heavenly angels were there; four-winged and four-faced cherubim were there; six-winged bright seraphim were there; Christ was there; and the glory of God, which was like devouring fire, was there.

But all this glory, and all these similitudes, were completely hidden from any eye of man by the "blackness, and darkness, and tempest: that enveloped the whole mount. For "Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke;" and "the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace," which formed a "thick cloud upon the mount," a cloud of "thick darkness;" and the voice of God was heard "out of the midst of the darkness."

Now, why was it that this wonderful scene of glory, even the *brightness* of the glory itself, was so completely hidden from the eyes of the people? Here is the answer: "Ye *saw no manner of similitude* on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire: *lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female, the likeness of any beast that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air, the likeness of anything that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth: and lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, and serve them.*" Deut. iv. 15-19.

If the people had been allowed that day to see any similitude, or any figure, on Sinai, they would inevitably have formed a likeness of it, as a means of their worshipping God. If they could have seen but the wings of the cherubim or seraphim, they would have used winged creatures, or the likeness of them, as a means of their worshipping God. And even though they had seen no figure or similitude, yet if only they had seen the *brightness* of the glory, then they would have employed the *brightness* of the glory, then they would have employed the *brightness of the sun* or the *moon*, or the *stars*, as symbols, representations, by which they would offer worship to the true God.

Nor would they have taken these representations which they would have made as of themselves gods, so as to worship the images or representations themselves; but would have *used them as visible symbols*, as *aids* in fixing their attention upon God, the better and more exactly to worship Him. And they would

have claimed all the time that, in this, they were worshipping the true God, and that such worship was true worship of God.

But all such idea as this, even all possibility of such idea, was utterly excluded by the Lord himself, in enveloping the whole grand array and glorious scene in impenetrable darkness. And then, by this fact, and in telling them why He did it, He gave His own clear interpretation of His own Second Commandment, and the plainest possible instruction to men as to how to observe it. In this the Lord Himself has given, in the plainest and most forcible way, instruction to all people, that in the worship of God no conceivable form or similitude can be used in any way, or to any extent whatever. And thus there was said at Sinai precisely what Jesus said to the woman at the well, neither more nor less: that "God is Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

God is Spirit, and is to be only spiritually discerned, and, therefore, can be worshipped only in spirit and in truth.

He can be worshipped only in truth as in spirit, because it is only by His word, which is the truth, that men can know what is true and acceptable worship. No man can know God except by revelation; and God must be worshipped strictly according to His own revelation: otherwise He is not worshipped at all.

This will be further considered next week.

A. T. JONES.

March 27, 1902

"The Second Commandment. Image Worship" *The Present Truth* 18, 13 , pp. 197, 198.

WE have seen that no similitude or likeness was seen on Sinai when God spoke His law, though there were many similitudes and likenesses there. We have seen that this was so, especially "lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image" or likeness. And thus in the Second Commandment there is forbidden, in the worship of God, the use of any similitude or likeness of any kind in any way whatever.

Yet there are a great number of professed Christians who use images, similitudes, and likenesses in abundance in their professed worship of God. This is worth inquiring into.

"This first introduction of a symbolic worship was in the veneration of the cross and of relics." - *Gibbons*. In "honour" of Christ and the martyrs.

And the first introduction of the cross as a *visible symbol* was by Constantine, and in the midst of that flood of evil that made the papacy.

It is true that the *sign* of the cross was used as early as the days of Tertullian; but it was only a *sign*, made with a motion of the hand upon the forehead or breast.

Constantine enlarged upon this by the introduction of the visible cross itself: in the *Labarum*. He erected in Rome his own statue, "bearing a cross in its right

hand, with an inscription which referred the victory of his arms and the deliverance of Rome to that salutary sign, the true symbol of force and courage.

"The same symbol sanctified the arms of the soldiers of Constantine; the cross glittered on their helmets, was engraved on their shields, was interwoven into their banners; and the consecrated emblems which adorned the person of the emperor himself were distinguished only by richer materials and more exquisite workmanship."

The *Labarum* was "a long pike intersected by a transversal beam," forming a cross. "The silken veil which hung down from the beam was curiously inwrought with the *images* of the reigning monarch and his children. The summit of the pike supported a crown of gold, which inclosed the mysterious monogram, at once expressive of the figure of the cross and the initial letters of the name of Christ."

The basis of all this was the fiction and the imposture of Constantine's "vision of the cross." And from it "the Catholic Church, both of the East and of the West, has adopted a prodigy which favors, or seems to favor, the popular worship of the cross."

Under Constantine's patronage also, "magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with *images* and *pictures*, where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple." - *Lawrence*.

Pictures were used first. The introduction of these pictures was made under the plea that they were useful to instruct the ignorant, to awaken the cold, and to gratify the prejudices of the heathen proselytes. What some person imagined and produced as a picture of Christ, would be painted on the wall or window; and these people would gaze upon that, and sail away upon a sea of their own imagination. In this they thought they were

198

contemplating Christ, and honoring Him, and indeed worshipping Him. But it was as sheer idolatry as ever was. They were only worshipping themselves, in their own imaginings. Never yet has there been made a picture of Christ. All that ever pretended to be such are only idolatrous imaginings.

Soon images were set up along with the pictures, and thus "by a slow, though inevitable, progression, the honors of the original were transferred to the copy; the devout Christian prayed before *the image* of a saint; and the pagan rites of genuflexion, luminaries, and incense again stole into the Catholic Church. The scruples of reason or piety were silenced by the strong evidence of visions and miracles; and the pictures which speak, and move, and bleed, must be endowed with a divine energy, and may be considered as the proper objects of religious adoration."

And thus "the use and even the worship of images was firmly established before the end of the sixth century [before A.D. 600]; they were fondly cherished by the warm imagination of the Greeks and Asiatics; the pantheon and Vatican were adorned with the emblems of a new superstition. . . . The style and sentiments of a Byzantine hymn will declare how far their worship was removed from the grossest idolatry: 'How can we with mortal eyes contemplate this image,

whose celestial splendour the host of heaven presumes not to behold? He who dwells in heaven condescends this day to visit us by His venerable image. He who is seated on the cherubim visits us this day by a picture which the Father has delineated with His immaculate hand; which He has formed in an ineffable manner; and which we sanctify by adoring it with fear and love." - *Gibbon*.

This will be followed further next week.

A. T. JONES.

April 3, 1902

"The Establishment of Image Worship. The Second Commandment"
***The Present Truth* 18, 14 , pp. 214, 215.**

THE SECOND COMMANDMENT

"I AM the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."

From the days of Constantine to the end of the sixth century image worship had become universally established in the Catholic Church. Thus stood Catholic idolatry when, early in the seventh century, the Mohammedans swarmed up from the deserts of Arabia, executing judgment upon the "idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood: which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk." Rev. ix. 20.

"The triumphant Mussulmans, who reigned at Damascus and threatened Constantinople, cast into the scale of reproach the accumulated weight of truth and victory. The cities Syria, Palestine, and Egypt had been fortified with the images of Christ, His mother, and His saints; and each city presumed on the hope or promise of miraculous defence.

"In the rapid contest of ten years, the Arabs subdued those cities and these images; and, in their opinion, the Lord of hosts pronounced a decisive judgment between the adoration and contempt of these mute and inanimate idols. In this season of distress and dismay the eloquence of the monks was exercised in the defense of images." - *Gibbon*.

Under the influence of the charge of idolatry, which the Mohammedans incessantly urged against the Catholics, some began to awake to the thought that perhaps the charge was true, and strongly desired the reformation of the

Church. Besides these there were scattered throughout Christendom true Christians who constantly opposed, with the word of God and the example of primitive times, the worship of images.

In a hundred years these influences had become so strong that Emperor Leo the Isaurian, in 727, took his stand, and issued an edict, against the worship of images. Opposition to this movement of the emperor's caused the famous Iconoclastic Controversy, between the worshipers and the breakers of the images, which continued with bloody and unabated fury for one hundred and twenty years, - 726-846, - and which finally resulted in the triumph of the worship of images, and the "religion of Constantine."

The Emperor ordered the images to be broken to pieces, the walls of the churches to be whitewashed, and prosecuted with honest but imprudent vigour his design of extirpating idolatry. But a fierce dissension at once raged throughout all Christendom: the monks and the people arose in defence of their images and pictures, and the emperor, even in his own capital, was denounced as a heretic and a tyrant.

There was an image of the Saviour, renowned for its miraculous powers, over the gate of the imperial palace called the Brazen Gate, from the rich tiles of gilt bronze that covered its magnificent vestibule. The emperor ordered the sacred figure to be taken down and broken to pieces. But the people from all parts of the city flew to the defense of their favorite idol, fell upon the officers, and put many of them to death.

"The women were even more violent than the men. Like furies they rushed to the spot, and, finding one of the soldiers engaged in the unhallowed labour at the

215

top of the ladder, they pulled it down, and tore him to pieces as he lay bruised upon the ground. 'Thus,' exclaims the pious annalist, 'did the minister of the emperor's injustice fall at once from the top of the ladder to the bottom of hell.'

"The women next flew to the great church, and finding the iconoclastic patriarch officiating at the altar, overwhelmed him with a shower of stones and a thousand opprobrious names. He escaped, bruised and fainting, from the building. The guards were now called out, and the female insurrection was suppressed; but not until several of the women had perished in the fray."

"The execution of the imperial edicts was resisted by frequent tumults in Constantinople and the provinces; the person of Leo was endangered, his officers were massacred, and the popular enthusiasm was quelled by the strongest efforts of the civil and military power."

In 728 the edict of the Eastern emperor abolishing the worship of images was published in Italy. The pope defended the images, of course, and "the Italians swore to live and die in defense of the pope *and* the holy images." And thus there was begun a war which, in its nature and consequences, was in every sense

characteristic of the papacy. It established the worship of images, as an article of Catholic faith; it developed the supremacy of the pope in temporal affairs.

When Leo's decree against the worship of images was published in the West, "the images of Christ and the Virgin, of the angels, martyrs, and saints, were abolished in all the churches in Italy;" and the emperor threatened the pope that if he did not comply with the decree, he should be degraded and sent into exile. But the pope - Gregory II - stood firmly for the worship of images, and sent pastoral letters throughout Italy, exhorting the faithful to do the same.

"At this signal, Ravenna, Venice, and the cities of the exarchate and Pentapolis adhered to the cause of religious images; their military force by sea and land consisted, for the most part, of the natives; and the spirit of patriotism and zeal was transfused into the mercenary strangers. The Italians swore to live and die in the defense of the pope and the holy images. . . . The Greeks were overthrown and massacred, their leaders suffered an ignominious death, and the popes, however inclined to mercy, refused to intercede for these guilty victims."

At Ravenna, A.D. 729, the riot and bloody strife was so great that even the exarch, the personal representative of the emperor, was slain. "To punish this flagitious deed, and restore his dominion in Italy, the emperor sent a fleet and army into the Adriatic Gulf. After suffering from the winds and the waves much loss and delay, the Greeks made their descent in the neighborhood of Ravenna. . . . In a hard-fought day, as the two armies alternately yielded and advanced, a *phantom* was seen, a voice was heard, and Ravenna was victorious by the assurance of victory. The strangers retreated to their ships, but the populous seacoast poured forth a multitude of boats; the waters of the Po were so deeply infected with blood, that during *six years* the public prejudice abstained from the fish of the river; and the institution of an annual feast perpetuated the *worship of images*, and the abhorrence of the Greek tyrant. Amidst the triumph of the Catholic arms, the Roman pontiff convened a synod of *ninety-three* bishops against the heresy of the Iconoclasts. With their consent he pronounced a general excommunication against *all* who by *word or deed* should attack the traditions of the Fathers and the images of the saints."

A. T. JONES.

July 17, 1902

"Mammon-Worship in Giving" *The Present Truth* 18, 29 , pp. 450, 451.

ONE method of manifesting idolatry in the worship of Mammon not often considered is in *giving away* the money that has been so obtained. There is just as much idolatry in giving away money that is obtained by idolatry, as there is in

getting it by idolatry. Not all Mammon worshippers are misers: only a very few of them. Many of them are abundant givers; and these have just as much satisfaction in giving away the money as they had in getting it, because it is further indulgence of the same idolatry.

The labouring man is oppressed and robbed in his wages; the poor man is oppressed and robbed in the increased prices; small dealers are oppressed and robbed or driven entirely out of business in order that a few in the great combinations may draw to themselves the tribute of all the people. And when that is done, they will make gifts of millions to colleges and universities, thousands to churches, hundreds of thousands to hospitals, thousands to churches, etc., etc.; and then further pride themselves upon the world's idolatry of their "great benevolence." But there is not a particle of benevolence in any gift that is thus made: it is sheer idolatry.

By the Lord, in perfect justice and righteousness, all our gifts are measured, and stand altogether upon the basis upon which *we get the money*.

We say it again; for it is applicable to people who are not millionaires, as truly

451

as to those who are: All the value of our giving as measured by the Lord, in perfect justice and righteousness, rests altogether upon the basis upon which we make our money. If my money is not made honestly, not a penny that I . . . gave away will . . . to my credit; it cannot in righteousness; it cannot in justice. I robbed another man to get it; it is his still, and when I give it away, it is his money that I give away.

And this is another reason why the two mites of the poor widow were more than all that the wealthy put in of their abundance. We know that the Mammon worshippers in Christ's day were like the Mammon worshippers in this day; they would crowd down in the dealing when people were selling to them; and they would *crowd up* on the price when people were to buy of them, and thus at both ends they increased their gains. "It was this spirit that was manifested by the priests and temple officials in their gatherings for the Passover. Cattle were bought by the dignitaries, the moneyed men, who oppressed those whom they purchased. The representation was made to those owners out in the country, who had the cattle, the sheep, and the doves, and whoever had these to sell that these animals were to be offered as a sacrifice to God at the Passover, and thus urged, the owners sold them at a cheap price. Then those scheming men brought their purchases to the temple - purchases which meant double robbery - robbery of the men of whom they had purchased, and robbery of those who wished to sacrifice, to whom they were again sold at exorbitant prices.

And then they would put great offerings into the temple treasury of the Lord, and take credit to themselves of the Lord, and take credit to themselves because they gave so much to "the cause." But that poor widow, who, because of these men who devoured widows' houses and for a pretence made long prayers, was reduced to a pittance, in giving out of her love to the Lord what little she had left after she had passed through the devouring hands of these men, gave more than all the others together. Every particle of it was honest. Every particle of it came from honest effort. And that was a gift that measured according to righteousness

in the sight of God. There is such a thing as honest dealing; and it can be practised in this world. And whatever means is not acquired in that way, how much soever of it may be given, it cannot be counted as the gift of him that gives it. It will be counted to those widows and the poor whom he has ground down to get it, to the labourers whose wages be ground down to the . . . to increase or to possess his great gains.

This is why God says to the labourers, Be patient unto the coming of the Lord. The husbandman waiteth for the precious fruits of the earth, and hath long patience for it. Be ye also patient; your labour is not in vain. God knows the just wages that you earn, and of just how much of it you are robbed. And in the day of reckoning He will reckon it to you in full justice and righteousness.

Be ye patience. Serve God. "Obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God: and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that *of the Lord* ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ."

In that day God will distribute justly all the rewards of labour. He is the righteous God. The Christian can cheerfully bear to be ground down, robbed, and oppressed; he can wait for the day of grand distribution in righteousness; for he knows that in that day he will receive all that his honest toil ever earned, and he shall have the eternal glory of it. Even though in this world some Mammon worshipper absorbed it, and made a great gift of it, and got the worldly fleeting glory of it; yet since from the beginning it belonged in righteousness to him who was defrauded of it, in righteousness it, with all the fruits of it, will be reckoned to him to whom in righteousness from the beginning it belonged.

This is the word and the message of God to the robbed, oppressed, and defrauded working men everywhere to-day, who are clamouring for a righteous distribution of the fruits of their labour: "Fear God, and keep His commandments." No righteous distribution can be made by force and violence. In that way, an iniquitous and bad condition can only be made more iniquitous and worse. "Sanctify the Lord of hosts Himself; and let Him be your fear, and let Him be your dread. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." Then shall every man receive his own reward according to his own labour.

A. T. JONES.

August 21, 1902

"Causes of Israel's Captivity" *The Present Truth* 18, 34 , pp. 531, 532.

THERE is hardly any portion of the Bible story that receives less attention than that relating in the period of the restoration of Israel to their own land, from the captivity in Babylon. And yet there is hardly any portion of the Bible story that is more full of the very life and movement of God in human affairs; hardly any portion more full of valuable lessons. Indeed, there is no portion of the Bible story

so full as is this of striking illustrations of how easily, how promptly, and how triumphantly, God can interpose with kings and powers in behalf of His cause and His people in the earth.

The books of the Bible especially embraced in this Bible story are, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. The period of the world covered in the narrative is about from B.C. 536 to the crucifixion.

God had brought Israel out of Egypt, and, having separated them from all the nations, had placed them in the land of Canaan, "the glory of all lands," to be the light of the world. The chief reason why He placed them in the land of Canaan - Palestine - is that then, and for ages afterward, that little country was the pivot of the world. Between Egypt and the eastern and northern nations there was then, and for ages afterward, constant intercourse, practically all of which necessarily passed through Palestine. Yet later, when the weight of empire passed to the west, still Palestine was the centre around which swirled the world's affairs.

At that centre of the world's great currents God set His people to be His light to all the nations, whose people by thus constantly passing and repassing through that land, should behold that blessed people and glorious land, and be led to say, "Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people" (Deut. iv. 6); and thus be led to inquire for the source of this wisdom and understanding, this prosperity and glory, and so find the true God, and turn from idolatry to the worship of Him. God intended that by His splendid presence abiding with them, His people should thus influence all the nations for good; and thus to carry on His fulfilment of His promise to Abraham, "In thee shall all nations be blessed."

Therefore, of Israel God had said, "Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." Num. Xxiii. 9. But the people would not have it so. They exclaimed and insisted, "Make us a king," "that we may be like all the nations." 1 Sam. viii. 4-35. They had their way; they rejected God, and not only became "like all the nations," but did "worse than the heathen" round them. And then, as with the nations that were in that land before them, the land could no longer endure them, and so much spew them out. They were carried captive to Babylon, and the land was left desolate that it might have rest from the sickening iniquities with which it had been afflicted.

The special sins that brought the captivity of Israel and the desolation of the land, were: -

1. Oppression and injustice. "O house of David, thus saith the Lord; Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings." Jer. xxi. 12. "Thus saith the Lord; Execute ye judgment and righteousness, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor: and do no wrong, do no violence to the stranger, the fatherless, nor the widow, neither shed innocent blood in this place," "then will I cause you to dwell in this place." Jer. xxii. 3; vii. 5-8.

2. Oppressing and defrauding the labourer in his wages, while they in their wealth revelled in luxury. "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbour's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work; that saith, I will build me a wide

house and large chambers, and cutteth him out windows; and it is ceiled with cedar, and painted with vermilion." Jer. xxii. 13, 14.

3. Neglect of the poor. "Shalt thou reign, because thou closest thyself in cedar? did not thy father eat and drink, and do judgment and justice, and then it was well with him? He judged the cause of the poor and needy; then it was well with him: was not this to know me? saith the Lord. But thine eyes and thine heart are not but for thy covetousness." Jer. xxii. 15-17.

4. Disregard of the Sabbath. Jer. xvii. 21-27.

5. The worship of the sun, with all the abominations that go with it. Eze. viii. 3-18.

6. Rejection of the word and message of the Lord in reproof, counsel, and warning. Jer. xxvi. 1-23; xxxvi. 22, 23; xxxvii. 1-21; xxxviii. 1-28.

532

But the very crowning abomination of all was,

7. Their making the temple of God and the forms of worship of the Lord their confidence of salvation, while practising all these other iniquities and abominations; their holding God to a strict accountability for His promises, while they ran perfect riot against every precept upon which those promises could possibly rest, their making capital of God's temple and ordinances and services designed to put away sin, as security in their complete abandon in the indulgence of sin: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Amend your ways and your doings, and I will cause you to dwell in this place. Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, are these." [Luther's translation: "Here is the Lord's temple, Here is the Lord's temple, Here is the Lord's temple."] Jer. vii. 3, 4. "Hear this, I pray you, ye heads of the house of Jacob, and princes of the house of Israel, that abhor judgment, and pervert all equity. They build up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity. The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money: yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us." Micah iii. 9-12. "Behold, ye trust in lying words, that cannot profit. Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations? ["There is no danger to us, though, or as long as, we do such abominations." - *Luther's Translation.*] Is this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes? Behold, even I have seen it, saith the Lord." Jer. vii. 8-11.

"Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest." Micah 3:12. "Go ye now unto my place which was in Shiloh, where I set My name at the first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of My people Israel. And now, because ye have done all these works, saith the Lord, and I spake unto you, rising up early and speaking, but ye heard not; and I called you, but ye answered not; therefore will I do unto this house, which is called by My name, wherein ye trust, and unto the place which I gave to you and to your fathers, as I

have done to Shiloh. And I will cast you out of My sight, as I have cast out all your brethren, even the whole seed of Ephraim. Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to Me: for I will not hear thee." Jer. vii. 12-16.

Because of that deplorable, even desperate, condition of things in Jerusalem, the Lord of Jerusalem was compelled to liken her to Sodom, declaring that she and Sodom were sisters; and further: "As I live, saith the Lord God, Sodom thy sister hath not done, she nor her daughters, as thou hast done, thou and thy daughters. Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom, pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness was in her and in her daughters, neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy. And they were haughty, and committed abomination before me: therefore I took them away as I saw good." Eze. xvi. 48-50. And consequently Ezekiel saw in a vision a man with a writer's ink-horn by his side, passing throughout Jerusalem, setting a mark upon the foreheads of the men who were sighing and crying for all the abominations that were done therein. Following him were six other men, each with a slaughter-weapon in his hand, to "slay utterly" all to whom they should come, except that they were to "come not near any man upon whom is the mark." Eze. ix. 1-7.

Now this whole narrative has its parallel in the last days, even in our own time. General wickedness prevails (Matt. xxiv. 12; 2 Tim. iii. 13); oppression, injustice, defrauding the labourer in his wages to increase the overloaded coffers of the rich, who revel in luxury - all this is indulged (James v. 1-8); in the midst of this abundance to boundless millions there is such neglect of the poor that God is obliged to turn His attention especially to them (Luke xiv. 21-23); the Sabbath is disregarded (Isa. lvi. 1, 2; lviii. 13, 14); the sun - in the *Sunday* - is honoured (Dan. vii. 25; Rev. xiv. 9-12); the Word of God in counsel and warning, concerning all the evil and impending destruction, is rejected (2 Peter iii. 3-7, 10-14; Matt. xxiv. 37-39).

And, also, there prevails the same chief abomination of all - the indulgence of a whole catalogue of iniquities under the form and profession of godliness (2 Tim. iii. 1-5); - so that, looking again upon it all, God is compelled to liken it also to Sodom, because the last days of the world are as the last days of Sodom: "Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot . . . even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." "The same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of Man is revealed." Luke xvii. 28, 29, 30.

And while this destruction and desolation is impending, the heavenly messenger (Rev. vii. 2, 3) passes through the world, setting the royal seal - the heavenly mark - upon the servants of God, who are sighing and crying for all the abominations that are done in the land; and after him pass the messengers of judgment, slaying utterly all upon whom is not found the mark. Rev. xiv. 9, 10; xvi. 1-21.

Thus certainly and thus fully does the period which culminated in the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of that land, contain lessons of deep meaning to the people who live in the last days - even now - when all the cities of the nations and of the world are to be broken down, and the earth made

desolate, "at the presence of the Lord, and by His fierce anger." Jer. iv. 26; Rev. xvi. 19; Zeph. i. 14-18.

So, also, does the period of the restoration from that ancient destruction and desolation contain lessons of deep meaning to the people of God of all times, and especially of the last days.

A. T. JONES.

August 28, 1902

"Restoration from Babylon. The Release from Captivity" *The Present Truth* 18, 35 , pp. 547, 548.

ISRAEL had frustrated God's purpose to enlighten all the nations by them in the land where He had planted them; yet He would fulfil His purpose and His promise to Abraham, and enlighten all the nations through them in the lands where He had scattered them.

By unbelief and iniquity Israel, when planted in their own land, had lost the power to arrest and command the attention of all the nations, that the nations might consider God and His wonderful works and ways with the children of men; but as they were scattered among the nations, God would use them to enlighten those who had acquired the power to arrest and command the attention of all the nations, and thus through them would still cause all nations to consider the wonderful works and ways of God with the children of men.

Through Daniel and his three brethren in captivity, God enlightened King Nebuchadnezzar who was ruler over all the nations; and by King Nebuchadnezzar twice distinctly proclaimed to all people, nations, and languages His wisdom, His justice, His power, His glory, and His kingdom and dominion. Dan. iii. 29; iv. 1-3, 34-37.

Nebuchadnezzar and his empire, and even the last vestige of his kingdom, passed away. Another kingdom and empire took the dominion of the world. "Darius the Median took the kingdom." Dan. v. 31. As the result of a conspiracy, Daniel was cast to the hungry lions in their den. But God shut the lions' mouths that they did him no hurt; because innocency was found in him, and because he believed in his God. This so fixed upon God as the only true and living God, the heart of king Darius the Mede, who was now king of all the nations, that he also "wrote unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth," proclaiming that "the God of Daniel" "is the living God, and steadfast for ever, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and His dominion shall be even unto the end. He delivereth and rescueth, and He worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth." Dan. vi. 25-27.

In the very first year of Darius the Mede, B.C. 538, Daniel turned his attention especially to the Scriptures relating to the subject of the return from their captivity; and found and "understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that He would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem." Dan. ix. 1, 2. One thing that had

caused Daniel to be most deeply interested in this subject was the word of Palmoni, the wonderful numberer in the vision of Daniel 8, given to him in the third year of Belshazzar, saying, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Dan. vii. 14.

This two thousand and three hundred days to the cleansing of the sanctuary caused Daniel great anxiety. He could not understand it. The temple at Jerusalem was a ruin, and had so lain for more than fifty years. Was it possible that it should so lie for yet two thousand and three hundred years, before the ruins should be cleared away and the temple restored? To this the book of Jeremiah answered, No: "After seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform My good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place." Jer. xxix. 10. Could it be possible, then, that they should return, and yet the temple be not restored for so long? To this the book of Isaiah answered, No; for therein God had declared to Jerusalem, "Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid;" and that this should be *in the time of Cyrus*, and Cyrus was no living and sixty years old.

What, then, could mean that word, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed"? Was there any connection between that and the return from captivity and the rebuilding of the city and temple? This problem was beyond solution by human thought. Therefore -

"I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes; . . . [and] whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning [Dan. viii. 16], being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation." Dan. ix. 3, 21.

548

"And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

"Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks; the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations He shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." Dan. ix. 22-27.

Within two years, in 536, Darius the Mede died, and was immediately succeeded by Cyrus the Persian, of the same united and universal kingdom of the Medes and Persians. Cyrus had been the commander of the Medo-Persian armies in the destruction of the empire and kingdom of Babylon. At that time he was an idolater. Yet long before that, even one hundred and fourteen years before he was born, the God of Israel had called him by name; and had recorded a message addressed to him personally. And this is the message: "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight: I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron: and I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known Me." Isa. xlv. 1-4.

Thus the Lord revealed Himself to Cyrus as the God of Israel. But since Cyrus was an idolater, God must further reveal Himself to him as the only true and living God. This He did in the further word: "I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside Me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known Me: that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside Me. I am the Lord, and there is none else." Verses 5, 6.

God thus revealed Himself to Cyrus as the God of Israel, and as the only true God: it remained to reveal to Cyrus that He, the God of Israel, and the only true God, was distinct from and above the gods that Cyrus had worshipped. Therefore the Lord revealed Himself yet further, "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace and create evil." Verse 7. The point in this is -

1. The Persians, in their religious system, recognised two original principles - good and evil. Their conception of good and evil, however, did not rise to the height of moral and spiritual good and evil, or righteousness and sin, as is revealed by the Lord; rather as men naturally conceive of good and evil as manifested in prosperity and adversity, tranquillity and disturbance. Therefore when the Lord would show to Cyrus that He is over all, He said, "I make peace, and create evil." That is, I make tranquillity and create disturbance; I give prosperity and send adversity.

2. The Persians held that their principle of good was represented in light; and the principle of evil in darkness. Therefore when the Lord would reveal to Cyrus the Persian that He is above all, He said, "I form the light, and create darkness."

The night that the city of Babylon was captured and Belshazzar slain, before the capture king Belshazzar had made Daniel the first man of the empire after the two kings, Belshazzar and his father. Then when the city was taken, Balshazzar slain, and his father a captive, this left Daniel the first man of the kingdom. Darius and Cyrus, the new rulers, found Daniel in his royal robe of scarlet with his insignia of office, the "chain of gold about his neck," They found him so intelligent in all the affairs of the vanquished kingdom that they

immediately took him into their council, and gave to him the chief place in the re-organisation of the kingdom.

And when Cyrus thus met Daniel, Daniel showed to him the word of the Lord, written to him by Isaiah on hundred and seventy-four years before. The message was so direct and so personal, and the revelation so plain and indisputable, that Cyrus accepted and acknowledged God as "the Lord God of heaven," and declared, "He is the God."

There was also read t Cyrus the further word of the Lord by Isaiah to him, "That saith of Cyrus, He is My shepherd, and shall perform all My pleasure. . . . I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways: he shall build My city, and he shall let go My captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts." Isa. xlv. 28; xlv. 13. This message, too, Cyrus accepted from the Lord; and in 536, when Cyrus came to the throne of the empire, that very year the seventy years' captivity expired, and in that very year Cyrus issued the decree and proclamation throughout the whole empire, releasing from captivity all the people of Israel, and calling them to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the city, and especially the house of the Lord.

And here is a copy of that decree: -

"Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and He hath charged me to build Him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all His people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel, (He is the God,) which is in Jerusalem. And whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, beside the freewill offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem."

"Let the house be builded, the place where they offered sacrifices, and let the foundations thereof be strongly laid; the height thereof threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof threescore cubits; with three rows of great stones, and a row of new timber: and let the expenses be given out of the king's house: and also let the golden and silver vessels of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar took forth out of the temple which is at Jerusalem, and brought unto Babylon, be restored, and brought again unto the temple which is at Jerusalem, every one to his place, and place them in the house of God." Ezra i. 1-4, vi. 3-5.

That decree was published by "proclamation throughout all his kingdom," and was put "also in writing;" and was deposited among the archives of the kingdom in the palace at Ecbatana, the Median capital of the empire. "Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests, and the Levites, with all them whose spirit God had raised, to go up to build the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem. And all they that were about them strengthened their hands with vessels of silver, with gold, with goods, and with beasts, and with precious things, beside all [that] was willingly offered."

"Also Cyrus the king brought forth the vessels of the house of the Lord, which Nebuchadnezzar had brought forth out of Jerusalem, and had put them in the house of his gods; even those did Cyrus king of Persia bring forth by the hand of Mithredath the treasurer, and numbered them unto Sheshbazzar, the prince of

Judah. . . . All the vessels of gold and of silver were five thousand and four hundred. All these did Sheshbazzar bring up with them of the captivity that were brought up from Babylon unto Jerusalem." Ezra i. 5-11.

And of the people who returned to Jerusalem, -

"The whole congregation together was forty and two thousand three hundred and threescore, beside their servants and their maids, of whom there were seven thousand three hundred thirty and seven: and there were among them two hundred singing men and singing women. . . . And some of the chief of the fathers, when they came to the house of the Lord which is at Jerusalem, offered freely for the house of God to set it up in his place: they gave after their ability unto the treasure of the work threescore and one thousand drams of gold, and five thousand pound of silver, and one hundred priests' garments. So the priests, and the Levites, and some of the people, and the singers, and the porters, and the Nethinims, dwelt in their cities, and all Israel in their cities." Ezra ii. 64-70.

The restoration of Israel had begun.

A. T. JONES.

September 4, 1902

**"Restoration from Babylon. Troublous Times" *The Present Truth* 18,
36 , pp. 565, 566.**

IT seems to have been about midsummer, or late in the summer of B.C. 536, when the returned of Israel arrived in their own country, and had taken up their abode and dwelt in their cities; for their first assembly at Jerusalem for worship was at the regular annual feast of the memorial of blowing of trumpets - the first day of the seventh month.

On that day "the people gathered themselves together as one man to Jerusalem;" and under the direction of Jeshua, the highpriest [*sic.*], and Zerubbabel, and their brethren, they "builded the altar of the God of Israel, to offer burnt offerings thereon, as it is written in the law of Moses the man of God. And they set the altar upon his bases; for fear was upon them because of the people of those countries; and they offered burnt offerings thereon unto the Lord, even burnt offerings morning and evening." Ezra iii. 1-3.

They could not celebrate the day of atonement - the tenth day of the seventh month - in due order, because there was no temple or house yet built; but they kept the Feast of Tabernacles (the fifteenth to the twenty-second of the seventh month), as it is written, and offered the daily burnt-offerings by number, according to the custom, as the duty of every day required; and afterward offered the continual burnt-offering, both of the new moons, and of all the set feasts of the Lord that were consecrated, and of every one that willingly offered a free-will offering unto the Lord. From the first day of the seventh month began they to offer burnt-offerings unto the Lord.

"But the foundation of the temple of the Lord was not yet laid." However, preparations were immediately begun for the building of the temple. Masons and

carpenters were regularly employed, and set to work to prepare the stones and timber. They also established with Tyre and Zidon trade of provisions - food, drink, and oil - for cedar trees for the temple, to be brought from Lebanon by sea and delivered at Joppa, "according to the grant that they had of Cyrus king of Persia."

This work of preparation continued till "the second month" of the "second year of their coming unto the house of God at Jerusalem," when they actually began work in building the temple.

"And when the builders laid the foundation of the temple of the Lord, they set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites the sons of Asaph with cymbals, to praise the Lord, after the ordinance of David king of Israel. And they sang together by course in praising and giving thanks unto the Lord; because he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever toward Israel.

"And all the people shouted with a great shout, when they praised the Lord, because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid. But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice; and many shouted aloud for joy; so that the people could not discern the noise of the shout of joy from the noise of the weeping of the people; for the people shouted with a loud shout, and the noise was heard afar off."

In Gabriel's explanation of the two thousand and three hundred days, he had said to Daniel of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, that "the street shall be built again and the wall, *even in troublous times.*" And now those troublous times began. Satan was determined to hinder, in every way that he possibly could, the establishment of the work of God in Jerusalem. He found ready instruments, in the mixed people and religion of Samaria, that had resulted from the successive transportations by Sargon, Esar-haddon, and Asswhur-banipal, kings of Assyria, before 625 B.C. As soon as the Jews had begun to build, these mixed peoples of the land of Samaria devised a scheme so to turn to their own advantage the rebuilding of Jerusalem so that, by alliance with the Jews, they could fix their power in Jerusalem and the land of Judah, as in Samaria, execute a successful revolt, set up an independent kingdom there, and dominate all the territory between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean Sea, as had been done in old time.

Accordingly when they had "heard that the children of the captivity builded the temple unto the Lord God of Israel, then they came to Zerubbabel, and to the chief of the fathers, and said unto them, Let us build with you; for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esarhaddon king of Asshur, which brought us up hither. But Zerubbabel, and Jeshua, and the rest of the chief of the fathers of Israel, said unto them, Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto the Lord God of Israel, as king Cyrus the king of Persia hath commanded us."

Then the Samaritans revealed their real spirit from the beginning, and showed that their interest in the God of Israel, and their "kind" offer to help in building the temple and city, was a sheer pretence to hide their rebellious intent; they "weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and *troubled them in building,* and

hired counsellors against them [at the court of the Persian kingdom], to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius king of Persia," a period of fourteen years.

The situation was this: The Jews had the decree of Cyrus to sustain them in all that they were doing. The Samaritans knew that it was vain to try to get that decree reversed while Cyrus lived. But the funds for the building work must all pass through the imperial treasury. These hired counsellors were officials of the court and council of Cyrus, and they accepted from the Samaritans bribes to be on the watch for the affairs concerning Jerusalem, and block every procedure possible. They could hold back the supply of funds; they could delay the official applications for funds; by empty technicalities they could force tedious correspondence and delay in reports; they could prevent correspondence and even messengers from reaching Cyrus, or even Daniel; - in a thousand ways they could frustrate the purpose of the builders at Jerusalem.

Daniel was still prime minister at the court of Persia, and it was not a great while before he discovered that the work in Jerusalem was being hindered, and his own efforts hampered in the court of Cyrus, by influences and actions so subtle that it was impossible definitely to expose or successfully to check them. This caused him great and anxious concern for the work of God. Yet he spent no time in attempting to arrange, or to carry on any counter-intrigue; he appealed direct to God.

By those hired counsellors, the Samaritans had got their schemes to working at the court of Cyrus in the latter part of the second year of Cyrus. On the third day of the first month of the third year of Cyrus, Daniel began his appeal to God in fasting and mourning and prayer. This he continued three full weeks, before he was positively informed that his appeal was heard. Yet his appeal was heard, the very

566

first day. But the adverse influences at the Persian court were so strong that Gabriel dared not leave the presence of the king. And these adverse influences were just then so determined and so persistent that every possible thing was done, every conceivable device was employed, and every moment of the time was occupied, during the whole of that three weeks, in the endeavour to turn Cyrus from his true course and to frustrate the purpose of God concerning Jerusalem. To defeat the subtle devices and continued efforts of the enemy, Gabriel must be ever watchful. He continued thus three full weeks. Daniel continued his earnest praying. Still the angel could not leave the presence of the king. Yet Daniel's prayer must be answered by Gabriel in person. It was a crisis in the cause of God in the earth. Then Michael, the first of the heavenly princes, came to help him. This secured victory; the enemy's siege was broken, and Gabriel went to Daniel by the river Tigris.

His own words in explanation of the three weeks delay are these: "Fear not, Daniel; for from *the first day* that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy God, *thy words were heard*, and I am come *for thy words*. But the prince of the kingdom of Persia, *withstood me* one and twenty days; but, lo, Michael, the first of the princes, came to help me; and I kept the

victory with the kings of Persia. Now I am come to make thee know what shall befall thy people in the latter days; for the vision is yet for many days. . . Knowest thou why I am come unto thee? And now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia. . . . But I will show thee that which is noted in the Scripture of truth: and there is none that holdeth with me in these things but Michael your prince." Dan. x. 2-4, 12, 13, 20, 21. Verse 12, margin, and Luther's Translation.

Thus, through prayer and faithfulness to God, Daniel and his people were victorious against all the machinations of Satan and his instrumentalities. And so shall it ever be. The heavenly agencies are always ready to co-operate with the faithful ones of earth to-day, as in the days of Daniel, Jeshua, Zerubbabel, and their companions. Prayer to God, that obtains the co-operation of heavenly messengers, is even to-day worth infinitely more in securing the co-operation or restraint of the powers of earth, than could be all the political wire-pulling and lobbying that could ever be employed. The hearts of kings are in the hand of the Lord, and only He can move them right.

Daniel must have died shortly after this vision, for in the vision the last words of the angel are, "Thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." Cyrus lived five years longer. But though the Samaritans and their hired counsellors continued all this time their work of weakening the hands of the Jews, of hindering them and frustrating their purpose in building, they never succeeded in stopping the work. The "victory" of Daniel and the heavenly ones still "kept" with Cyrus the king of Persia, though the work went on still in "troubulous times."

September 11, 1902

"Restoration from Babylon. The Success of the Samaritans" *The Present Truth* 18, 37 , pp. 579, 580.

AT the death of Cyrus king of Persia, Cambyses his son, the Ahasuerus of Ezra iv. 6, immediately succeeded to the throne of the empire. The Samaritans who had so persistently carried on their work of obstruction by hired counsellors and otherwise "all the days of Cyrus," continued it all the days of Cambyses - about seven years.

At the very beginning of his reign, in addition to the work of their hired counsellors, the Samaritans took the bold step of presenting to Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, a formal and written accusation against the Jews: "In the reign of Ahasuerus, in the beginning of his reign, wrote they unto him an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem." Ezra iv. 6.

There is no known record that any notice at all was taken of their accusation. Even if any notice was taken of it, it is certain that their efforts were still in vain. The victory gained over them in the three weeks' contest at the Persian court in the first month of the third year of Cyrus, still held all the days of his son Cambyses. This shows that there was real meaning in Gabriel's words that at the end of the three weeks' contest at the court of Persia he held the victory with not

only the king, singular, but plural, - with the kings of Persia. From this it is plain that Cambyses, the heir apparent to the throne, was in that council through that three weeks' contest, and therefore when the contest was ended and the victory was kept, it was victory not only as respected Cyrus and the time being, but also respecting Cambyses and the years to come. The victory was kept with the kings of Persia.

There was a second son of Cyrus, named Smerdis; but Cambyses caused him to be secretly murdered. Indeed, this was accomplished with so much secrecy that the great body of the people believed that he was still alive. This gave opportunity for conspiracy and the rise of a usurper, whose real name was Gomates, but who claimed before the people to be Smerdis, the son of Cyrus. This occurred at the capital of Persia while Cambyses was absent on his expedition in the conquest of Egypt. The original account runs thus: -

Cambyses the son of Cyrus was king. . . . This Cambyses had a brother, named Smerdis (Bardiga); they had the same mother and the same father. Afterward, this Cambyses killed Smerdis. When Cambyses killed Smerdis, the people did not know that Smerdis was killed. Then Cambyses went to Egypt. The people became bad; and many falsehoods grew up in the provinces, as well as in Persia, as in Media, as in the other lands. And then a man, a Magian, named Gomates, from Pasargade, near the mount named Arakadris, there he arose. On the 14th day of the month Vlyakhna, thus arose: To the people he told lies, and said, "I am Smerdis, the son of Cyrus, the brother of Cambyses." Then all the people revolted from Cambyses, went over to him, and the Persians, and the Medes, and the other nations. He seized the kingdom. On the ninth day of the month Garmapada he took the royalty from Cambyses. . . . Gomates the Magian deprived Cambyses as well of the Persians, as of the Medians, as of the other nations; he did according to his own will, and seized the royalty over them. - *Darius*, in "Records of the Past," Old Series, vol. VII., pp. 89, 90.

Cambyses, returning with his army from Egypt, went as far as Syria, and was there met by one of the many heralds whom Gomates had sent into all the empire publishing the "proclamation to the troops that henceforth they were to obey Smerdis, the son of Cyrus, and not Cambyses." Cambyses, believing now that his secret murderers of Smerdis had really played him false; and that thus Smerdis was really alive and reigning in the capital, immediately killed himself (*Darius*): "having reigned, in all, seven years and five months, and left no issue behind him, male or female." - *Herodotus*. This was the end of July, 522 B.C.

As before stated, Gomates, this false Smerdis, was a Magian. His usurpation was a part of the conspiracy of the Magian priests to make predominate the Median element in the mixed national religion of Media and Persia. And though Gomates the Magian reigned as Smerdis *the Persians*, yet he was but the tool of the Magians to swing back the predominant element in the imperial religion from the Persian to the original Median. The difference was more sectarian and merely priestly, than fundamental and popular; but it furnished an opportunity that was

instantly seized by the Samaritans and their hired counsellors to make effective their determination to stop the work on the temple at Jerusalem.

Accordingly, no sooner was it known in Palestine that the new king reigned, than the Samaritans wrote to him a new and extended accusation against the Jews. For this Gomates, the false Smerdis, was the Artaxerxes of Ezra iv. 7-23.

"In the days of Artaxerxes wrote Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabeel, and the rest of their companions, unto Artaxerxes king of Persia; and the writing of the letter was written in the Syrian tongue, and interpreted in the Syrian tongue. Rehum the chancellor and Shimshai the scribe wrote a letter *against Jerusalem* to Artaxerxes the king in this sort: -

"Then wrote Rehum the chancellor, and Shimshai the scribe, and the rest of their companions; the Dinaites, the Apharsathchites, the Tarpelites, the Apharsites, the Archevites, the Babylonians, the Susanchites, the Dehavites, and the Elamites, and the rest of the nations whom the great and noble Asnapper brought over, and set in the cities of Samaria, and the rest that are on this side the river, and at such a time. . . . Thy servants the men on this side the river, and at such a time. Be it known unto the king, that the Jews which came up from thee to us are come unto Jerusalem, building the rebellious and the bad city, and have set up the walls thereof, and joined the foundations. Be it known now unto the king, that, if this city be builded, and the walls set up again, then will they not pay toll, tribute, and custom, and so thou shalt endamage the revenue of the kings. Now because we have maintenance from the king's palace, and it was not meet for us to see the king's dishonour, therefore have we sent and certified the king; that search may be made in the book of the records of thy fathers: so shalt thou find in the book of the records, and know that this city is a rebellious city, and hurtful unto kings and provinces, and that they have moved sedition within the same of old time; for which cause was this city destroyed. We certify the king that, if this city be builded again, and the walls thereof set up, by this means thou shalt have no portion on this side the river."

That letter is a most subtle and deceptive mixture of truth and falsehood. It was true that the city of Jerusalem had in old time been rebellious and seditious to the eastern kings, and that because of that, the city was destroyed. It was true that the imperial records at Babylon would confirm all this. But it was not in any sense true that such was the intention in now rebuilding the city, or that such would be the result of its rebuilding. This attributed intention of the Jews, and this surmised result of the rebuilding of the city, was nothing else than the revealing of their own secret purpose, when at the very first they offered to join the Jews and help in the building of that very city; and which they would have carried out to the full as soon as the city should have been finished, as certainly as they had been allowed to join in the building of the city.

Such a subtle mixture of lies and truth would have been well calculated to deceive any new king; and when it came to the

false Smerdis, the tool of the reactionary priests, it only the more readily had its intended effect. "Then sent the king an answer unto Rehum the chancellor, and

to Shimshai the scribe, and to the rest of their companions that dwell in Samaria, and unto the rest beyond the river: -

"Peace, and at such a time. The letter which ye sent unto us hath been plainly read before me. And I commanded, and search hath been made, and it is found that this city of old time hath made insurrection against kings, and that rebellion and sedition have been made therein. There have been mighty kings also over Jerusalem, which have ruled over all countries beyond the river; and toll, tribute, and custom, was paid unto them. Give ye now commandment to cause these men to cease, and that this city be not builded, until another commandment shall be given from me. Take heed now that ye fail not to do this: why should damage grow to the hurt of the kings?"

This letter was of course exceedingly gratifying to the rebellious, seditious, and officious Samaritans. Accordingly, "when the copy of king Artaxerxes' letter was read before Rehum, and Shimshai the scribe, and their companions, they went up in haste to Jerusalem unto the Jews, and made them to cease by force and power."

"Then ceased the work of the house of God which is at Jerusalem." Then the Samaritans laughed, and congratulated one another, and strutted, and rode around among the Jews, asserting their power. But even in the most exalted moments they never dreamed of what it really was over which they were so gleeful and so perfectly satisfied. They had no idea of what it was in reality into which they had so persistently, and at last so triumphantly, pushed themselves. In about six months there was another turn in imperial affairs. In the eighth month of his reign the false Smerdis, Gomates the Magian, was slain by Darius the Persian and six companions, and Darius the Persian, of ancient kingly race and descent, reigned in the Medo-Persian Empire. The Magian scheme was annihilated; the Persian element was once more predominant; the tide turned again in favour of the Jews, the rebuilding of the temple and the city went on, and by the power which they had invoked the Samaritans were compelled to help in the good work. This was exceedingly galling to them; but they had persistently pushed themselves into it, and there they must stay; they had been exceedingly glad when the power which they had invoked worked altogether their way; they could not fairly complain when that same power worked altogether the other way.

A. T. JONES.

September 18, 1902

"Restoration from Babylon. The Samaritans Compelled to Help" *The Present Truth* 18, 38 , pp. 598, 599.

BY the presence and the messages of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, the Jews were encouraged to take up again the work of building the temple of God and the wall of Jerusalem. Faith once more found her place in the hearts of the people; the land and people were blessed with prosperity and good cheer;

and the work was begun and carried on with a spirit and an alacrity that meant success certainly and speedily. Yet it was not all peace.

News of this soon reached the Samaritans, and of course set them all astir again. However, among the changes that had come in the imperial government by the death of the false Smerdis and the accession of Darius, was the change of the governor and other officials of Samaria. Rehum the chancellor and Shimshai the secretary had been displaced by Tatnai as governor and Shethar-Boznai as secretary. These men, of themselves, were fair-minded men; but there was about them the same officious Samaritan party as "companions." These urged on Tatnai and Shethar-Boznai to go up to Jerusalem, and again call a halt upon the work there. They did so, but, being fair-minded men, they did it in a perfectly fair way.

They asked, "Who hath commanded you to build this house, and to make up this wall?" and, "What are the names of the men that make this building?" The Jews told them that the temple had been built there many years before by a great king; that it had been destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar; and that Cyrus had issued a decree for the rebuilding of it, and had sent back from Babylon the gold and silver vessels that belonged in the house. Yet the Samaritans tried to have them stop the work; but they would not stop. Besides, "the eye of their God was upon the elders of the Jews, that they could not cause them to cease, till the matter came to Darius." Ezra v. 5.

Since they could not stop the work, the Samaritans had Tatnai and Shethar-boznai, write to Darius. They did so, but not as did Rehum and Shimshai in their deceptive mixture of truth and falsehood; they stated the case with fairness; exactly as the Jews had stated it to them. They wrote as follows: -

"Unto Darius the king, all peace. Be it known unto the king, that we went into the province of Judea, to the house of the great God, which is builded with great stones, and timber is laid in the walls, and this work goeth fast on, and prospereth in their hands. Then asked we those elders, and said unto them thus, Who commanded you to build this house, and to make up these walls? We asked their names also, to certify thee, that we might write the names of the men that were the chief of them. And thus they returned us answer, saying: -

"We are the servants of the God of heaven and earth, and build the house that was builded these many years ago, which a great king of Israel builded and set up. But after that our fathers had provoked the God of heaven unto wrath, he gave them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, the Chaldean, who destroyed this house, and carried the people away into Babylon. But in the first year of Cyrus the king of Babylon the same king Cyrus made a decree to build this house of God. And the vessels also of gold and silver of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar took out of the temple that was in Jerusalem, and brought them into the temple of Babylon, those did Cyrus the king take out of the temple of Babylon, and they were delivered unto one, whose name was Sheshbazzar, whom he had made governor; and said unto him, Take these vessels, go, carry them into the temple that is in Jerusalem, and let the house of God be builded in his place. Then came the same Sheshbazzar, and laid the

foundation of the house of God which is in Jerusalem; and since that time even until now hath it been in building, and yet it is not finished.

"Now therefore, if it seem good to the king, let there be search made in the king's treasure house, which is there at Babylon, whether it be so, that a decree was made of Cyrus the king to build this house of God at Jerusalem, and let the king send his pleasure to us concerning this matter."

When this letter reached Darius, he went about the matter in the thoroughly business-like way that characterised his whole reign and administration; he "made a decree" that search should be made for the records mentioned. First "search was made in the house of the books, where the treasures were laid up in Babylon." It was not found there, nor anywhere in Babylon. The search was continued in the other capitals; "and there was found at Ecbatana, in the palace that is in the province of the Medes, a roll, and therein was a record thus written:

-

"In the first year of Cyrus the king the same Cyrus the king made a decree concerning the house of God at Jerusalem, Let the house be builded, the place where they offered sacrifices, and let the foundations thereof be strongly laid; the height thereof threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof threescore cubits; with three rows of great stones, and a row of new timber: and let the expenses be given out of the king's house; and also let the golden and silver vessels of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar took forth out of the temple which is at Jerusalem, and brought unto Babylon, be restored, and brought again unto the temple which is at Jerusalem, every one to his place, and place them in the house of God."

This being found, Darius wrote to Tatnai and Shethar-boznai and the Samaritans as follows: -

"Now therefore, Tatnai, governor beyond the river, Shetharboznai, and your companions the Apharsachites, which are beyond the river, be ye far from thence: let the work of this house of God alone; let the governor of the Jews and the elders of the Jews build this house of God in his place.

"Moreover I make a decree what ye shall do to the elders of these Jews for the building of this house of God; that of the king's goods, even of the tribute beyond the river, forthwith expenses be given unto these men, that they be not hindered. And that which they have need of, both young bullocks, and rams, and lambs, for the burnt offerings of the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine, and oil, according to the appointment of the priests which are at Jerusalem, let it be given them day by day without fail; that they may offer sacrifices of sweet savours unto the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king, and of his sons.

"Also I have made a decree, that whosoever shall alter this word, let timber be pulled down from his house, and being set up, let him be hanged thereon; and let his house be made a dunghill for this. And the God that hath caused his name to dwell there destroy all kings and people, that shall put to their hand to alter and to destroy this house of God which is at Jerusalem.

"I Darius have made a decree; let it be done with speed." Ezra vi. 1-12.

That settled the question for ever. Therefore Tatnai, and Shethar-boznai, and their companions, "according to that which Darius the king had sent, so they did

speedily. And the elders of the Jews builded, and they prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo. And they builded, and finished it, according to the commandment of the God of Israel, and according to the commandment of Cyrus and Darius. . . . And this house was finished on the third day of the month Adar [the twelfth month], which was in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king" - 517 B.C. Ezra vi. 13-15.

And as soon as the house was finished, it was dedicated; and the children of Israel "kept the dedication of the house of God with joy," and offered sacrifices "according to the number of the tribes of Israel." And "they kept the Passover upon the fourteenth day of the first month;" "and kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days with joy; for the Lord had made them joyful, and turned the

599

heart of the king of Assyria unto them, to strengthen their hands in the work of the house of God, the God of Israel." Ezra vi. 16-22.

The temple and worship of God was restored. Against all opposition the cause of God had triumphed so far. However, the battle was not yet over; the wall was not yet built; and this was yet to be built "even in troublous times."

A. T. JONES.

October 23, 1902

"Knowing by Faith" *The Present Truth* 18, 38 , p. 673.

FAITH is not speculation. It is not a guessing at things. It is not a taking for granted that of which there is not, and cannot be, any certainty. Faith is the means of attaining to knowledge which cannot be reached in any other way. And it is absolute knowledge too. Instead of faith being the taking at a venture things of which there is no certainty, it is that which introduces us to the very certainties of the universe itself.

If the world could see God or the things of God with worldly eyes, and could know God or the things of God by worldly knowledge, this would reduce God and all the things of God to the level of this world and the things of this world. And this would be only to confirm, by the sanction of God, this world for ever in its own ways as they are. But God wants to lift the world up to Himself and His ways, instead of having the world bring Him down to its own level to confirm its own wickedness. And in order that the world may be brought to God and His ways, it must see with other than worldly eyes and know with other than worldly knowledge. It must see with the eyes of God and know with the knowledge of God. And that it may do this, God has made to all the world the gift of faith.

By faith we see that which without it cannot be seen, and by faith we know that which without it cannot be known. By faith we see Him who is invisible (Heb. xi. 27), and the things that are eternal (2 Cor. iv. 18). By faith we know Him who is the Author and Fountain of knowledge, and that which passeth knowledge. Eph. iii. 19. So, while the world cannot receive the Spirit of God because it seeth Him not neither knoweth Him, they who are of faith can receive Him. And having received Him they see Him, though He be invisible, and know Him. To these He

says, "Ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you." And, "Ye see Me." And, "I will manifest Myself to him."
A. T. JONES.

October 30, 1902

**"The Division and Punctuation of the Scriptures" *The Present Truth*
18, 44 , pp. 694, 695.**

THE marginal references in the Bible, the punctuation, the divisions into verses and chapters, are all the work of men. Not of men met together for that purpose, as in the translation of the Scriptures; but by several men at different times, and each independent of all the others.

First was the division into chapters. This was made by Hugo de Sancto Carol, who was born at St. Cher, Dauphine, France, about A.D. 1200, was created a cardinal by Pope Innocent IV., in 1245, and died in 1263. In preparing to make a concordance to the Latin Vulgate Version of the Scriptures, he divided both the Old Testament and the New into chapters, and that division still remains as he made it, in all our Bibles.

Next was the division into verses. The first direct step toward this was taken by Rabbi Mordecai Nathan, a celebrated Jewish teacher, in a "Concordance to the Hebrew Scriptures," composed A.D. 1438 to 1445. In this concordance, he made the division into verses, and marked every fifth verse with a Hebrew numeral letter. Then in 1661, Athias, a Jew of Amsterdam, printed an edition of the Hebrew Bible, in which he adopted the verses of Rabbi Nathan, and marked every verse with the figures in common use, 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., etc., except the verses previously marked with Hebrew numerals by Rabbi Nathan. With the rejection of these Hebrew numerals, and placing instead the corresponding figures, the verses and numbers of Nathan and Athias are still retained in all the copies of the Bible in other languages. But observe, this refers only to the Hebrew Bible, *i.e.*, the Old Testament. The verses of the New Testament, as now used, are the invention of a printer, Robert Stephens by name, in imitation of those made for the Old Testament by Rabbi Nathan. They were first introduced in 1551, in an edition of the New Testament, printed by Stephens.

As for punctuation points, with the exception of the period, no such things were known when the New Testament was written, nor for a long time afterward, for the writing in the oldest manuscripts is all in capital letters without accent or mark of any kind, not even spaces, between the words. Here is a translation of the copy of the first few lines of the Gospel of John, as it was written: -

"INTHEBEGINNINGWASTHE
WORDANDTHEWORDWAS
WITHGOD. ANDGODWASTHE
WORD. HEWASINTHEBEGINNING
WITHGOD
ALLWEREMADEBYHIMANDWITH

OUTHIMWASMADENOTONETHING
THATWASMADEINHIMLIFEWAS."

About 400 A.D., Jerome, and others from him, used points that correspond with our comma and colon, but they did not go into general use at all. Again in the eighth century the stroke now called comma was received, and Jerome's points were again used at the command of Charlemagne, and in the ninth century the Greek note of interrogation, which is now our semicolon, was first used. But it was not till the invention of printing that any of these points came into general use. Thus the colon and the period began to be used about 1485, the comma was next given a better shape, and the semicolon added about 1521, and in Sir Philip Sydney's "Arcadia," 1587, they all appear, as also the note of interrogation, the asterisk, and the parenthesis.

Then again, there were no acknowledged rules to guide the editors and printers in the use of the points, consequently they were placed just as each one pleased, and very often arbitrarily. And yet again the same editors and printers would change the punctuation in the different editions of the same work as they were successively printed; especially did Stephens vary his points in every edition of the Bible that he printed. And more than that, this variance in the punctuation of the Bible is not yet ended, as anyone may prove by comparing copies of the Bible printed only as far back as 1830 or 1840 with the later editions, and looking at Matt. xix. 28 and Heb. x. 12. In the earlier copies, at Matt. xix. 28, you will see the comma placed after "regeneration," in the passage reading thus: "Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed Me in the regnera-

695

tion, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory," etc., whereas in the later copies the comma is placed after "me," thus: "Ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory," etc. See what a difference it makes. The first would imply that Christ had been regenerated. But the difference in Heb. x. 12 is still more apparent, for in the older editions the comma is after "sins," thus: "But this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God," where in the newer editions the comma is placed after "ever," thus: "But this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God." While the first would make Christ sat down at the right hand of God for ever, the last only makes one sacrifice for sins for ever, and then sat down at the right hand of God only "till His enemies be made His footstool."

To anyone who will compare the Revised New Testament with the old version of common use, it will be apparent that the Revision Committee did not hold themselves subject to the punctuation of the common version, but changed it wherever they chose; and it would seem that their changes are not always for the better, for instance, Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. From this it would appear that at the death of the Saviour, "many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised;" and yet did not come out of the tombs till after His resurrection, which was the third day after His death. Such a thing is hardly to be supposed, but rather, as our old version gives it, that, at the death of Christ "the graves were opened; and

many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of their graves after His resurrection," that is the graves were opened at His death, when the earth quaked, and the rocks were rent; but the saints did not arise till after His resurrection. This looks more reasonable, and is less ambiguous. Yet there are places in our old standard version where the punctuation needs to be changed before the Scripture will be in harmony with itself. One notable instance is Luke xxiii. 43; by placing the comma after "to-day," instead of after "thee." Then it will harmonise perfectly with Zech. ix. 12, and John xx. 17, and with the whole course of Scripture on that subject.

A. T. JONES.

December 11, 1902

"Heaven in the Home" *The Present Truth* 18, 51 , p. 808.

HEAVEN in the home: it is possible to have it there. Heaven belongs on the earth, and of all places on the earth, surely most of all in the home.

The Lord Jesus came to this earth to bring heaven to the people as much as He did to take the people to heaven. Indeed, in a sense, He came for the purpose of bringing heaven to the people; for heaven must be brought to the people on earth and they must become acquainted with it, and desire it, and be made fit for it, before they can possibly be taken to it. And even when the glad throng of every kindred, tongue, people and nation, have reached heaven, it is with joyous anticipation that they exclaim, "We shall reign *on the earth*" (Rev. v. 10). That will be when "The new heaven and the new earth" shall have taken the place of this old one; and the great voice from heaven announces, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away" (Rev. xxi. 3, 4). Thus of very truth heaven belongs on the earth.

But it is only Christ who has brought heaven to the earth; and only in Him can it be found one earth. So it is written that we give "thanks to the Father, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son" (Col. iii. 13); and that kingdom is "the kingdom of heaven."

The word of God is "the word of the kingdom" (Matt. xiii. 11-19), and the object of the Word of God is to cause that the days of men on the earth shall be as the days of heaven upon earth. For so is it written; "Therefore shall ye lay up these, my words in your heart and in your soul, . . . and ye shall teach them to your children that your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children . . . as the days of heaven upon the earth" (Deut. xi. 18-21).

The Word of God laid up in the heart and in the soul, and taught diligently to the children, makes the days of parents and children as the days of heaven upon the earth. And the Word of God, and the truth as it is in Jesus, if allowed to prevail in the home, makes *heaven in the home*.

God wants it so, and God has planned it so, that all who go to heaven, shall, as they go, have heaven within and all around to go to heaven in. And as the home is the one place on earth where all the life most centres, God has fixed it so that, of all places on earth, there shall most of heaven in the home

[sic].

A. T. JONES.

The Present Truth, Vol. 19 (1903)

January 22, 1903

"When's and Why's" *The Present Truth* 19, 4 , p. 50.

WHEN Christ has said, "The Sabbath was made for man," WHY should any of His professed followers contend that it was made for the Jews only?

WHEN the Sabbath was made it was to be a memorial of God's creative work (Gen. ii. 2, 3; Ex xx. 8-11); then WHY should it cease to exist as long as His creative work remains? See Ps. cxxxv. 13.

WHEN the Lord wished to impress upon man the difference between Himself and the heathen gods, He always referred to the fact that He is the One that made the heavens and the earth (Isa. xlii.; xlviii. 12, 13; Acts xvii. 24; Rev. xiv. 7), thus giving the facts on which the Sabbath commandment was based. WHY, then, should the memorial be abolished while the facts still continue?

WHEN the Israelites came out of bondage, and before they received the ten commandments at Sinai, they were told that the seventh day "is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord;" that this is that which the Lord hath said;" and they were required to "keep" it (Ex. xvi. 22-30): WHY did the Lord tell them that it was the Sabbath, and require them to keep it, if it did not exist before the law was spoken at Sinai?

WHEN the ten commandments were given, WHY should nine of them be of perpetual obligation upon all the nations of the earth, and one - the Sabbath commandment - given only to the Jews, and this only from Sinai to Calvary?

When the Scriptures plainly teach us that Jesus Christ is the Creator of all things (John i. 3; Col. i. 16); the Deliverer of Israel from Egyptian bondage (Ex. xxiii. 20-23; 1 Cor. x. 4); the same One who spoke the law from Sinai (Ex. xx. 2); and the Redeemer of the world (Isa. xliii. 7, 11; xlv. 6); WHY should not we honour Him by keeping as the memorial of the creative work, the Sabbath which He made, blessed, sanctified, and kept?

A. T. JONES.

"Kept by the Word" *The Present Truth* 19, 4 , p. 54.

In the Christian life everything depends upon the Word of God. It is true that God is able, and desires, to keep us from sinning: but this must be done through His Word. So it is written, "By the Word of Thy lips I have kept me from the paths

of the destroyer." "Thy Word have I hid in my heart, that I might not sin against thee." This is the way that God has appointed, and there is no other way to have this thing accomplished.

Nor is this way appointed merely because he arbitrarily chose that this *should* be the way, and then laid it upon men that this *must* be the way that they should go. His Word is the way of salvation and the way of sanctification (Christian living), because this is the way that the Lord does things: because this is the way that He manifests Himself. It was by His Word that he created all things in the beginning: it is by His Word that He creates men anew; and it will be by His Word that He will re-create this world and all things pertaining to it. "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth. . . . For He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast." "Being born again, . . . by the Word of God." "And He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. . . . And He said unto me, It is done."

It is not only that the worlds were created by the Word of God; but they are also sustained by the same word. "By the Word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby [by the Word of God] the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. But the heavens and the earth, which are now, *by the same Word* are kept in store." So also it is not only that the Christian is created by the Word of God, but by that same Word he is sustained, nourished, and caused to grow. God holds up "all things" by His powerful Word. And the Christian is among this "all things" no less than any or all the worlds.

There can be no question whatever that all the worlds are held up, and held in their places, by the Lord. But it is not only all the worlds, it is "*all things*" that are held up and held in place by the Lord. and it is as true of the Christian as it is of any star in the firmament or any world on high. Nor can there be any question that the stars and the world are held up and held in their courses by the word of the Lord. And no less than this can there be any question that the Christian is held up and held in his right course by the Word of the Lord.

This is to be believed and depended upon by every one who professes the name of Christ. You and I can no more hold ourselves up and in the right way than can the sun or the earth. And as certainly as the worlds are dependent upon his word, so certainly is the Christian to depend upon his word. And when this is so, the Christian is kept in the way of the Lord as certainly and as easily as is any planet in the universe. It is written that he "is able to keep you from falling." And he says, "I will uphold thee with the right hand of My righteousness." "Yea, he *shall be* holden up; for God is able to make him stand."

O struggling, failing Christian, is not that Word which holds up great worlds able also to hold up you? Trust that Word. Depend implicitly upon it. Rest wholly *upon* it: and they you will find rest *in* it. Trust the Lord to hold you up, just as you trust Him to hold up the sun. His word holds up the sun, and His Word is over and over to you, "Fear thou not; for I am with thee." "I will uphold thee." I will keep thee, thou art Mine. "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." I will never leave thee till I have done that thing which I have spoken to thee of.

"The Word of God is quick ["living," R.V.] and powerful." "Powerful" means "full of power." The Word of God is living and full of power, to do for you, with you, and in you, all that that Word says. Believe that word, trust it: for it is the Word of the living God. It is the Word of the pitying Saviour. "Receive with meekness the engrafted Word, which is able to save your souls." "I commend you to God, and to *the Word* of His grace, which is able to build you up." You "are kept by the power of God through faith." The power of God is manifested through His Word, and therefore it is his powerful Word. Faith comes by hearing the Word of God; therefore it is the *faithful* Word, the Word full of faith. Therefore when he says, you "are kept by the power of God through faith," it is only saying in another way, You are kept by the Word of God, "unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." Believe that Word, trust it, and find its keeping power.

A. T. JONES.

January 29, 1903

"The Papacy and Civilisation" *The Present Truth* 19, 5 , pp. 67, 68.

INFLUENCE IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

IT is claimed and urged on behalf of the Papacy that she is the best promoter of a proper and "Christian" civilisation.

As the basis and sufficient proof that the Papacy is the source and stay of a "Christian" civilisation, there is presented by both Catholics and "Protestants," and not less by "Protestants" than by Catholics, the stupendous "fact" that she civilised the barbarians of the fifth century and the middle ages, who annihilated the Roman Empire. This theory the late Dr. Philip Schaff constantly affirmed, though it clearly contradicted and undisputed and indisputable facts of the history which he himself had written. The truth is that there never was a clearer historical fraud put forth than this claim that the Papacy civilised the barbarians who destroyed the Roman Empire, and occupied Western Europe in the middle ages.

It must not be forgotten that the Papacy had possession of the Roman Empire itself, with all the power of the empire at her command, for nearly a hundred years before the barbarians ever entered the Western Empire with any intention to stay, and more than a hundred years before she had any chance to "civilise" them. It must be remembered, too, that her alliance with the empire, and her securing possession of it, were for the express purpose of assuring to it the benefits of a "Christian civilisation" and consequent "salvation." Surely here was ample time to test her powers in this direction, before she was ever called upon to "civilise" the barbarians.

What, then, was the result? It was this: When, by the union of Church and State, church membership became a qualification for political as well as every other kind of preferment, hypocrisy became more prevalent than ever before. This was bad enough in itself, yet the hypocrisy was voluntary; but when through the agency of her Sunday laws and by the ministrations of Theodosius the church

received control of the civil power to compel all without distinction, who were not Catholics, to act as though they were,

HYPOCRISY WAS MADE COMPULSORY

and every person who was not voluntarily a church member was compelled either to be a hypocrite or a rebel. In addition to this, those who were of the church indeed, through the endless succession of controversies and church council, were forever establishing, changing, and re-establishing the faith; and as all were required to change or revise their faith according as the councils decreed, all moral and spiritual integrity was destroyed. Hypocrisy became a habit, dissimulation and fraud a necessity of life; and the very moral fiber of men and of society was vitiated.

All the corruptions that had characterised the earlier Rome was thus reproduced and perpetuated *under a form of godliness* in this so-called Christian Rome, the Rome of the fifth century. Bower says of this time: -

The primitive rigour of discipline and manners was utterly neglected and forgotten by the ecclesiastics of Rome. The most exorbitant luxury, with all the vices attending it, was introduced among them, and the most scandalous and unchristian arts of acquiring wealth universally practised. They seem to have rivaled in riotous living the greatest epicures of Pagan Rome when luxury was there at the highest pitch. For Jerome, who was an eyewitness of what he writ, reproaches the Roman clergy with the same excesses which the poet Juvenal so severely censured in the Roman nobility under the reign of Domitian.

The only possible result of such a course was constantly to increase unto more ungodliness, to undermine every principle of the foundation of society, and really to

HASTEN THE DESTURCTION

of the empire. The pagan delusions, the pagan superstitions, and the pagan vices that had been adopted and brought into the Catholic Church by her apostasy and clothed with a form of godliness, wrought such infinite corruption that the society of which it was the greater part could no longer exist. It must inevitably fall by the weight of its own corruption, if from nothing else.

Dr. Schaff says in his "History of the Christian Church:" -

The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theatre going, intemperance, lewdness; in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman Empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude, but simple and morally vigorous, barbarians.

And onward those barbarians came, swiftly and in multitudes. They came, a host, wild and savage, it is true; but whose social habits were so far above those

of the people which they destroyed, that, savage as they were caused fairly to blush at the shameful

68

corruptions which they found in this so-called Christian society of Rome. This is proved by the best authority. A writer who lived at the time of the barbarian invasions, and who wrote as a Christian, Salvian, gives the following evidence as to the condition of things: -

"The Church, which ought everywhere to propitiate God, what does she but provoke Him to anger? How many may one meet, even in the Church, who are not still drunkards, or debauchees, or adulterers, or fornicators, or robbers, or murderers, or the like, or all these at once, without end? It is even a sort of holiness among Christian people to be less vicious." "From the public worship of God, and almost during it, they pass to deeds of shame. Scarce a rich man but would commit murder and fornication. We have lost the whole power of Christianity, and offend God the more, that we sin as Christians. We are worse than the barbarians and heathen. If the Saxon is wild, the Frank faithless, the Goth inhuman, the Alanian drunken, the Hun licentious, they are, by reason of their ignorance, far less punishable than we, who, knowing the commandments of God, commit all these crimes."

And Dr. Schaff remarks of this very period, and the consequences of this effort of the Papacy at the civilisation of the Roman Empire: "Nothing but the Divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian but essentially heathen world, could open the way for the moral regeneration of society." This is precisely how the Papacy gave "Christian civilisation" and "salvation" to the Roman Empire, when she held full and undisputed possession of it for more than a hundred years. And her work of civilising the barbarians was after precisely the same order. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, when she assures us that the Catholic Church "is in this world the one thing that never changes."

A. T. JONES.

February 5, 1903

"Why Is this This?" *The Present Truth* 19, 6 , p. 87.

MENANDER was a Greek writer of comic plays, who lived in the time of Alexander the Great. All his writings were lost, and for ages were known only by quotations in other authors. Only lately some papyri were unearthed in Egypt containing nearly a hundred verses of what is said to be "one of Menander's most celebrated plays." How this is *known* is by the fact that in these verses there are found "three passages that are quoted by ancient writers as being from the play in question."

We do not deny that this is all correct enough. But what we would call attention to is the fact that the Biblical writings are not accepted on like evidence

by the same scholars who "know," and fully accept upon this evidence, all these verses as the veritable words and work of Menander.

There have come to us in the Bible whole books purporting to be the writings of Moses. In the New Testament, in the writing of other hands, there are passages quoted from these writings of Moses, which are there plainly declared to be quoted from the writings of Moses. Anybody can turn from these quotations to the original books, and find there the quoted passages. Yet this is not allowed to weight anything in favor of these *books* being the veritable writings of Moses; all that is allowed is that these particular quoted passages *in the books* are the genuine writings of Moses. It is the same way with other books all through the Bible.

Now what we want to know is, Why is not this procedure in the matter of the writings of Menander accepted and followed with respect to the writings of Moses and other Biblical authors? Why is it that three quoted passages, when verified in purported writings of Menander, are accepted as sufficient proof by which to "*know*" that the *whole document* is genuine, when, by these same people, a greater number of quoted passages from the writings of Moses and of other Biblical hands are accepted only as evidence that the *particular quoted passages* are genuine, and prove nothing as to the *books*?

These "ways are not equal." There is something wrong somewhere. Upon the verification of three quoted passages, the *whole* of a pagan, corrupt, idolatrous document is accepted as genuine; while with respect to divine, purifying, saving books, the verification of any number of quoted passages is not allowed of *the particular passages themselves!* It all only illustrates the ready and stubborn infidelity of the natural mind, which receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, because they are foolishness to him.

A. T. JONES.

February 26, 1903

"The Lord's Wish" *The Present Truth* 19, 9 , p. 142.

TEMPERANCE is self-control. Christian temperance is self-control *in all things*, - of body, - soul, and spirit. For he which "striveth for the mastery is temperate [controls himself] in all things." This is the only true temperance. And this in order that we may glorify God in both body and spirit, - glorify Him, and Him alone, in all things, and so meet the object of our creation and of our redemption.

The Lord has created and redeemed the body as really as He has the soul. He cares for the body as really and as fully as He does for the soul. And He wants us to care for the body as really and as fully as we care for the soul. Therefore He has said, "I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health even as thy soul prospereth." Thus it is certain that the wish of the Lord is that our prosperity in health shall be even - evenly balanced - with our prosperity of soul, or spirit.

No one will for a moment question that God has given directions and prescriptions abundant to assure the prosperity of the soul. Every one knows that every one who will sincerely accept the word of God as to the good of his soul will assuredly find his soul prospering abundantly. Yet as the Lord has recorded His wish, "*above all things*," that our health may prosper *evenly* with our souls, it certainly follows that He has given directions and prescriptions assuring prosperity in health *evenly* with the directions and prescriptions assuring prosperity of soul.

Yet this is very little thought of, even by professed Christians; and by many who happen to think of it, it is not believed sufficiently to lead them to an honest study of the word of God to know what He has said on the subject, and then give it a place in the life. Many will bear great concern about the prosperity of their souls, to the utter neglect of their health, when if only they would take thought and care as to how they are living, and correct that by the word of God, the prosperity of their souls would be so abundant that there would be no room for anxiety in the matter.

A. T. JONES.

March 19, 1903

"The Way to True Greatness" *The Present Truth* 19, 12 , pp. 182, 183.

A LEADING writer has defined life as "a seeking for power." There is much truth in that definition, as witnesses the whole history of the world. As the world seeks for it, it is a vain search, as also witnesses the whole history of mankind. Yet the desire for power, even for unlimited power, is wholly a right desire - a true Gospel desire. And God in Christ by the Gospel has established the true and only way to satisfy this desire. So it is written: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God . . . to every one that believeth." I cease not to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be . . . strengthened with all might according to His glorious power." "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come."

This is the way, and the only true way, to power. This is the way to power that is really power - power that perfectly satisfies, always in all things, and in all circumstances; power that is unlimited and almighty; for it is the very power of God unto "all the fulness of God." But instead of taking this way to the power that perfectly satisfies in all things and for ever, men will take the way of crushing out their fellowmen, wiping out nations, and wading through seas of blood, to attain to a power that is wholly precarious and wholly unsatisfactory, and which, at the very best, is only "for a moment." The desire for power is a wholly right desire;

men taking the wrong way to attain to that right thing, miss it altogether. The way of "Christ the power of God" is the only way to power.

It is entirely so, also, as to greatness. It is wholly right to desire to be great. To desire to be great is a true gospel desire. In the Word of the Gospel it is presented as an incentive "that ye shall be called great

183

in the kingdom of heaven." Read it: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

It is altogether right to keep the commandments of God and to teach men so. There is no more righteous thing than that. Indeed, there is no greater thing than that. In the nature of things, a person must be great, to do great things. A man, therefore, must be great to be able to do the great thing of keeping the commandments of God and of teaching men so. And being great, and doing that great thing, that he should be called great, is but the simple thing of calling him what he already is. And since it is supremely and eternally right to desire to keep the commandments of God, and to teach men so; and since, in order to do that, we must be great, it follows that it is eternally right to desire to be great. Accordingly, concerning John the Baptist, the forerunner of the model Man, it was spoken by the angel of the Lord: "He shall be great in the sight of the Lord." And of Christ, the model Man Himself it was also spoken by the angel of the Lord: "He shall be great." And it is right for every man to desire to be like Him, the model Man. Therefore it is right for every man to desire to be great.

This truth is strikingly emphasised and strongly illustrated in the life of the twelve disciples and Christ's dealing with them. Those disciples were almost constantly querying in their own minds "Who shall be the greatest?" or "Who shall be called greatest?" in the kingdom which they were expecting Christ to establish. Time and again, these queryings broke out into discussion and even contention among them. More than once their anxiety in this matter led them even to ask Jesus openly the question. Once two of them had it so far settled in their own minds that they two were the greatest, that they put themselves forward and actually asked openly that they two should be given the two places of chief honour, one on His right hand, and the other on His left, in that kingdom that they had in mind. And yet, though invariably speaking to them on the subject, never by as much as a hint did Jesus reprove their desire to be great or even the greatest; never once did He suggest to them that greatness was an altogether unbecoming subject for them as His disciples to even think of aspiring to. Yet while this was so, He never missed an opportunity, He seized every occasion, to show to them that they had in view the utterly wrong way to greatness, and to point out to them the true way to greatness.

What, then, is this way? "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying: Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called little child unto Him, and set him in the midst of them and said: Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child,

the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. Conversion, then, - a changed life and humility, - is essential to greatness. This is indeed the entrance to the way of true greatness.

The rest of the way is made plain, as follows: "Jesus called them unto Him and said: Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not so among you; but whosoever will be great among you let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many:" and "I am among you as he that serveth."

The world's way, the human and false way, to greatness, is for a man by an assertion of power, dominion, or authority to exalt himself to a position of lordship and have as many as possible to serve him and be subject to his beck and nod. But in the true way of greatness it is not so; here it is humility to the emptying of self and becoming himself the servant of all, being "at the call of every one."

Service, then, service of our fellow-men, freely chosen by a free man, this is the true way to greatness. He who, being free from all, freely chooses to be servant to all, and at the call of every one, is in the way of true greatness. And he who thus serves most people, who is at the call of the most people, is the greatest; even as the Son of man, the model Man, came not to be ministered unto, but to minister; not to be served, but to serve; not to have all people at His call, but to put Himself at the call of all people, and to devote His life and pour it out for mankind.

Free service to mankind, ministering to their needs, answering their calls, ready ever to do them good in whatever possible way, seeking to perform and striving to be able to perform, all this in the most efficient way, to do the most possible good in service to the greatest possible number of people - this is the true way of greatness. So it is perfectly proper to desire to be great, and even to be the greatest in this the right and true way. It is totally unlike the world's way; and it is impossible for anyone ever to become proud of the greatness so attained.

And this is the greatness that accomplishes that truly great thing of the keeping of the commandments of God and teaching men so. For it is written: "Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not a liberty for an occasion for the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Since, therefore, loving service to others by those who are free, is the fulfilling of all the law of liberty, the law of God; and since those who do this great thing were called great simply because, in the nature of things, that is what they must be and what they are, it follows that loving service to others by those who are free in Christ is true greatness.

Oh, then, let us all aspire to greatness in this the only right way. In the world's way only a very few can ever attain to greatness. In this the true way every soul can attain to it; every soul can be like the model Man, who, "anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, went about doing good and healing set that were

oppressed of the devil, for God was with Him."
A. T JONES.

June 11, 1903

**"Origin of the Doctrine of Natural Immortality" *The Present Truth* 19,
24 , pp. 374, 375.**

IN order to get a clear understanding and appreciation of the standing of the papacy at the moment when the Roman Empire vanished, and she found herself alone in the midst of that vast scene of destruction and anarchy, it is essential to know the source of her strength, by which she was able to survive. And, in order to know this, it is essential that we sketch a certain portion of her preceding history.

In that dismal mixture of downright heathenism, and the profession and forms of Christianity in the philosophical schools of Ammonius Saccas, Clement, and Origen, in Alexandria, there was given birth to the element which, shove all other things, have ever been the mainstay of the papacy-monkery, or monasticism: from the Greek word signifying, "living alone, solitary; a man who retired from the world for religious meditation and the practice of religious duties in solitude; a religious hermit."

In the philosophy of Ammonius, Clement, and Origen, all Scripture contains at least two meanings, - the literal and the hidden: the literal was considered the baser sense of the Scripture, and therefore a hindrance to the proper understanding of the hidden meaning with its train of farther hidden meanings, and, accordingly, was despised and separated as far as possible from the hidden sense, and counted as of the least possible worth. It was said that "the source of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal or external part of Scripture;" that "those who do so will not attain to the kingdom of God;" and that, therefore, "the Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written." Now, the basis of that whole scheme was their conception of man himself. It was because, in their philosophy, the body is the baser part of man, that the literal was counted the baser sense of Scripture. It was because the body often betrays good men into sin, that, in their philosophy, the literal sense of Scripture was held to lead men into error. In their system of philosophy, the body of man was but a clog to the soul, and hindered it in its heavenly aspirations; and therefore was to be despised, and, by neglect, punishment, and starvation, was to be separated as far as possible from the soul. And from this it followed, in their imagination, that the literal settee of Scripture which corresponded to man's body, - was, likewise, a hindrance to the proper understanding of the hidden meanings of the Scripture, and was, therefore, to be despised, neglected, and separated as far as possible from the hidden sense or soul of the Scripture.

HEATHEN PHILOSOPHY

WHENCE came to them this philosophy of the nature of man? It was the adoption entire of the heathen conception of the nature of man: it was the direct continuation, under the Christian profession, of the heathen philosophy of the immortality of the soul. For, about the close of the second century, "a new philosophic body suddenly started up, which in a short time prevailed over a large part of the Roman Empire, and not only nearly mellowed up the other sects, but likewise did immense injury to Christianity. Egypt was its birthplace, and particularly Alexandria, which for a long time had been the seat of literature and every science. Its followers chose to be called Platonics [or Platonists]. Yet they did not follow Plato implicitly, but collected from all systems whatever seemed to coincide with their own views."

"Plato had taught that the souls of heroes, of illustrious men, and eminent philosophers, alone, ascended after death into the mansions of light and felicity, while those of the generality, weighed down by their lusts and passions, sunk into the infernal regions, whence they were not permitted to emerge before they were purified from their turpitude and corruption. This doctrine was seized with avidity by the Platonic Christians, and applied as a commentary upon that of Jesus. Hence a notion prevailed that only the martyrs entered upon a state of happiness immediately after death; and that, for the rest, a certain obscure region was assigned, in which they were to be imprisoned until the second coming of Christ, or, at least, until they were purified from their various pollutions.

Of the inquiries of the ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome with regard to the immortality of the soul, it has been well observed that "their reason had been often guided by their imagination, and that their imagination had been prompted by their vanity. When they viewed with complacency the extent of their own mental powers, when they exercised the various faculties of memory, of fancy, and of judgment, in the most profound speculations, or the most important labours, and when they reflected on the desire of fame, which transported them into future ages, far beyond the bounds of death and of the grave, they were unwilling to . . . suppose that a being, for whose dignity they entertained the most sincere admiration, could be limited to a spot of earth, and to a few years of duration." - Gibbon.

THE FRUIT OF VANITY AND SELF-LOVE

THUS it is plain that vanity, self-love, self-exaltation selfishness - is the root of the philosophy of the immortality of the soul. It was this that led them to confider themselves, in their souls, "immortal and imperishable" (for so Plato definitely puts it), and so, essentially a part of the Deity. And this is confirmed by revelation. For, when God had said to the man whom He had formed and placed in dominion over all the earth and over every moving thing upon it: "Of all the trees of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree which is in the midst of the garden thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Satan came with the words: "*Ye shall not surely die*; for God doth know that, on the day ye eat thereof, your eyes will be opened and ye will be as *God*." Gen. iii. 4, 5, R.V. The woman believed this Satanic word. So believing,

she saw what was not true - that the tree was "to be desired to make one wise," a philosopher; and "she took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat."

CHRIST OUR LIFE

THIS is the origin of the philosophy of the immortality of the soul, in this world. The only reason why man did not die that day, even in the very hour when he sinned, is that there, at that moment, *Jesus Christ offered Himself* in behalf of man, and took upon Himself the death that would then have fallen upon the man; and thus gave to man another chance, a probation, a breathing space, that he might choose life. This is why God could immediately say to the deceiver: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel." Gen. iii. 15; Haggai ii. 7; Rom. xvi. 20; Heb. 11. 14. And so it is written: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." John x. 10. He came that they might first have life; and, without His then offering Himself, man never would have had life after he sinned. And, having come that the man might first have life,

375

this life to the man was and is solely for the purpose that he might use it in securing life more abundantly, even eternal life, the life of God. Thus it is only by the gift of Christ that any man in this world ever has opportunity to breathe at all. And, the sole object of man's having an opportunity to breathe, is that he may choose life, that he may live and escape the death that is due to sin.

EARTH-LIFE A VAPOUR

AND so it is written: "What is your life? - It is even a vapour that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away." James iv. 14. And, what is death - the death which men die in this world? - It is even a sleep (John xi. 11-14; 1 Thess. iv. 15, 16; Acts xxiv. 15; John v. 28, 29) from which there is waking only in the resurrection of the dead. So the entering of Christ - Christ's gift of Himself when man had sinned - gave to man this life which is but a vapour, and which ends in this death which is but a sleep, between that life which is life indeed, and that death which is death indeed. Therefore, to all mankind it is spoken for ever: "See I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil. Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." Deut. xxx. 15, 19. "He that heareth My word and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." John v 24.

LIFE THAT IS LIFE INDEED

ACCORDINGLY, "he that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life; "for" this is the record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son." 1 John v. 11, 12. And this life which is life indeed, beyond this life which is a vapour and this death which is a sleep, is assured only

in Christ, through the resurrection of the dead: as it is written, "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory." Col. iii. 4. "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. iv. 15-17. And, without the resurrection of the dead, there is no hereafter; for "if the dead rise not . . . your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins; then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." And "if after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." 1 Cor. xv. 16-18, 32.

IMMORTALITY ONLY BY THE GOSPEL

THIS is the true course, and the only true course, to immortality: not merely immortality of the soul, but the immortality of both soul and body. For Christ has bought, and will redeem, the body equally with the soul; He cares, and would have men care, for the body equally as for the soul; as it is written, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth." 3 John 2. God only hath immortality. 1 Tim. vi. 16. Christ "hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." 2 Tim i. 10. Thus immortality is the gift of God, and is obtained only by believers of the Gospel. And to these it is given only at the resurrection of the dead; as it is written: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. xv. 51-57.

CHRIST AND HIM CRUCIFIED

THIS is the truth as to immortality. This is the true way of mankind from mortality to immortality. But, it is directly antagonistic to the Platonic or pagan idea of immortality, and of that way to it. This is evident on its facie; but it is aptly confirmed by an incident that occurred at the very seat of the original Platonic philosophy - in Athens itself. Paul, in one of his journeys, came to Athena, where he remained several days, and talked "in the synagogue with the Jews, and with the devout persons, and in the market daily with them that met with him." And, in all his speech, he preached the Gospel - Christ and Him crucified: Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God: Christ and the resurrection of the dead:

and life and immortality only through Christ and the resurrection of the dead. "Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics encountered him. And some said, What will this babler say? Other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods." And this "because he preached unto them *Jesus and the resurrection*." This was altogether a new doctrine, something which they never had heard. Therefore, "they took him, and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears: we would know therefore what these things mean." And when, standing on Mars' Hill, he preached to them the Gospel, and called upon all "to repent: because He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath *raised Him from the dead* - when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked: and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter."

This account demonstrates even by inspiration that the Christian conception of immortality is not in any sense that of Plato and the other philosophers. If Paul had preached in Athens the immortality of the soul, no one in Athens would ever have counted him "a setter forth of strange gods." Such preaching would never there have been called "new doctrine." Nothing of that sort would ever have been "strange things to their ears." But Christianity knows no each thing as the immortality of the soul. Therefore Paul preached immortality as the gift of God through Jesus Christ and the resurrection from the dead: immortality to be sought for and obtained only through the faith of Christ, by believers in Jesus - immortality only through Christ and the resurrection of the dead He preached that, without the Gospel, all men are lost, and subject to death. For, to the Greeks he wrote: "If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4. He preached the Word, - not that the soul is "immortal and imperishable," but - "the soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Eze. xviii. 4); that "the wicked shall perish" (Ps. xxxvii. 20); that "they shall be as nothing;" that "yet a little while and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be" (Ps. xxxvii. 10); that "the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord;" Rom vi. 23. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil way; for why will ye die?" Eze. xxxiii. 11.

A. T. JONES.

December 24, 1903

"Not the Outside But the Inside" *The Present Truth* 19, 51 , p. 804.

IT is not what is outside of us but what is *inside*, that makes us Christians and keeps us so.

If you think you could be a better Christian if there were better brethren and sisters in the church, you greatly mistake. It is just the other way; if you were a better Christian, you would find better brethren and sisters in the church.

If you think you could do better if only you had better neighbours, you greatly mistake. The truth is that if you would do better, you would have better neighbours. And if you were a better Christian, you would do better. You must *be* better before you can do better.

Christianity does not come from ourselves, nor from anybody nor anything that is around us. It comes down straight from heaven to every soul who will receive it. And having its source in heaven, it is not and cannot be affected by anything that is of earth.

Thus the Christian has joy in sorrow, peace in perplexity, riches in poverty, society in loneliness, and friendship among strangers and even enemies.

A. T. JONES.

¹ This article will be followed next week by another on "The Infallibility of the Pope: Where does It come from, and How does He get It."

² Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," Laodicea. In both the Greek and latin copies of this canon, the word "Sabbath" is used instead of "Saturday;" and the word "anathema" - accursed - is the one which Hefele translates "shut out." The following is the Latin: "Quod non oportet Christianos Judaizare et otiare in Sabbato, sed operari in eodem die. Preferentes autem in veneratione Dominicum diem si vacare voluerint, ut Christiani hoc faciat; quod si reperti fuerint Judaizare Anathema sint a Christo."

³ Quotations in this article, except when otherwise indicated, are from Dean Stanley's "Lectures on the Eastern Church."

⁴ I take this occasion to remark that which has already become apparent, and which becomes more and more emphatic as the history proceeds, that the term "Christian," in such connection as it is here used by Stanley, is totally misapplied. This was not an assembly of the Christian church; it was not the Christian church that united with the State. This was an assembly of the Catholic Church; it was the Catholic Church that formed the union with the State. The history of "the church" is not the history of Christianity. The history of Christianity has not been written except by the rack, by sword, and by flame; in tears, in sufferings, and in blood, - and in the books that shall be opened at the last day. Faithfulness to the authors quoted will require, in a few instances, the printing of this misapplication of the word "Christian." But the reader will need merely to note the connection, to see that the word is sadly misused; and this note will be the assurance in every such case that, though it is so printed, it is not endorsed in any such connection.

⁵ Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," see 172, par. 22-24; and Bower's "History of the Popes," Leo, par. 46.

⁶ Milman, "History of Latin Christianity," book ii., chap. 4, par. 2.